

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 17908. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to prescribe standards for training and control of National Guard units assigned to duty in connection with civil disturbances occurring on or adjacent to institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 17909. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow the issuance of visas to brothers and sisters of citizens of the United States as immediate relatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17910. A bill to authorize a program for the development of a tuna fishery in the Central and Western Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 17911. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend to the College of the Virgin Islands the benefits now available to certain other institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. KERR):

H.J. Res. 1247. Joint resolution to amend section 19(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIDNALL (for himself, Mr. BROCK, Mr. CONABLE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.J. Res. 1248. Joint resolution on wage and price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Res. 1060. Resolution to stop funds for war in Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, or North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H. Res. 1061. Resolution to urge the withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 1062. Resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to investigate and report on campaign expenditures of candidates for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 17912. A bill for the relief of Jin Soo Park and Moon Mi Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 17913. A bill for the relief of Chan Ku Lee, his wife, Young A., and daughter, Eun Kyung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause of rule XXII, 503. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the National Association of State Aviation Officials and other national associations representing the civil aviation industry, proposing immediate steps to increase the capacity of airports and airways, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JULIAN F. ROSS, SMALL BUSINESS ADVISER OF DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY, RETIRES

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I would like to say a few words about our good friend, Julian F. Ross, the Small Business Adviser of the Defense Supply Agency, upon the occasion of his recent retirement from Federal service.

Mr. Ross has had an exceptionally distinguished career in the Federal service. He served in the U.S. Army, entering as a private in September 1942, and was released as a captain in June 1946. Continuing in the Reserves, he achieved the rank of lieutenant colonel prior to his retirement from the Reserve Corps. In civilian service, Mr. Ross has held various assignments with the Office of Price Administration; Office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army; Office of Design and Construction, General Services Administration, prior to his appointment to the Defense Supply Agency in February 1962.

Dedicated to the philosophy that small business must have a fair share of Government procurement, Julian Ross for many years has ably served the interests of the small businessman in America, as well as enforcing the high standards of procurement of the agency he represented.

Mr. Ross has always fully cooperated with our committee as a DSA witness in procurement hearings and in connection with the solution of many procurement problems and complaints presented to our committee by Members of Congress on behalf of their small business constituents. His achievements have been

extremely helpful both to the small business community and to the Government.

Lt. Gen. Earl C. Hedlund, Director of the Defense Supply Agency, in recognizing these accomplishments, has presented to Mr. Ross the Agency's highest award, the DSA Exceptional Civilian Service Award. The citation on this award reads as follows:

For exceptional performance of duty as Small Business Advisor of the Defense Supply Agency from 15 May 1964 to 15 May 1969. Mr. Ross has consistently demonstrated an exceptional degree of professional ability. His outstanding leadership, integrity, and managerial ability forged Defense Supply Agency's Small Business Program to the forefront at its inception and has continued this preeminence through subsequent years with the highest rate of effectiveness, resulting in DSA being the only major Department of Defense element meeting or exceeding established goals. Mr. Ross' contributions reflect great credit upon himself and the Department of Defense.

In addition to this, Mr. Ross earlier received the DSA's Outstanding Performance Award for his years of service from 1962 to 1964. I would only comment that both awards and the citation emphasizes the respect and admiration that all of us—committee members and staff—have for Julian Ross.

While we shall miss him, it is our wish that his well-earned retirement will bring to Mr. Ross and to his family the enjoyment of good health and happiness for many years to come.

SOVIET NUCLEAR STRATEGIC ARMS BUILDUP

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, until such time the Soviets show some sign of

deescalating their nuclear strategic arms buildup, it would be an unacceptable risk for the United States not to move ahead with the deployment of MIRV and the ABM Safeguard System. These systems are the two best bargaining weapons America has in negotiating a reduction in strategic arms at the SALT talks now in session in Vienna.

It is encouraging to note that the State newspaper in Columbia, S.C., fully supports the deployment of MIRV and ABM. In the May 22 issue, an editorial points out the grave danger of a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of MIRV. Full support of U.S. intentions to deploy MIRV and the ABM will place the United States in a strong position to trade with the Soviets. In my judgment, it would be foolish to give away our trump card in advance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

HOPES OF ARMS LIMITATION MUST NOT NULLIFY DEFENSE

Despite the best efforts to make the issue of national defense understandable, some critics of U.S. defense spending absolutely refuse to understand even a little about the subject. It suffices for their purpose to lament the "military-industrial complex," having done which they retire from debate, satisfied at a job well done.

The subject, needless to say, is considerably more complex than they imagine. Likewise considerably more important, for if the SALT talks in Vienna fail to make pacifists of the Soviets, the nation must fall back on the Pentagon for whatever security it will enjoy in the years ahead.

Yet the giddy feeling persists that the Pentagon should declare a moratorium on defense work for the duration of the Vienna talks. Senator Edward Kennedy, for example, declared in a speech last week that Defense Secretary Laird's insistence on the Safeguard ABM system and MIRV warheads "is undermining" attempts to get an international

agreement on disarmament. The MIRV, a cluster of warheads in one rocket, particularly alarms him.

"Large scale deployment of MIRV by the U.S.," he said, "would so threaten the Russians' second-strike capabilities that they would probably have to revert to a launch-on-warning system." This is the tactic whereby a nation, fearing near-certain destruction of its missile force, launches its missile force the moment it detects radar blips that look like incoming missiles.

If our MIRVs are that fearful a weapon, it becomes difficult to follow Senator Kennedy's logic; deployment would seem to be the best possible way of encouraging the Russians to sign a disarmament agreement. But let it pass. What needs to be understood is that MIRV is not that fearful a weapon. Just the opposite, in fact.

The chief virtue of the MIRV is its ability to penetrate an antiballistic missile (ABM) defense, but it can do so only at a price. The price is diminished destructive power for each warhead. Instead of one missile of, say, 50 megaton capacity, the MIRV would carry 10 missiles of five megaton capacity. As a first-strike weapon—one designed to knock out the enemy's hardened missile silos—the MIRV is a flop. In spite of this Senator Kennedy and other critics of the MIRV insist on treating it as precisely the kind of weapon it is not.

They also ignore, in the debate on an ARM system, the increasing Soviet firepower. In five years, the Nixon administration has recently disclosed, the Soviet Union will have 25,000 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs). This will be two and a half as many as the United States will have by then. In terms of megatonnage, the Soviet missile force will outweigh the U.S. force by five or more to one. The Pentagon estimates that such a Soviet force would be able to destroy 95 per cent of America's land-based missiles.

These are frightening statistics. The prospective Soviet advantage in this decade can be offset only by an ABM system to protect this country's land-based missiles or by the construction and deployment of enough additional missiles so that the United States could retaliate after a Soviet first-strike. It will be expensive, but what is the alternative? The SALT talks perhaps, and let us keep our fingers crossed. But if the SALT talks should fail, it would be nice to have something more comforting than faith in the Kremlin's self-restraint.

DISSENT: A RIGHT?

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, the Franklin Road Jaycees of Nashville, Tenn., were the sponsors of an Americanism essay contest for the students of Hillsboro and John Overton High Schools in Nashville.

The contest was designed in order to give the students an opportunity to become more useful American citizens by studying Americanism. It was felt that, through the essay contest, the participating students would be given the opportunity to research timely topics on Americanism and express their own individual thoughts in essay form.

The winner of the contest was Miss Debbie Bryant of Nashville, whose win-

ning entry was entitled "Dissent: A Right?"

Mr. Speaker, I found a great deal of insight in Miss Bryant's essay and a good deal of commonsense. I insert it in the RECORD at this point and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

DISSENT: A RIGHT?

(By Debbie Bryant)

In a little room in Philadelphia, a young man sits writing. His penmanship, small but strong, keeps true to the line, like every word he puts down. He is making the first draft of the Declaration of Independence. The young man's red hair is damp, for it is late June 1776, and a blistering hot day. But his heart is even hotter.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

It is true that throughout our long history our forefathers have spoken for the rights of men. These men had definite aims they sought in regard to an individual's virtues. Today, though, several problems have arisen in our society. Exactly who speaks for man's rights today? What do we mean by "our rights"? Do our rights give us authority to be irresponsible, to burn draft cards, or to stomp an individual to dust simply because he disagrees with us? Of course, we know that the rights of an individual do not refer to these things mentioned.

Consider this idea: Everyone, at some time or another, has heard of an individual making demands for his rights, but has anyone ever heard of an individual asking about his responsibilities? At best, it is quite a rare incident, and yet in our form of government, that government which has not only established these individual rights but protects them as well, the two terms are so interrelated as to be impossible to separate them.

It would seem that if a man had only to accept his own individual rights, without further concern for anything or anybody, it would be a wonderful world in which to live. History, however, has taught us that individual rights cannot exist without individual responsibilities accompanying them. History has also taught us that we must respect these same individual rights and responsibilities for all of the citizens throughout our land.

There is no argument about the importance of the rights of man or the position which they should take in our American way of life, nor is there any downgrading of this importance however, in all important documents which have been written for the purpose of defining a code of conduct to govern man, everywhere that a right is expressed a responsibility is at least implied. No place is this found to be more evident than in our own Constitution and Bill of Rights.

None of us in America deny the right of an individual to investigate and question governmental policy nor the right to reflect upon the competence of our leadership, but rather we encourage it. If an individual is in disagreement with what he finds, it is his duty as a citizen to attempt to bring about a change.

Suppose a time should come when the prevailing government, instead of upholding the rights of the people, is found to be destructive of those rights. Under such circumstances, it is the right of the citizens to change the form of their government. Always, however, the purpose of such a change must be "to effect their safety and Happiness."

Once again, I would like to say that the rights of an individual does not mean that a man may break into your home and steal your property. It does not mean that a man or a group of men may undermine or over-

throw those safeguards and restraints which are necessary for the perpetuation of a man's rights. Rights cannot exist without order.

The temptation to present America as a republic of rebellious angry people trying to hold each other back from adopting the changes which were coming about prevails throughout our country. Everyday we hear newscasts about all the absolute unrest in our society. "Establishment" is an extremely dirty word. Just wait a minute: Actually our country is not anything as it is pictured. Our country is now undergoing a great evolution. And no change as great as the one occurring comes about without a reasonable amount of trouble. Today, changes are coming about because of the voices of the young generation speaking out. This is a very vital part of our country's existence. But despite what is being said and despite the changes which are occurring, there is still very much hope and promise in our land. Take a look at the changes which are being made and see if they are not fruitful.

This poem by Bill McCullam of the Hearst Headline Service seems appropriate to express his opinion of the dissenting voices and also the changes in our lives:

"Mourn not the passing time that's logged
As summer turns to fall.

What's been is blurred; the future's fogged
What's real is now; this moment—all."

NATURAL RESOURCE TANGLE

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the time is surely near when the Nixon administration will advise the Congress of the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Executive Organization, better known as the Ash Council, for the reorganization of the executive agencies which deal with natural resources and the environment.

The importance of doing something about the "natural resources tangle" has been discussed for years. Authority for the administration of the programs which shape the environment in which we live—and upon which the future of life on this planet actually rests—is divided among a dozen different agencies and departments, with built-in conflicts, overlapping, duplication, and confusion. There is critical need for clarification.

Five years ago I introduced a bill to establish a Department of Natural Resources and the Environment which detailed how the reorganization might be accomplished—by abolishing the Interior Department, transferring those agencies which deal mainly with human resources, or not closely identified with the environment, to other appropriate departments, and putting under an umbrella of one great department all governmental functions which deal with our water, our land, our air, our oceans—any aspect of our environment. But even such an obviously practical idea has its opponents.

Ann Cottrell Free, distinguished writer in the conservation field, has now summarized the problem, and discussed the potential of the Ash Council report, in a special article written for the Washington Star on May 24, 1970, entitled

"Straightening Out the Natural Resources Tangle." I ask unanimous consent that this informative article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Washington Star, May 24, 1970]

STRAIGHTENING OUT THE NATURAL
RESOURCES TANGLE

(By Ann Cottrell Free)

If April's "Earth Day" accomplished nothing else, it posed, once again, in the governmental sense a perplexing question:

"Whose Earth (the U.S. part) is this, anyway? Interior's? Agriculture's? Commerce's? Army Engineers? Transportation's? Housing and Urban Development's? Health, Education and Welfare's? Federal Power Commission's? Atomic Energy Commission's? the Council on Environmental Quality's?"

The list could go on and on. Nearly every department or independent agency of the federal government is involved with natural resources or the environment—or both. Nobody seems in charge. Conflict and overlap breed confusion. And confusion proliferates.

Air problems continue up in the air, with at least a half-dozen agencies getting in the act, either as polluters or antipolluters. The nation's water programs continue muddled regardless of the interdepartmental Water Resources Council and the Water Pollution Control Administration. The very soil itself is subject often to conflicting approaches as to its best use.

The sight of the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Public Roads being locked in battle with the National Parks Service has become a commonplace.

Twenty government departments or agencies involve themselves with our coastal zones and non-military oceanography.

There are at least 10 different federal approaches to the uses of recreation grounds. Philosophies toward wildlife are confusing enough to give even a sleeping bear a nervous breakdown.

And when it comes to pesticides, authority still appears diffuse—not only between departments, but within departments.

Nearly everyone agrees that something should be done about the jumble. But hardly anyone agrees on what and how it should be done.

So now it is the Nixon administration's turn to have a go at the increasingly complex problem.

That time is soon at hand. A fresh focus and a new dialogue soon will reach center stage as a result of the Ash Council's recently completed study and recommendations to the President on stream-lining of natural resource and environmental responsibilities.

Roy L. Ash, president of Linton Industries, was appointed by the President a little more than a year ago to head up the Advisory Council on Executive Organization.

The council earlier this year recommended improvements in the Executive office of the President itself and as a result President Nixon asked for Congressional approval of a Domestic Council and an expansion and re-naming of the Bureau of the Budget to the Office of Management and Budget.

The President may ask for legislative action on the eagerly-awaited Ash Council's proposals. Or he could handle some of the suggestions by executive order. Or, as the Wildlife Management Institute, cynically comments, "he can do nothing."

If nothing is done, it won't be the first time. In 1935 Interior Secretary Harold Ickes asked for a better line-up of conservation duties. In 1949 some of the task forces of the first Hoover Commission suggested a Department of Natural Resources, the estab-

lishment of which President Truman tried to obtain up until 1951. President Eisenhower asked that the water functions of the Army Corps of Engineers be transferred to Interior. And President Kennedy in 1961 pledged to do his best to make sense out of the conservation cross currents in government.

But nothing has happened.

The Ash Council is thought to lean favorably toward changing the name of the Department of Interior to the Department of Natural Resources and the Environment. This approach has been spelled out in bill form by Senator Frank Moss, D-Utah, since 1965. In brief, it would transfer to the re-named department the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service from the Agriculture Department, the Corps of Engineers' civil functions from the Army, and air pollution jurisdiction from HEW. The Bureau of Indian Affairs would go from Interior to HEW.

Hearings held on the Moss bill in 1967 led Senator Moss to the rueful comment that the bureaucrats, whose departments would be dismembered, "would rather fight than switch." Though he would have become more powerful with the Forest Service and the Engineers under his jurisdiction, then Secretary of the Interior Udall was realistic enough to know that the battle to wrest these agencies away from their parent bodies would be a losing battle. He did endorse the change of name. Secretary Hickel has made no public statements on the Moss concept, but he has shown considerable interest in the reshuffling idea.

Regardless of the Ash Council's specific proposal, another view will soon come in for a great airing. This is the Muskie approach. The Maine Senator proposed recently the establishment of an environmental super-agency, called the National Environmental Quality Administration. It would group together under one roof all the environmental regulatory powers of the Federal government.

Muskie questions also whether "the Department of Transportation should be the agency to determine air pollution requirements for the transportation industry." He notes also that some of the responsibilities for solid waste programs are lodged in the Interior Department's Bureau of Mines, which has as its primary mission the promotion of mineral resource development and use.

His approach could be quite appealing if the Council on Environmental Quality had not been set up less than six months ago. Not an umbrella for environmental functions of government, nor an operating agency, this three-man council has tremendous power. Already, under the leadership of Russell Train, it is knocking agency heads together. And the very Act that set up the Council—the National Environmental Policy Act—has been used to halt a variety of infringements.

Conservationists such as Spencer Smith of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources say "Give CEQ a change." Lloyd Tupling, Washington man for the Sierra Club, feels the same way.

As the various conservation groups and bureaucrats prepare their positions in regard to the Ash Council's report, each is taking a look backward and asking "How did we get into this mess?"

Interior, the key department in the environmental-natural resource tangle, is a "just-grew-like-Topsy" kind of department. It was set up in 1849—the year of the great Gold Rush. It was a combo of the old (1812) General Land Office and the Indian Office.

In 1905 Interior lost the Forest Service to Gifford Pinchot and the Agriculture Department. Between them ever since no love has been lost. Interior's Bureau of Land Management—which manages 176 million acres of public land in continental U.S.—also sells timber, but under different regulations.

The story of the controversial Corps of

Engineers role in dam building, flood control, waterway improvements and navigability began in 1824. Congress gave the Corps \$75,000 to clear out sandbars and other obstructions from the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. Since then the Corps has become dearer than the flag and apple pie to politicians. The annual Rivers and Harbors Bill—which translates into "pork barrel"—keeps Congressmen in office and the corps busy.

Realists, such as Tennessee Valley Authority's Frank Smith, see attempts to wrest the Engineers or the Forest Service away as "bone shattering" fights. Other realists see a reshuffling as a possible affront to Congressional committee seniority. What would happen to the committees that ordinarily keep the Forest Service happy? Would campaign support from special lobbies leave them cold?

These and other aspects of re-alignment of departments, agencies and committees have been studied by a special group of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. It suggested the formation of a joint committee of Congress, composed of chairmen of relevant committees, to look into the problems. The Wildlife Management Institute feels, also, that some type of co-ordinating council be formed to take a long-range, in-depth study.

No easy task stopping the overlap. Nixon may find like Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy that straightening out the natural resource tangle may be too much for him, too. But at least this time around more steam, more thought is being put behind the question.

QUESTIONS ON VIETNAM: V. A SETTLEMENT WILL BE MORE DIFFICULT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of an avowed intent to end the Vietnam war by negotiation with an ultimate goal of peaceful self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, the United States has allowed a very undemocratic government to continue in Saigon. We have supposedly agreed to Communist participation in a coalition government in South Vietnam, but we have allowed the Saigon government to announce our policy in its deeds. The Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars at Cornell University deals with this in the following question:

QUESTIONS ON VIETNAM

9. The negotiating position taken by the United States has been to agree in principle to communist participation in free elections for a coalition government in the South, but the communists have refused to negotiate this question with the Americans. Isn't this evidence of the communist's refusal to accept self-determination as called for by the majority of the South Vietnamese?

American statements have been ambiguous and contradictory on this question of elections, and this has confused not only the Vietnamese communists but our European allies as well. However, we have made it absolutely clear that our position is consistent with that of President Thieu (see, for instance, President Nixon's speech of May 14, 1969); and Thieu's position on this question is very clear. First, he insists that any such elections must be held under conditions where his present government is in control

of the administration and of the police; secondly, he insists that any such elections be in conformity with the constitution of his own regime, one which explicitly forbids those who support communism from running in the elections. (This is naturally not reassuring to the Vietnamese communists who are in effect asked to repudiate their own political views and connections before participating in an electoral process.) The American suggestion of a mixed electoral commission, including representatives of the communists, is not a significant inducement to the NLF (Vietcong) given the fact that the commission would have to operate within an administrative and police context dominated by President Thieu's own government.

Essential to understanding the attitude of the communists toward elections is the history of the post-Geneva period. The communists still bitterly recall that in 1954 (at Geneva) they agreed to an armistice and regrouped their armies on the promise that election would be held two years later, but that once they had made the concession of agreeing to an armistice and pulled their troops out of many strategic areas, the promised elections were never in fact held. Thus, today they insist that a coalition government be formed before elections are held so that by sharing in power they can be protected against reprisal and ensure that elections are actually held.

Furthermore, and undoubtedly most basic, is the fact that the communists are already very conscious of the way in which "free" elections, have been carried out previously by Thieu's government. In the 1967 elections, not only were those labeled by Thieu as communists and neutralists barred from participating, but also candidates who advocated a peaceful settlement and negotiations with the NLF, and those who had been arrested for political reasons by the French colonial administration. They also know what has happened to those numerous Buddhist and other non-communist leaders who tried to compete through legal channels in the 1967 elections and are very much aware of how many of them today languish in Saigon's jails as political prisoners. The communists assume that if non-communist opponents of the Thieu regime are treated in this way that they can hardly expect fair treatment in elections themselves. Given the history of Thieu's tactics, it is hardly realistic to expect that the NLF (Vietcong) will turn in its arms (as Thieu insists) before the elections are held and trust to the mercies of Thieu's police.

A PROUD RECORD DESERVES JUST RECOGNITION

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is seldom that a first-term Member of Congress receives extraordinary recognition for his work in Congress. It has become axiomatic that a freshman Representative is to be seen but heard very little. If this is true, the first-term Representative from the First District of Kansas is breaking precedent in a dramatic way.

The Honorable KEITH SEBELIUS, who now so ably represents this great district, is compiling an outstanding record in the House and is gaining widespread recognition for his accomplishments on

behalf of the fine people of western Kansas.

Representative SEBELIUS has been deservedly recognized for his efforts in an editorial published in the Oberlin Herald, in Kansas on May 28, 1970. I ask unanimous consent that this splendid tribute be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXAMPLES OF SEBELIUS' GOOD WORK

If the U.S. is to save both its great cities and small rural communities, efforts are going to have to be made to lure job-providing industries from the metropolitan areas to towns like ours.

In order to do this, we will need better roads and more recreation facilities for the leisure-oriented city folk.

Two bills introduced in Congress by Rep. Keith Sebelius, R-Kans., would help provide both.

One would designate U.S. 36 and U.S. 83 interstate routes, thereby putting Oberlin at the intersection of two modern, heavily traveled highways that would link three nations and the industrial East with the Rocky Mountains.

"This bill would be of great help in offsetting the current farm income and tight money crises through increased employment opportunity," said Sebelius. "Since modern transportation inspires economic growth, modern highways in our rural areas would mean expanded economic opportunity in areas where people prefer to live," he said. And people are increasingly saying they want to live in the country.

The other bill, drafted to hasten and expand water resource development in the nation, would expedite construction of needed reservoirs in this community.

This measure would authorize the inclusion of "secondary benefits" in determining the cost feasibility of all water resource projects.

"Before the federal government will finance a big water project . . . the cost must be measured against the benefits to the surrounding area," said the congressman. "My bill would make sure these benefits take into account such items as outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife resources, preservation of unique areas of natural beauty, area redevelopment and population dispersal."

Oberlin has more than a casual interest in two such projects.

In December, Congress okayed \$22,000 for study on proposed Oberlin Reservoir, which would be situated on Sappa Creek 2 miles southwest of Oberlin.

Proposed Herndon Dam to be built a mile west of Herndon on Beaver Creek, was once deemed feasible on a cost-benefit ratio that has been erased by a cockeyed government formula that applies inflation to the cost but not the benefits. And the project may not be declared feasible until proposed benefits include the "social and human factors" Bureau of Reclamation Commissioner Ellis Armstrong says should be added to feasibility figures.

These factors, which Sebelius brings out in his bill, will become increasingly important as our nation's population continues its rapid growth.

One questions whether Sebelius can get his congressional colleagues from the cities to see the wisdom of bolstering the rural economy to help solve the problems of the urban areas. But his efforts to improve our region's transportation arteries and help us hold precious water for farm, municipal, industrial and recreational uses are examples of the good work this man is doing for us in Washington.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT AT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best articulated complaints in my district is the complaint against the present method of running colleges and universities. The destruction committed by the students.

It is strange that colleges and universities are almost exclusively run by men. Nothing makes clearer the basic insecurity of such men than the fact that they have absolutely refused promotions to qualified women. At the present time, various well-qualified groups of women are researching these problems and bringing actions against the universities. Consider the following shocking facts and instances:

SILVER SPRING, Md.,
June 1, 1970.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this letter as a formal charge of sex discrimination under Executive Order 11246 as amended, which forbids Federal contractors from discriminating against women.

These charges are filed against the entire state university and state college system of the State of California including:

University of California at Berkeley.
University of California at Davis.
University of California at Irvine.
University of California at Los Angeles.
University of California at Riverside.
University of California at San Diego.
University of California at Santa Cruz.
University of California at San Francisco.
University of California at Santa Barbara.
California State College at Dominguez Hills.

California State College at Fullerton.
California State College at Hayward.
California State College at San Bernardino.
California State College at Long Beach.
California State College at Los Angeles.
California State Polytechnic College.
Chico State College.
Fresno State College.
Humboldt State College.
Sacramento State College.
San Diego State College.
San Fernando Valley State College.
San Francisco State College.
San Jose State College.
Sonoma State College.
Stanislaus State College.

These charges are initially based on a news release (enclosed) from California State Senator Mervyn M. Dymally who gives numerous examples and states that "the statistics prove conclusively a distinct and deliberate plan to shut out women from many professions and restrict the opportunities in others to low-level, low-paying positions."

Additional data will be submitted within the next few weeks.

We request that all current contract negotiations with any institutions of the California state university or state college system be immediately suspended, and that no further Federal contracts be issued until such time as compliance reviews are instituted and a comprehensive plan of affirmative action to remedy the effects of past discrimination is adopted and implemented.

We further request that such compliance reviews include an investigation of admission policies, financial assistance to students, placement of graduates, hiring and promotion policies for staff and faculty, and salary differentials.

While we have not investigated the factual nature of this complaint we are forwarding it to you in accordance with our usual policy of bringing these matters to your attention.

Please notify me when the compliance reviews are scheduled.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, Ed.D.,
Chairman, Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education, WEAL.

DYMALLY CALLS THE 1970'S THE DECADE OF WOMEN

Senator Mervyn M. Dymally (D-Los Angeles) announced that he has introduced a series of bills designed to correct the glaring pattern of discrimination against women in our higher educational institutions.

"There must be women faculty members and women administrators in order to encourage the aspirations of young women", said Dymally. "To apply for admission to most graduate schools, a girl has to reject the advice of her counselor, who will tell her there are no job opportunities unless she stays within the traditional confines of women."

Dymally stated that the statistics prove conclusively a distinct and deliberate plan to shut out women from many professions and restrict the opportunities in the others to low-level, low-paying positions.

"For example, the School of Law at University of California, Davis has five women out of a student body of 340. U.C. Irvine has 250 medical students, none are women. U.C. Berkeley has five women students out of a student body of 300 in graduate Physics courses.

"The picture at the State Colleges is almost as bleak," said the Los Angeles legislator, "San Francisco State has 12 women in its Political Science Graduate School and there are 15 women in the School of Journalism at San Jose State."

In a recent study of the faculty of Political Science Departments in all of California, it was established that there are no full professors at any University of California campus. This is notable in that in 1969 alone, 12% of the awarded Ph. D.'s in Political Science went to women, according to Dymally. The statistics prove that such graduates are doomed to be lecturers, teaching assistants and other badly paid, low prestige jobs.

Dymally described the legislation he has drafted as overdue and said that he believes that the Seventies will be the decade in which women finally achieve acceptance as human beings.

"Women pay taxes to maintain our education institutions, but are denied jobs for which they are qualified. My bills will prove that the Legislature recognizes the seriousness of this situation and that we are ready to set an example for private industry at the University and in the State College system."

Senate Bill 907 requires that State College Trustees immediately begin using compensatory hiring to integrate women into faculty, administration and support staff. Senate Bill 1203 calls on the U.C. Regents to do the same.

Senate Bill 908 asks that the student body of each State College Graduate School more nearly reflect the percentage of women in California and that sufficient financial aid and scholarships be set apart for this purpose. Senate Bill 1147 makes the same request of the U.C. Graduate Schools.

Senate Bill 909 requires that the Trustees set up free, full time, day care centers for the children of male and female students, faculty, and staff. Such centers will employ student help and will give course credit for development and training programs. Senate Bill 1148 will provide day care centers at the University.

Senate Bill 1072 requires that school boards adopt for use in elementary schools, textbooks which portray men and women functioning in all roles, including professional and executive and which do not include stereotyped images of either sex. Senate Bill 1073 requires that the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education immediately hire women staff members. S.C.R. 54 calls on those with appointing powers to the Council, to fill half of the vacancies occurring in 1970 with women appointees.

Senator Dymally said, "Our society has much to gain by utilizing one of our best and, until now, most wasted resources. My friend, Shirley Chisholm, New York Congressman, stated recently that she has been more discriminated against as a woman than as a Black. I believe that my legislation is a positive and practical approach to eliminating this shameful situation."

SILVER SPRINGS, MD.,
May 11, 1970.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this letter as a formal complaint under Executive Order 11246 as amended which forbids Federal contractors to discriminate against women.

The charges of sex discrimination are specifically filed against the University of Georgia and is based on information forwarded to me. The person forwarding this information has asked that she remain anonymous, although she will be glad to talk with an official investigator during a compliance review. I will be glad to furnish her name when the investigation begins.

According to the University of Georgia Graduate School Bulletin for 1969-71, there are 333 appointed members of the University faculty. Only 12 of these are women (less than 4%). They are: 1 Prof. of Special Education, 3 Professors of Education, 1 Prof. of Literature, 1 Associate Prof. of Education, 1 Professor of Economics, 1 Assistant Professor of Vet. Pathology, 1 Professor of Home Economics, 1 Assistant Professor of Drama, 1 Professor of Psychology, and 1 Assistant Professor of Education. There are some indications too that there may well be discrimination in admission of women, particularly to graduate programs.

We request that an immediate compliance review of the University of Georgia be conducted; that such a review include an investigation of admission policies, financial support to women students, placement of graduates, hiring and promotion policies for both staff and faculty; and salary differentials. We further ask that all current contract negotiations be immediately suspended until such time as all inequities are corrected and a plan of affirmative action is worked out and implemented.

I am enclosing a list of selected fields showing the number of doctorates awarded nationally to women. It will be instructive to compare the percentage of women employed in various departments of the University of Georgia with the percentage of doctorates given to women in those particular fields.

While we have not investigated the factual nature of this complaint, we are forwarding it to you in accordance with our usual policy of bringing these matters to your attention.

Please notify me when the compliance review begins.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, Ed.D.,
Chairman, Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education (WEAL).

WOMEN'S EQUALITY ACTION LEAGUE—WEAL

Percentage of doctorates awarded to women in selected fields in 1967-68:

General Biology	29.0
General Zoology	14.8
Bacteriology, Virology, Mycology, Parasitology, and Microbiology	18.0
Biochemistry	22.3
Pharmacology	14.1
Educ. of Mentally Retarded	44.4
Educ. of Deaf, Speech, & Hearing	23.8
Art Education	34.0
Music Education	11.0
Early Childhood Education	100.0
Elementary Education	42.4
Secondary Education	17.0
Adult Education	21.4
Educ. Administration, Supervision & Finance	8.2
Counseling & Guidance	20.9
Rehab. Counselor Training	23.0
History & Philosophy of Educ.	19.2
Curriculum & Instruction	24.5
General Education	18.7
Educational Psychology	28.4
English & Literature	27.4
Journalism	15.6
General Arts	25.0
Music	14.5
Speech & Dramatic Arts	18.5
Fine and Applied Arts	34.0
Linguistics	20.6
French	38.1
Italian	18.0
Spanish	31.7
Philology & Literature of Romance Languages	35.8
German	23.9
Pharmacy	10.0
Library Science	31.8
Mathematics	6.0
Philosophy	9.1
Chemistry	8.0
Psychology	22.5
Anthropology	23.9
History	13.0
Political Science	11.3
Sociology	18.5
Social Work	22.0

(Source: Earned Degrees Conferred: Part A—Summary Data, Office of Education, OE-54013-68-A.)

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
May 11, 1970.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this letter as a formal charge of sex discrimination against Columbia University, under Executive Order 11246 as amended, which specifically forbids Federal contractors from discriminating against women.

The charges are based on an extensive report prepared by the Columbia Women's Liberation group and will appear in a future copy of the Barnard Alumni magazine. A copy, prepared from the galley proofs, is enclosed. It documents widespread discrimination at Columbia. For example, 24% of the doctorates awarded by Columbia go to women. Yet the percentage of women with tenure in the Graduate Faculties has remained steady at just over 2% since 1957.

We request that an immediate compliance review of Columbia University be conducted; that such a review include an investigation of admission policies, financial support to women students, placement of

graduates, hiring and promotion policies for both staff and faculties, and salary differentials. We further ask that all current contract negotiations be immediately suspended until such time as all inequities are corrected and a plan of affirmative action is worked out and implemented.

While we have not investigated the factual nature of this complaint we are forwarding it to you in accordance with our usual policy of bringing these matters to your attention.

Please notify me when the compliance review begins.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, Ed.D.,

Chairman, Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education (WEAL).

COLUMBIA WOMEN'S LIBERATION: REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN FACULTY

A Columbia Women's Liberation group, formed in the spring of 1969, grew out of women's consciousness that the problems of sexual status must be articulated in political and economic terms. We concentrate on the problems that women face in common because of society's attitudes . . . problems which are not a matter for individual adjustment but require group action. As a university organization, we can focus on several areas: education and curricular questions; health care; employment practices as they affect teaching and administrative staff; the criteria for awarding graduate school fellowships; child care. This report summarizes the research of a small group of graduate students and junior faculty who are concerned about the employment practices of this university.

On method: Our method is simple. We have tabulated the number of women and men doing the same job. Percentages of the totals may then be constructed. In the case of ambiguous catalogue listings, by calling Department offices we double-checked names whose gender was unclear. The report uses the catalogues of the various divisions of the university, the yearly publication recording the names and fields of all Master's and Doctor's degrees awarded, the American Association of University Professors' annual salary reports, national statistics and a few other relevant publications.¹

Questions not answered: The only fully satisfactory way to prove discriminatory practices would be the case-history method. We did not have the facilities to carry out a proper investigation along these lines, but the university should consider making such a study. Information could be sought from former and present faculty members, male and female, and from unsuccessful applicants of both sexes for positions at Columbia and Barnard. The criteria of departmental hiring committees could be investigated and assessed. The study should be extended to include comparable schools where similar hiring criteria will operate. Salary scales for women and men must be compared, as well as their rates of promotion. Clearly we recommend broader and more detailed studies, since ours is only an introduction to the facts of discrimination.

What proportion of the Columbia University faculty should be female? In studying the different numbers of men and women employed by the various divisions of Columbia University, we did not assume that a 50/50 ratio was either immediately desirable or justifiable. We based our expectation of

the proportion of female faculty to male on the proportion of women known to have the appropriate training, namely a Ph.D. excluding for the time, being most other factors affecting the employment of men and women with Ph.D's. For example, there is evidence that suggests that women in some fields should be represented in higher proportions than that of degrees earned on the grounds that women are more likely than men to be employed by educational institutions, the men working instead in industry and government.² A fuller report would have to consider such factors.

How should women be represented? Since a woman does not invest time, energy and money in obtaining a doctorate in order to be a better wife and mother or more entertaining companion for her husband, women should be represented in a proportion that reflects the number of doctorates going to women. Those who argue that a woman's commitment to her profession differs from that of a man must be able to cite detailed studies of the career patterns of highly trained women.³

Women earned an average of 15 per cent of all doctorates awarded during the 1940s; an average of 10 per cent of all doctorates awarded during the 1950s; and an average of 11 per cent during the 1960s. Given the normal timetable of the academic career, we would expect to find the women who earned their degrees in the 1940s represented now in the higher ranks of the faculty of Columbia and comparable institutions in a proportion of 15 per cent, and in the lower ranks in a proportion of 10 per cent. The following table, drawn from Columbia's catalogues for the academic year 1968-69 tells another story.⁴

School	Professor	Associate professor	Assistant professor	Instructor	Lecturer	Associates preceptors assistants
Columbia College	1/133 (0.7)	0/68 (0)	7/101 (6.5)	8/76 (9.5)		20/50 (29)
Law School	0/34 (0)	0/2 (0)	0/4 (0)			
School of Dental and Oral Surgery	0/78 (0)	1/70 (1)	1/102 (1)	0/54 (0)		0/31 (0)
School of Int'l Affairs	3/87 (3)	0/23 (0)	1/17 (6)	0/1 (0)		
School of Business	2/37 (5)	0/23 (0)	0/13 (0)			

School	Professor	Associate professor	Assistant professor	Instructor	Lecturer	Associates preceptors assistants
General Studies	5/49 (9)	8/28 (22)	8/48 (14)	17/42 (29)		24/43 (36)
Graduate Faculties		8/367 (2.1)	10/74 (12)	7/52 (12)		
Barnard College	11/38 (22)	12/12 (50)	21/12 (64)	15/16 (48)		23/5 (82)
American Language Program					0/3 (0)	29/16 (64)

Explanation: The figures given above are the ratio of women to men in that category. The figures in parentheses below this ratio are the percentages of the total number of teachers represented by women.

For full professors in the eight divisions that employ them, the actual percentage is 5.2 per cent (2.8 per cent if Barnard is excluded). This compares rather badly with the 15 per cent of doctorates that were earned by women in this age group. The Barnard figure hardly compensates for the lack of female representation in the other, better-paid divisions. Even at Barnard, 78 per cent of the full professors are men. In the 1950's, women received 10 per cent of the doctorates awarded. Since in over half the divisions shown on the chart, women are not represented at all at the Associate Professor level, there is no need to belabor this disturbing lack.

In the lower ranks, women constitute a much higher proportion of the total teaching staff than they do at the upper levels. Women received 11 percent of the Ph. D.s awarded between 1960-68. At some divisions of Columbia, their numbers exceed this proportion at both Assistant Professor and Instructor levels. However, this distribution begins to reveal another aspect of the university's hiring practices. Overall, women are concentrated in the lower ranks, and have been for several years. They are also to some degree segregated by sex by being confined to Barnard College, General Studies and the Graduate Faculties. Women constitute a majority of only one category—part-time

employment (Preceptors, Assistants and Associates).

Summary: This data reflects two major tendencies. The greater the proportion of women students, the greater the number of women faculty at all ranks. Second, the higher the rank and the better the pay, the fewer the number of women at that rank. While to some minds this arrangement may have an appealing symmetry, we believe that it reflects and reinforces a marked inequality of opportunity and compensation.

Barnard College and What It Indicates: The role of Barnard College as an equalizer in the otherwise male-dominated Columbia community is worth examining for other clues about the status of women. Although 78 per cent of Barnard's full professors are men, the number of men and women employed in full-time teaching there is almost equal. Barnard is in fact the only one of the Seven Sisters colleges to hire (slightly) more women than men, but at all these colleges men control the full professorships and the chairmanships.⁵ Even the one group of educational institutions founded to give women college educations and access to professional careers do not, after more than 50 years of activity, serve as models demonstrating to the rest of the community the abilities of

women to manage demanding careers in responsible positions theoretically open to them.

All these women's colleges lack the endowment of their male equivalents; all of them have fewer facilities; all pay lower salaries to their faculty. The differences between Barnard and Columbia salaries are well known, varying from an average of over \$5,500 at the full professor level to \$1,765 at assistant professor level.⁶

Columbia Full Professor: \$22,540 average compensation.

Barnard Full Professor: \$16,892 average compensation.

Columbia Associate Prof.: \$14,909 average compensation.

Barnard Associate Prof.: \$12,188 average compensation.

Columbia Assistant Prof.: \$11,486 average compensation.

Barnard Assistant Prof.: \$9,721 average compensation.

It should be noted that not only the absolute but also the percentage differential in compensation between Barnard and Columbia increases with rank. These salary differences do not measure relative excellence but rather punish those engaged in the education of women. They are a direct reflection of the value society places on women's education and on women's role in society. We sug-

Footnotes at end of article.

gest it is urgent that Barnard bring salaries up to the level of those at Columbia in order to prevent further penalization of Barnard's faculty.

Graduate Faculties and the Training of Women: Statistics for the Graduate Faculties of Columbia, the division responsible for training graduate students and granting degrees, show a startling contrast between the percentage of doctoral degrees awarded to women and the percentage of women employed full-time, especially in tenured positions. The rise in percentages of doctorates awarded to women may mean that more women are going on to a Ph. D. after completing the MA program than used to be the case. Investigation is needed in this area. Thirty-eight per cent of current graduate students are women.

DOCTORATES AWARDED

Year	Female	Male	Percent female
1956-57	11	229	4.6
1960-61	39	300	11.5
1964-65	75	369	16.9
1966-67	88	298	22.8
1967-68	99	307	24.3

As the table shows, the proportion of Columbia doctorates awarded to women has risen steadily from 4.6 per cent to 24 per cent in a decade. The percentage of women with tenure in the Graduate Faculties has, however, remained steady at just over 2 per cent since 1957.

TENURED FACULTY IN THE GRADUATE FACULTIES

Year	Female	Male	Percent female
1957-58	7	287	2.4
1958-59	8	318	2.4
1959-60	7	298	2.6
1965-66	9	348	2.5
1966-67	9	370	2.3
1968-69	8	367	2.1

In recent years this meager percentage has even suffered a decline.

The cost of a token: We think that it is essential for Columbia University to hire more women in the Graduate Faculties, particularly since it is clear that to do so requires no sacrifice of standards. We are puzzled by the Graduate Faculties' commitment to train women, but not to hire them. We know from experience as students and teachers that it is vital for women students in graduate school to see women engaged in the academic profession as naturally as men are. At present, many women students will never have any contacts with such role models, or will meet so few that they become used to the idea of women as exceptions in the more demanding areas of the academic world. Students will not be unaware either that most of the tenured women they meet are single, and thus in theory able to devote more of their time to their profession than their married male colleagues. They will not be unaware either that the small number of women with tenure in the Graduate Faculties are all exceptionally distinguished scholars, whose presence helps perpetuate the unfortunate idea that to succeed in any professional career, a woman has to be not just as good, but several times as good as a man. Tokenism is always based on abnormal criteria of excellence in order to limit the number of qualified people of certain races and sexes with access to a profession. Its cost is the high expectation of failure for the discriminated group. By the obvious scarcity of women training women graduates, the institution acclimatizes women students to their professional expectations: low rank, low pay, low status, a slower rate of promotion than their male colleagues and a more difficult tenure hurdle. We note that the percentage of women at assistant professor level has risen from 4 per

cent in 1962-63 to 15 per cent in 1968-69. It will be interesting to see whether the rise at this level is reflected over the next five years in an increase in the number of women in the Graduate Faculties with tenure. The absolute number of women instructors has risen slightly but the percentage of women at that rank has declined from 22 per cent in 1963-65 to 13 per cent in 1968-69.

NONTENURED RANKS, GRADUATE FACILITIES

	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
Assistant professors:						
Female	3	6	4	6	10	14
Male	72	71	64	84	74	78
Percent female	4	7.7	5.9	6.6	11.9	15.2
Instructors:						
Female	4	13	9	9	7	11
Male	28	45	31	35	52	73
Percent female	16.5	22.4	22.5	20.4	11.9	13.2

Doctorates awarded to women: The percentage of doctorates going to women in subjects long stereotyped as masculine are in some cases surprisingly high. In the years 1966-68, which will be quoted throughout this section, 10 per cent of the Chemistry doctorates went to women; 8.6 per cent of the Physics doctorates went to women; but no women earned doctorates in the fields of Geology, Mathematics or Mathematical Statistics. Columbia has had in the recent past women as Professors of Physics, Chemistry and Microbiology, and has women as Professors of Biochemistry and Physics at the moment.

The following section compares percentages of doctorates awarded to women in specific Departments with the percentages of female faculty in that Department. Cross-listed faculty are excluded because their appointment and teaching duties are not primarily in the Graduate Faculties.

French: 66.8% of their doctorates went to women; no full-time female faculty.

Art history and archeology: 54% of their doctorates went to women; 26% of the tenured faculty is female; 71% of the non-tenured faculty.

Biological sciences: 45% of their doctorates went to women; 9.5% of the tenured faculty is female; 33% of the non-tenured (i.e. 2 men, 1 woman).

Anthropology: 44% of their doctorates went to women; no full-time female faculty.

Psychology: 36% of their doctorates went to women; no female faculty.

English and comparative literature: 27% of their doctorates went to women; 4% (1 woman) of their tenured faculty is female.

Sociology: 26.6% of their doctorates went to women; in 1967-8 they had one female assistant professor.

History: 17% of their doctorates went to women; 2 women on their faculty.

Philosophy: 17% of their doctorates went to women; no women faculty.

Public law and government: 16% of their doctorates went to women; they have one female instructor. There are 35 men in the department, 26 of them full professors.

It will quickly be seen that only the Department of Art History and Archeology hires women in numbers even close to the proportion of women they train. We believe that women should be fairly represented at least in those departments that attract a proportion of women in excess of 15 per cent. Women should in fact be hired in all Departments.⁹

Discrimination: We realize that these figures do not prove that Columbia University has in the past discriminated or is now discriminating against women. Given these statistics, however, it will be difficult to dis-

prove discrimination. An examination of the data does lead one to believe that some discrimination must occur, for it is clear that the number of women who hold faculty positions is remarkably small, and is in most cases below the national average of labor available for that category. Here it is worth noting that the per cent of women working in all institutions of Higher Education in the United States is 22 per cent.⁹ We believe that women are by and large excluded from the more prestigious colleges and universities and must find employment instead in teachers colleges, the smaller liberal arts colleges and junior colleges, where in fact they can be found in proportions ranging from 34 per cent to 42 per cent.¹⁰

Women, work and family: Undoubtedly it will be argued that academic women marry and drop out of the labor market while their children are small at least. We would be interested in figures based on Columbia's past employment patterns that substantiate such claims. Other studies have shown that the more training a woman receives and the better her job, the more likely she is to remain in full-time employment, even if she has children.¹¹ Academic women are also more likely to remain single than other women, and to have small families when they do marry.¹² A trained woman is also financially in a position to hire domestic and child-care help for those tasks she wishes to delegate. Granted these observations, we suspect any explanation of the position of women in academic life that relies too heavily on the conditions of their supply rather than on the conditions of the market's demand for them.

Recommendations: Given the findings of this report, we call upon the university, perhaps through the Senate, to undertake four tasks:

1. to prepare a full study of the status of women faculty in the university, using sources that were not available to us, e.g. salaries. Half at least of the persons concerned with that study should be women.

2. to declare its unequivocal support of the right of women to equal employment opportunities and equal pay compared with those of men of comparable qualifications and ability. Such a declaration will mean the hiring of more women at all ranks in all divisions and a review of their salaries.

3. to engage in intelligent discussions of child care and paid leave for child birth, available to all employees of the university, whether faculty, administration or staff.

4. to invite submission of reports of alleged discrimination to a Committee on Employment Practices, and further to have such a Committee initiate investigations into the hiring patterns that may be discerned in various departments and divisions of the university.

This report was prepared by Rachel Duplessis, Rachel Blau '63, Preceptor, English; Linda Edwards, graduate student, Economics; Ann Sutherland Harris, Assistant Professor, Art History & Archeology; Kate Millett, Instructor, Philosophy (Barnard); and Harriet Zellner, graduate student, Economics. Joan Mitchell collected the catalogues.

APPENDIX I—FACULTY BY RANK AND SEX, 1969-70, COLUMBIA COLLEGE BARNARD COLLEGE, GRADUATE FACULTIES GENERAL STUDIES

	Ratio of women to men	Percent women
Columbia College:		
Full professors	1/125	(1)
Associate professor	0/50	0
Assistant professor	7/88	7.3
Instructor	14/61	18
Preceptor	15/38	28
Barnard College:		
Full professor	9/31	22
Associate professor	16/29	54
Assistant professor	24/33	74
Instructor	11/20	55

	Ratio of women to men	Percent women
General studies:		
Full professor.....	3/45	6
Associate professor.....	3/37	7.5
Assistant professor.....	17/71	19
Instructor.....	12/25	32
Graduate faculties:		
Full professor.....	6/324	1
Associate professor.....	2/73	2.6
Assistant professor.....	6/42	12.5
Instructor.....	2/4	66

Note: Assistant, associate, and full professors with Ph. D.'s granted between 1960 and 1970 by sex (Barnard excluded as dates of Ph. D.'s not given by catalogues).

	Male		Female	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Assistant professor.....	91	47	24	96
Associate professor.....	74	38	1	4
Full professor.....	30	15	0	0
Total.....	195	100	25	100

¹ Under 1 percent women.

If women faculty with Ph. D.s granted in the 1960s were distributed in the three ranks as men faculty are now, there would be 3 female full professors, 9 female associate professors and 13 female assistant professors. The average date of the Ph.D. awarded to the women in the assistant professor category in 1965; of the men 1966. Well over 50 per cent of the men with 1964 and 1963 Ph.D.s are associate professors; none of the women in that category have been promoted.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The figures on degrees earned by subject and sex are taken from Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Circular numbers 262 (1949), 282a (1950), 333a (1951), 360a (1952); Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Circular numbers 380a (1953); 418 (1954), 461 (1955), 499 (1956), 527 (1957), 570 (1958). And OE 54010-59; OE 54010-60; OE 54010-61; "Earned Degrees Conferred 1961-2"; OE 50039-63; OE 54010-65; OE 54013a-66. Degrees earned in general by sex, from 1900-1957, from *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957* (Series H327-338). Statistics from 1957-66 are aggregations of the disaggregated data from Office of Education circulars.

² *Women and the Scientific Profession*, edited by Jacquelyn A. Hatfield and Carolyn G. Van Aken, Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press, 1965, p. 63. Women are, however, more likely to earn a Ph.D. in the humanities rather than in science. In 1966, for example, 17.4% of the doctorates in the humanities and social sciences went to women although only 11% of all Ph.D.s awarded went to women.

³ A study of 1,979 women who received doctorates in the years 1957-8 showed that 91% were working, 81% of them full-time. (Helen Astin, *The Woman Doctorate*, Basic Books, 1970, quoted by Malcolm J. Scully, "Women in Higher Education Challenging the Status Quo," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 9, 1970, pp. 2-5, especially p. 4).

⁴ For professional schools such as Law, Dental and Oral Surgery, International Affairs and Business, the proportion of degrees earned by women is a more accurate guide than the overall proportion of doctorates earned by women. The following data for post-1949 degrees will give some idea of the proportion of Ph.D.s going to women in these subjects.

	1949-53	1954-59	1961-66
Law.....	0.02	0.03	0.04
History.....	.11	.12	.11
Political science.....	.08	.06	.08
Sociology.....	.14	.14	.19
Economics.....	.06	.04	.05
Business.....	.07	.03	.03

⁵ *Token Learning: A Study of Women's Higher Education in America*, Education Committee of the National Organization for Women, New York Chapter (Kate Millet, Chairman), 1968, pp. 37-40.

⁶ AAUP Bulletin, 1968. Compensation is defined as salary plus fringe benefits.

⁷ Part-time and visiting appointments are excluded, as are cross-listed appointments.

⁸ In 1960 John Parrish studied the distribution and numbers of women faculty in ten high endowment and ten high enrollment institutions of higher education ("Women in Top Level Teaching and Research", *Journal of the American Association of University Women*, Vol. LV, 1962, Jan., pp. 103-109). Table 4 shows their distribution by subject, varying from 93.1% of Home Economics faculty to .2% of Engineering faculty. Columbia was among the high endowment institutions studied. The percent of women faculty by rank in the eight institutions with high endowment who responded to the questionnaire in 1960 was: Full Professor—2.6%; Associate Professor—7.5%; Assistant Professor—8.5%; Instructor—9.8%. With Barnard excluded, Columbia's current faculty enrollment shows a lower percentage of women at all ranks than Parrish's 1960 study.

⁹ Scully, "Women in Higher Education," p. 2. The median salary of women in Higher Education was 16.5% less than that of men in 1965-6 and 18% less in 1968.

¹⁰ Jessie Bernard, *Academic Women*, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964, provides many useful statistics on the distribution of women in American institutions of higher education.

¹¹ See note 3. See also Evelyn Sullerot, *Histoire et Sociologie du Travail Feminin*, Editions Gonthier, Paris, 1968, pp. 300-302. Columbia University does not own this book, the best comprehensive study of women and work published to date. Sullerot (p. 318) also cites French studies that show absenteeism among women lessens in inverse proportion to the degree of education they have received, and that level of education is a more important factor than either marriage or the arrival of children.

¹² *Women and the Scientific Professions*, p. 75 and *Womanpower*, National Manpower Council, New York, 1957, p. 75. Jessie Bernard also notices this factor.

NEW YORK STATE SCHOLAR INCENTIVE AWARDS

Any student who has been a legal resident of New York State for the preceding year is entitled to a Scholar Incentive Award for each term in which he is registered as a full-time degree candidate. Further information and application forms may be obtained from the State Education Department, Regents Examination and Scholarship Center, Albany, N.Y. 12201. To insure timely processing, application for awards should be filed three months in advance of the beginning of the term for which the grant is to apply.

ENDOWED FELLOWSHIPS: OPEN TO STUDENTS IN ANY OF THE THREE GRADUATE FACILITIES

Richard Butler Scholarship (1903). Awarded biennially to male students from the State of Ohio. A gift of Mrs. Richard Butler in memory of her husband.

Henry J. Carman Fellowship (1949). Awarded annually to seniors in Columbia College. To be used for work toward an ad-

vanced degree under one of the Graduate Faculties. Students may not apply; selection is made by the Dean of Columbia College. A gift of friends and former students of Dean Carman.

Curtis University Scholarship (1896). Awarded annually to first-year students in the Graduate Faculties who are graduates of Barnard College. Established by the Trustees of Columbia University in accordance with conditions set forth by President Seth Low.

William Bayard Cutting Traveling Fellowships (1913). Awarded annually to men who have been in residence under the Graduate Faculties and are certified candidates for the Ph.D. degree. A detailed itinerary approved by the student's sponsor, and a budget of estimated expenses are required before final selection. A gift of Mrs. William Bayard Cutting and her children in memory of her husband.

Vera B. David Scholarships (1963). Awarded annually. A bequest of Vera B. David in memory of her husband John David.

Frances M. Dibblee Scholarship (1933). Awarded biennially to women graduates of Barnard College or Teachers College who are looking forward to careers in teaching or finance. A bequest of Charlotte Dibblee in memory of her mother.

Dyckman Institute Scholarships (1943). Awarded annually to students who are residents of Manhattan or the Bronx. A gift of the Dyckman Institute.

George W. Ellis Fellowships (1930). Awarded annually to graduate students who are residents of the State of Vermont or who have been graduated from a Vermont college or university. A bequest of George W. Ellis.

Henry Evans Fellowship (1928). Awarded annually to graduates of Columbia College for study either abroad or in the United States. Students may not apply; selection is made by the Dean of Columbia College. A gift of Mrs. Henry Evans in memory of her husband.

Gottsberger Fellowship Fund (1904). Awarded triennially. A gift of Ellen J. Banker in memory of her brother, Cornelius Heeny Gottsberger.

Graduate Faculties Alumni Fellowship (1966). Awarded annually. A gift of the Graduate Faculties Alumni of Columbia University.

Leta Stetter Hollingsworth Fellowship (1944). Awarded annually to women who are graduates of the University of Nebraska, with preference given to those who were born in Nebraska or received their earlier education there. Holders are eligible for reappointment for one year. A gift of Harry L. Hollingsworth in memory of his wife.

Hu Shih Fellowship (1962). Awarded annually to students of history, philosophy, or literature. A gift of various donors in memory of Dr. Hu Shih.

Edward W. Scudder Johnson Scholarships (1946). Awarded annually. A bequest of Mary Mandeville Johnston in memory of Edward W. Scudder Johnston.

Euretta J. Kellett Research Fellowship (1931). Awarded annually to graduates of Columbia College who are studying in the Faculties of Philosophy or Political Science, who have completed course work and certifying examinations for the Ph.D. degree, and who must do research for their dissertations at Oxford University or Cambridge University. Applications should be submitted to the Dean of Columbia College before February 1.

Paul H. Klingsenstein Fellowship (1964). Awarded annually to a doctoral candidate who has completed at least one year of full-time graduate study at Columbia and who is preparing for a career in teaching. Preference is given to candidates from the Fac-

ulties of Philosophy and Political Science. A gift of Mrs. Kligenstein in honor of her husband.

Lydig Fellowship (1931). Awarded annually to an advanced doctoral candidate. Special provision: upon recommendation of the Dean of the Graduate Faculties, the holder may pursue his studies or research in a foreign country. A detailed itinerary approved by the student's sponsor and a budget of estimated expenses are required before final selection. A bequest of Hannah M. Lydig.

Walter Ross Martin Fund (1956). Awarded annually to students who are citizens of the United States, preferably those coming from Greene County, New York. A bequest of Walter Ross Martin.

President's University Scholarship (1896). Awarded annually to first-year male students in the Graduate Faculties. Established by the Trustees of Columbia University in accordance with conditions set forth by President Seth Low.

Lydia C. Roberts Graduate Fellowships (1920). Awarded annually to students born in Iowa who have been graduated from an Iowa college or university. In addition to the stipend, the fellow is reimbursed the cost of traveling once from Iowa to New York City and back. Special provisions: holders may not concentrate their studies in law, medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, or theology.

Schuyler Fiske Seager Fellowship (1932). Awarded annually for the study of economics. A bequest of Professor Henry R. Seager.

Wladimir S. Woytinsky Fellowship (1962). Awarded annually for the study of economics. A gift of Mrs. Emma S. Woytinsky in memory of her husband.

OPEN ONLY TO STUDENTS IN THE FACULTY OF
PHILOSOPHY

Victor Baier Fellowship (1922). Awarded annually for the study of church music. A bequest of Victor Baier.

Clarence Barker Musical Scholarship (1921). Awarded for two consecutive years. A bequest of Virginia Purdy Bacon; for the study of music, preferably in Europe.

Wendell T. Bush Fellowship (1954). Awarded annually for the study of philosophy. A bequest of Mary T. Bush in memory of her husband.

Ch'en Kuang Scholarship (1964). Awarded biennially for the study of Chinese. A gift in memory of Lucius C. Porter.

Edward Benton Coe Scholarship (1954). Awarded biennially. A bequest of Margaret E. Coe in memory of her father. Open to students in the Department of English and Comparative Literature.

Thomas S. Da Ponte Fellowship (1963). Awarded annually for the study of Italian language and literature. A gift of Mrs. Marcia Da Ponte.

Angel Del Rio Prize for Excellence in Hispanic Studies (1963). Awarded annually to the most outstanding recipient of the master's degree in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese.

Alice M. Ditson Fellowship (1940). Awarded annually for the study of music. A bequest of Alice M. Ditson.

Henry Drisler Fellowship. Awarded annually. A gift of President Seth Low in honor of Henry Drisler. Open to students in the Department of Greek and Latin.

Irwin Edman Fellowship (1954). Awarded biennially for the study of philosophy. A gift of friends of Professor Edman.

Lizette Andrews Fisher Fellowships (1945). Awarded annually to women students in the Department of English and Comparative Literature. A bequest of Lizette A. Fisher.

Giuseppe Garibaldi Scholarship (1932). Awarded biennially to students who plan to specialize in the study or teaching of Italian. A gift of the Italian Government, the income to be used to defray tuition expenses.

William Addison Hervey Memorial Scholarship (1924). Awarded biennially to students in the Department of Germanic Languages. Preference is given to graduates of Columbia College or Barnard College. A gift of friends and former students of Professor Hervey.

A. V. William Jackson Fellowship (1939). Awarded annually for Indo-Iranian studies.

Adam Leroy Jones Memorial Fellowship (1946). Awarded annually to students in the Department of Philosophy. A gift of Mrs. Adam Leroy Jones in memory of her husband.

Manfred Kridl Scholarship (1957). For study in the field of Polish language and literature. The gift of various donors.

Sylvanus Lyon Scholarship (1962). Awarded annually for doctoral study in the Department of English and Comparative Literature. A bequest of John H. H. Lyon in memory of his father.

William Mason Musical Scholarship (1933). Awarded annually. A bequest of Mina Mason van Sinderen.

William Mitchell Fellowship (1908). Awarded annually to graduates of Columbia College. Students may not apply; selection is made by the Dean of Columbia College. A bequest of Benjamin D. Silliman.

Mogilat-Mihaly Fellowship (1967). Awarded annually for summer travel expenses to the Soviet Union. Open to students in the Department of Slavic Languages.

Joseph Mosenthal Fellowship (1898). Awarded biennially to students of musical composition. A gift of friends of Joseph Mosenthal.

Austin Oldrini Traveling Fellowship (1957). Awarded annually for the study of Italian language and literature. A bequest of Linda Oldrini.

Alexander Moncrief Proudfit Fellowship (1899). Awarded biennially to graduates of Columbia College for study in the Department of English and Comparative Literature. Special provision: holders must be unmarried during the duration of the fellowship. A bequest of Alexander M. Proudfit.

Seidl Fellowship (1899). Awarded biennially for the study of musical composition. Special provision: preference will be given to candidates who demonstrate their ability to compose for the lyric stage (opera or ballet).

Carl Schurz Fellowship (1900). Awarded triennially for the study of Germanic languages and literatures. A gift of friends of Carl Schurz.

Henry Alfred Todd Scholarship (1936). Awarded biennially for the study of French language and literature. A gift of Mrs. Henry A. Todd.

F. J. E. Woodbridge Fellowships. Honorary fellowships awarded annually to advanced students of the highest academic achievement and promise. Students may not apply; nominations are made by the departments to the Committee on Instruction. Honorary fellows may hold a concurrent award carrying a stipend.

OPEN ONLY TO STUDENTS IN THE FACULTY OF
PURE SCIENCE

Ernest Kempton Adams Research Fellowship (1904). Awarded annually for research in the physical sciences or in their practical applications. Appointment made from among the distinguished physicists of the United States or of any foreign foundations, clubs, and labor unions. The names of the fellowships and scholarships awarded for the year 1967-1968 are as follows:

American Chemical Society Fellowships. In geology.

American Cyanamid Fellowship. In chemistry.

Armenian General Benevolent Union of America, Inc., Fellowship. In Armenian history, linguistics, literature, art history, archaeology, or theology.

Atran Foundation Scholarships. In Yiddish language, literature, and culture. Consult

the chairman of the Department of Linguistics.

Laura Boulton Fellowship. One fellowship awarded annually to a student who qualifies for work in the Research Project on World Music in the School of International Affairs. This fellowship may be used for field work or for studies at Columbia University.

Continental Oil Company Fellowship. In geophysics.

Walter Dorn Scholarship. In history.

Dupont Teaching Award. In chemistry.

Dupont Fellowship for Fundamental Research in Physics.

Esso Education Foundation Fellowship. In chemistry and chemical engineering, for a twelve-month period.

Harry G. Friedman Scholarship. In economics.

Friends of Music Scholarship. In music.

German Academic Exchange Fellowship. Awarded by the Federal Republic of Germany for studies in the humanities or social sciences or, with special permission, in the pure and applied sciences. For a full year of study (September 1 to August 31) at a university of the student's choice in West Germany or West Berlin. Further information may be obtained from the Graduate Faculties Office of Admissions and Financial Aid, 106 Low Memorial Library.

IBM Graduate Fellowship. For a student in the humanities who is using the computer as a tool in his research for the dissertation.

International Affairs Scholarships. In the Departments of Economics, History, and Public Law and Government.

Joseph Kligenstein Fellowships. In social psychology.

Samuel Kress Foundation Fellowships. In art history.

Lederle Scholarship. For a student of German extraction.

Adelene Moffat Fellowship. Awarded annually to a woman student for graduate study in geography. A gift of the Society of Woman Geographers.

Meyer Padve Scholarship. In American history.

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
May 11, 1970.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this letter as a formal charge of sex discrimination against Western Washington State College, under Executive Order 11246 as amended, which specifically forbids Federal contractors from discriminating against women.

The charges are based on the enclosed letter which was written to a woman who applied for a position there. The letter openly and blatantly states that the particular department is "looking for a man."

We request that an immediate compliance review be conducted at Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington. We further request that such a compliance review include examination of admission of women, financial support to women, placement of women graduates, hiring and promotion policies of women on both the staff and faculty, and a study of salary differentials.

Please inform me when the compliance review begins.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, Ed. D.,
Chairman, Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education (WEAL).

WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE,
February 2, 1970.

At the moment we are looking for a person who can handle our debate program who has, or is close to the Doctorate. We want

to take advantage of the Buyer's Market this year and hold out for just the right person.

Last year we brought on three women, so that one quarter of our staff is female. We were, frankly, looking for a man this time to fill our speech opening. But thank you for your interest in our school and our department.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR L. SOLOMON,
Chairman.

PART 3: PROMOTIONAL PRACTICES AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE 1930-1970 SHOWING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST DR. BABEY-BROOKE

A statistical analysis of promotion in the ranks of full, associate and assistant professor in the teaching faculty, including men and women, at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York from the inception of the college in 1930 to 1970 is the subject of this report. At first the year 1964 was chosen because it was at that time that Dr. Anna M. BabeY-Brooke, an assistant professor in the department of English, protested, among other charges, "that discrimination against her as an individual and against women existed at promotion time in Brooklyn College." Due partly to her case, to the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee, and to the Report of the Committee of Rank, the college administration made a gesture to correct this injustice and promoted women in wholesale numbers in 1966. This study has therefore, included an analysis of promotional practices in 1966-1968. The Brooklyn College Bulletins which are a matter of public record, were used for this study.

The names, dates of appointment of individuals together with the years required for promotion to the next rank are all enumerated. The rate of promotion for each rank is given in a departmental as well as on a college wide level. The record speaks for itself; there is no doubt about discrimination against women. Statistical tables provided in a memorandum from Deans Mals and Stroup to President Gideonse, February 21, 1962 and reissued April of 1964 by the Office of the Dean of Students as "Conference on the Status of Women" substantiate this report.

From the beginning when the College was first set up from the faculties of Hunter College—for women—and from the College of the City of New York—for men—discrimination against women existed. The men's division sent in all men as faculty; the women's division sent in both men and women: the major ranks filled exclusively by men. In 1932, 8 men were professors, but no women; 10 men and 4 women were associate professors; 21 men and 7 women were assistant professors. This trend continued so that in 1964, 34 men but no women were appointed full professors; 39 men and 5 women were associates. In the total count from 1930 to 1964, 151 men were made full professors in contrast to 16 women; 104 men were associates in contrast to 48 women.

The Bulletin of 1966-1968 shows the continuation of this trend: 145 men were full professors to 20 women; 125 men associates to 35 women; and 153 male assistants to 62 females. In the years 1966-1968 the women gained 4 full professorships at the expense of 13 associate professorships and the men lost 6 full professorships but gained 21 associate professorships. The senior ranks for females showed a net loss of 9 and for males showed a net gain of 15.

The latest Bulletin 1968-1970 lists 143 men as full professor to 17 women; 135 men associates to 25 women and 158 men assistants to 52 women. In two years from 1968 to 1970, men lost 2 professorships to 3 for women. Men gained 10 associate professorships and

women lost 10; men gained 5 assistant professorships and women lost 10 assistant professorships. In the senior ranks, men gained 8 and women lost 13. The figures speak for themselves.

In the following eight departments: anthropology, art, geology, music philosophy, physics, psychology, and sociology, no woman has ever been appointed to a full professor. This figure comprises more than half of the departments as listed in the statistical tables that follow in the departments listed on page 38 of the report published in 1966.

In the following four departments: art, music, philosophy, physics, and sociology, no woman has ever been made an associate professor.

Only on rare occasions have women held the rank of chairman of the department. This fact also is a form of discrimination, for it is the chairmen of the departments who make up Personnel and Budget, the Committee at Brooklyn College which votes on the candidates to be promoted. If the President concurs, the recommendations goes to the Board of Higher Education of the City University of New York.

In the BabeY-Brooke case—a pilot case in higher education—it was brought out in the hearings by the Board of Higher Education that the Committee on Personnel and Budget consisted of 18 men and 2 women, one of whom was the wife of the then-Dean of Administration who later became President of the College (Kilcoyne). At the hearing, it was further brought out that President Gideonse admitted that he had appointed at least 14 chairmen (of 14 different departments). This figure was a *small number* in his opinion. One of his appointees was Professor George Peck to the chairmanship of the Department of English. He went on to become Dean of Administration and then Acting President. BabeY-Brooke in her capacity as an elected member of the Appointments Committee, to which she had been elected by her colleagues for fourteen successive years voted against the appointment of Mr. Peck in 1955. Although President Gideonse called her into his office and asked her to change her vote, she refused.

The statistics for the spring of 1967 reported by the registrar of Brooklyn College were 12,330 women and 9,965 men for the total enrollment of 22,295 of the college; 5,246 women and 4,487 men out of that total represent the matriculated students in the day session. In this college where women predominate, a woman with a Ph.D. who has been an associate dean for over ten years was passed over for the post of Dean of Administration which was given to a man—an acting dean—who had an A.B. degree, no administrative experience, and certainly no scholastic accomplishment. The administration must have realized its mistake, for it then gave the post to Mr. Peck (March 1967, *Faculty Staff Note Book*).

When Mr. Peck was acting president, the acting dean with a B.A. degree was appointed as an associate dean (so that he could get his full professorship).

What follows in the report is a summation of each department of the college in regard to discrimination against women in the promotional practices prevailing at Brooklyn College.

SECTION II: PROFILE OF DR. ANNA M. BABEY-BROOKE'S PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES SINCE HER PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN 1953

I. RECORD OF SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENT IN FIELD OR PROFESSION

1. Guest Lecturer at International Congress of Acupuncture, Paris, France, 1969.
2. Guest Lecturer at International Congress of Acupuncture, Tokyo, Japan, 1965.

3. Lecturer to Medical Societies and colleges in Japan, 1965.

4. 1963-64: Senior Fulbright Grantee, Professor, English Graduate Studies, Lady Doak College, Madurai, South India. She was the head of the Graduate Department in English of this college, an affiliate of Madras University.

5. Guest Lecturer at the following colleges in India: American College, Theogarajan College, Theogararajan College of Preceptors, Maurai College.

6. Lecturer for United States Information Service on its various American cultural affairs programs at the following Universities in India: Annamalai, Karnatak, and five colleges associated with Calcutta University.

7. Special Public Lecturer for the Annual Address promulgated by the Vice-Chancellor of Madras University on "The Search for the Self in Eastern and Western Cultures."

8. Participant, American Studies Center, Hyderabad, Osmania University, Photostatic copies of letters, unsolicited, from four government officials will provide insights into her contributions.

N.B. Other Fulbrighters at Brooklyn College have been promoted for their governmental awards. BabeY-Brooke was bypassed even though she was one of two Americans invited to represent the United States at the International Congresses in Tokyo and in Paris.

II. RECORD AS ADMINISTRATOR

1. Educational Director and Chairman, American Association of University Women, 1966-present.

2. Member, Steering Committee, International Congress of Acupuncture, Tokyo, 1965.

3. Chairman, Graduate Studies, Lady Doak College, India, 1963-64.

4. Coordinator, Division of Written Communications, Division of Vocational Studies, 1955-1969 except for leave to teach in India.

5. Deputy Chairman, Division of Graduate Studies, English, Brooklyn College, 1958.

6. Faculty advisor to school *Landscapes*, a student publication.

III. RECORD OF SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY—ABROAD AND AT HOME

1. Lecturer at various social agencies in India: Y.W.C.A., Y.M.C.A., Lions' Club; Hindu Relief Organization; Hindu orphanages and Christian orphanages on fund-raising campaigns; maternity centers in local villages on outskirts of Madurai on an educational program.

2. Lecturer at College of Religious Science and the First Church of Religious Science and its clubs on the following: Plato, Aristotle, Great Truths, Buddhism, Taoism, General Semantics, William James, Existentialism, *The Upanishads*, *BhagavadGita*, Swedborg, Boehm, Confucius, Lao Tse etc.

IV. EVIDENCE OF CONTINUED GROWTH

She is the first American woman to receive the degree of Doctor of Acupuncture, a Chinese medical degree, signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and verified by the courts of Taiwan, Free China. This was awarded in June of 1964. (In the Sung Dynasty, Acupuncture was one of the three main subjects taught in the government medical schools.)

2. The State Department interviewed her in Washington about her experiences and contacts in India and Formosa.

3. She is a member of the International Committee on the Standardization of Nomenclature.

4. She is co-author of "The Pulse in Occident and Orient: It's Philosophy and Practice in India, China, Iran and the West." Dawson of Pall Mall, London; and Santa Barbara Press, N.Y., 1966.

5. Two articles published in International Journal of Acupuncture at the two different congresses—in Japan and France—and translated into other languages.

V. RECORD OF SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE

1. Her publications of various career manuals which are listed on the college special form—known as Form D—of her academic record require this explanation: She approached the dean in 1951 with preparing vocational brochures of interest to English majors and she prepared this material and edited a General Manual. These two Manuals were followed by the establishment of a college-wide committee on Employment and she became a Counsellor in the Division of Personnel Services. In 1954, the Minutes of the English Department reported that she had obtained a sum of money to defray the publication costs of a 16 page booklet. In 1954, 5,000 copies of this manual were distributed and in 1956, 2000 additional copies were sold.

2. Member, Faculty-Student Committee on Employment, 1951-53.

3. Chairman, Faculty Committee on Economic Services to Students, 1953-55.

4. Member, Committee on Career Publications (College-Wide) 1953-57.

5. Member, Committee on Scholarships and Awards, 1955-56.

6. Elected Member of Faculty Council, 1955.

7. President, Faculty Club, School of General Studies, 1958-59.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S CAMBODIAN ACTION

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many editorials throughout the country support President Nixon's decision to destroy North Vietnam's sanctuaries in Cambodia. However, few editorials equal the one entitled "It Was the President's Duty," published in the Columbia Record of Saturday May 23, 1970.

The editorial makes an irrefutable case to show that President Nixon's decision was logical, timely, necessary, and a master stroke of tactical surprise. To quote from the editorial:

It will be seen as the right move at the right time at the right place and under the right circumstances. For the President not to have taken advantage of the unexpected political developments in Cambodia when he did would have been a dereliction in his duty as President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Columbia Record, May 23, 1970]

IT WAS THE PRESIDENT'S DUTY

Not even some of the bitterest opponents of President Nixon's Cambodia incursion deny that he made a sound and laudatory tactical decision.

Under Sihanouk's policy of neutralism the Communists were granted use of Cambodian ports to receive war supplies. They occupied territory to establish military bases.

The Viet Cong and North Vietnamese stockpiled these sanctuaries with supplies and used them as springboards to attack

South Vietnam. Their guerrillas and army regulars could return to safety without fear of retaliation.

As long as Sihanouk ruled, his country were off limits to American and South Vietnamese forces, but the circumstances changed when Sihanouk was deposed. The allies were welcome to divert Communist forces from a takeover of the country.

This gave the Americans the opportunity to secure their left flank. As Commander-in-Chief, President Nixon seized the initiative with a surprise, blitzkrieg attack that has captured more military supplies than we believed the enemy held. The sanctuaries have been destroyed. The impending monsoon season will ensure that they cannot be rebuilt and restocked for many months.

An alternative to the Nixon decision was to hold back to defensive positions and allow the Communists to take over all of Cambodia with impunity, expanding the sanctuaries to intolerable proportions. This would have added new dimensions to the war and possibly caused a long and bloody delay to the planned orderly withdrawal of American forces.

In any previous war the action would have been hailed as a master military stroke, but the Vietnam War is different. It has been run almost entirely for political rather than military considerations, and has been directed by political rather than by military decision makers.

Consequently, a howl went up in the Senate because Congressmen had not been consulted beforehand about the military operation. Such a consultation most certainly would have destroyed the element of surprise for the enemy, and impeded the entire American peace effort.

The "invasion" issue was grabbed by those whose voices are constantly raised against any opposition to Communist aggression. Swept up in the wave of emotionalism that ensued were those who want peace at any price, those who have honest revulsion to American overseas involvement, and those who sponsor any cause that undermines the government of the United States.

When the storm of hysteria has passed and the Cambodian action and its results can be calmly and soberly assessed, we predict that it will be seen as climactic in bringing the war to a quicker end.

It will be seen as the right move at the right time at the right place and under the right circumstances. For the President not to have taken advantage of the unexpected political developments in Cambodia when he did would have been a dereliction in his duty as President of the United States.

AMERICANS ARRESTED ABROAD ON NARCOTICS CHARGES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Department of State relative to the increased number of young Americans who are under detention abroad for violation of foreign drug laws. This is a serious situation and I feel every effort should be made to acquaint our young people of the fact that when they go abroad, they are subject to the laws of the countries they visit and that in many countries penalties for possessing drugs are severe

while the penalties for trafficking can be even more stringent.

I also wish to encourage the Department of State to continue their present efforts and also seek additional methods to reach our young Americans regarding this serious situation.

The letter from the State Department follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You may already have heard about the increasing number of young Americans who are under detention abroad for violating foreign drug laws. However, we view the problem so seriously that we wish to make doubly sure that all Members of Congress are fully informed. The number of young Americans under detention abroad at the end of March last year was 142. A year later it had risen to 522.

We believe that many young Americans who go abroad do not realize that they are subject to the laws of the countries which they visit; nor do they realize that in many countries the penalties for possessing drugs are severe while the penalties for trafficking can be very serious indeed. The fact sheet attached to this letter will give you an idea of what can happen to the boy or girl who is apprehended abroad on this type of charge. Prison conditions in many countries, particularly in the Far East, Middle East and Latin America are severe; an individual who must serve a jail term faces a most distasteful ordeal. A person who has been apprehended must often spend several months in prison awaiting trial. In many instances, this time of incarceration is not subtracted from the sentence imposed by the court.

Our consular officers do the best they can to assure American citizens fair treatment under the legal procedures of the country involved. They cannot, however, represent them legally nor request special treatment on the basis that they are Americans. Moreover, the consular officers are unable to expend any U.S. Government funds in their behalf.

The Department has taken several measures to warn young people about the penalties of violating foreign drug laws. These warnings have included TV and radio interviews by the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Miss Barbara M. Watson; a press release which has been reprinted and widely circulated to almost 6,000 colleges and college newspapers; and instructions to our consulates abroad to use posters and notices in order to warn American boys and girls who are visiting their countries. Our purpose has been to alert them to the danger before they get into trouble.

I am sending you this letter because I believe you would want to know how serious the situation has become. Please feel free to use this letter and the enclosed fact sheet in any way you deem helpful in alerting your constituents to this problem.

Sincerely,
DAVID ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

AMERICANS ARRESTED ABROAD ON DRUG CHARGES

1. Total Americans arrested and under detention abroad on narcotics charges:

ARRESTS

During March 1969, 57.
During March 1970, 221.

UNDER DETENTION

As of March 31, 1969, 142.
As of March 31, 1970, 522.

2. Top 20 countries in which Americans are under detention for narcotics:

Country	Arrests in March 1970	Total under detention, March 31
Mexico.....	52	145
Spain.....	20	63
France.....	23	33
Japan.....	10	26
Jamaica.....	3	25
Sweden.....	10	23
United Kingdom.....	16	22
Italy.....		20
Israel.....	10	18
Canada.....	11	17
Lebanon.....	5	17
Germany.....	5	16
Greece.....	1	12
Panama.....	8	8
Netherlands.....	4	7
Bahamas.....	5	6
India.....	5	6
Turkey.....	1	6
Bolivia.....		5
Denmark.....		5

3. Representative penalties for possession and trafficking in narcotics:

Bahamas: Possession—Americans have been sentenced to from 3 months to 1 year in jail.

France: Possession—varies, but less than for trafficking. A minimum of 3-4 months pre-trial confinement; Trafficking—1-5 years jail.

Germany: Possession—One American sentenced to 2 years for possession of large amount of hashish.

Greece: Possession—Fine and sentence to few months jail. Trafficking—One American recently sentenced to 18 months, another to 5 years.

Italy: Possession—One American recently fined \$317 and sentenced to two years jail. Trafficking—3 to 8 years.

Jamaica: Possession—minimum of 18 months.

Japan: Sentences are based on the quality of narcotics involved. For small amounts, as are usually the case, sentences are light, are often suspended, followed by deportation. One American found with 600 grams of hashish was sentenced to two years. Most Americans arrested on narcotics charges are seamen.

Lebanon: Possession and use—1 to 3 years in detoxification asylum (usually a mental hospital). Trafficking—3 to 15 years.

Mexico: A minimum of 6-12 months pre-trial confinement; then, sentence usually under 5 years unless more than one-half ton of drugs involved.

Spain: Penalty depends on quantity of drugs involved: Less than 500 grams—fined and released or released on bail until trial.

More than 500 grams—heavy fine plus minimum of 6 years jail.

Sweden: Possession—One American recently sentenced 1 year jail. Attempted sale—One American sentenced 1 year, 9 months. Permanent expulsion from Sweden usually follows release.

Turkey: Possession—3 to 5 years. Trafficking—10 years to life.

U.S.S.R.: Trafficking—3 to 10 years.

4. Approximate age of persons arrested for narcotics violations:

According to a sample of about 1/3 of the cases in our card file, by far the greatest number arrested are below 30 years of age.

5. Distribution of arrest reports:

Initial reports of an arrest are sent to the Department of Justice as well as the Department of State.

EDUCATION VOUCHERS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State, the morning newspaper of

Columbia, S.C., has warmly endorsed the concept of educational vouchers as a method of heading off the crisis in public education.

Under the proposed voucher system, every parent would draw a certificate from public funds equivalent to the per-pupil cost of public education. He would then be able to apply this voucher toward tuition at any school that would accept his child.

This system would break the monopoly that forces most parents to send their children to the public school system for assignment to a school.

I believe that educators should welcome this proposal. It would provide the competition in education that is necessary to bring out the best in any enterprise. Every school, public or private, would have to reexamine its methods to see whether it is doing the best it can.

The real interest of government is to see that every child gets a good education. It is not in the interest of government to impose a monopoly on its people.

Mr. President, I commend the State newspaper for taking a forthright stand in favor of this proposal, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Public School Monopoly Challenged by Vouchers," published May 28, 1970, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

PUBLIC SCHOOL MONOPOLY CHALLENGED BY VOUCHERS

The public school establishment will not celebrate the idea, but a system of educational vouchers may—just may—be able to head off the crisis in public education.

Under the plan, long advocated by economist Milton Friedman and now being pushed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the virtual monopoly of public schools would be broken. Both private and public education stand to benefit. More important, so do the students.

The voucher plan works this way. Every parent of a school-age child would draw from the government a certificate equivalent to the per-pupil cost of public education. He could "spend" this voucher, if he wished, on public schools. But if he found private education preferable, he could use the voucher to send his child to a private school.

Opposition from the public school lobby is understandable. Under the existing order, public education has a captive student body whose parents are required by compulsory attendance laws to send their children to school, but who, for the most part, are economically unable to opt for private education. The result, in many cases, is the kind of stagnation that generally accompanies a lack of competition.

Aside from vested interests, however, the voucher plan's bitterest opponents are to be found among those who stand to benefit from it most: the urban blacks. The voucher system smacks of the old "tuition grant" device whereby Southern states once thought to escape the onus of compulsory integration. And since the courts have ruled, with some justification, that tuition grants were a dodge, the argument is now heard that even an honest voucher plan would be tainted.

It is not so, of course, but the opposition can be expected to latch onto the issue of racial prejudice with all the effectiveness of a squid inking down a menacing shark. But the threat is not to blacks. It is to that portion of public school officials, however

small, whose indolence or incompetence would be spotlighted by widespread availability of a voucher plan.

Beyond that, however, children from impoverished backgrounds could transfer out of impoverished "ghetto" schools. It is no secret that in countless communities most educational dollars are spent in the better-off neighborhoods. Slum dwellers resent the inequity, but are often powerless to bring about correction through the political process. The voucher system would give them a way out. If slum schools failed to meet the needs of slum children, parents could enroll their children in other public schools—or even private schools—that did.

From almost any angle, the voucher system has to be viewed as an improvement. By offering a private escape hatch, it would alleviate many of the social pressures now building dangerously in public school classrooms. It would give poorer families the access to private schools that only the relatively affluent now enjoy. Most of all, it would break up the public school monopoly and force public institutions to compete with each other and with private schools for acceptance.

But wait. The millennium is not here yet. If experience counts for anything, the vested interests will make a brave fight against any alteration of the status quo.

Nonetheless, the idea is so refreshing and so challenging that it deserves broad support—not only for initial adoption but for ultimate expansion.

WHO SPEAKS THUS?

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, now and again in our lives there sounds a voice out of the rhetoric, a clear bell from the cacophony that assaults our ears every day, that makes us turn and listen and say to each other, "What was that? Did you hear it? Who speaks thus?"

Such a voice comes through in an open letter to the President, from Dr. Miller Upton, the president of Beloit College in Beloit, Wis. I urge it on my colleagues as one of the most succinct appeals to reason that it has been my pleasure to hear in many years.

If there is one shining message in Dr. Upton's letter, it is the cry for truth and reason to prevail. The man has no ax to grind, no windmills that he tilts against. He opposes many of the viewpoints that prompt his letter, but he opposes even more the strident voices from his own profession who want to overcome these viewpoints by shouting them down.

Mr. Speaker, I would count myself lucky if my enemies were men like Dr. Upton. I would be even more blessed if I could call him my friend. I have never met him, but I am grateful to him because he has shown me that men still know how to seek justice, defend truth, and do it well. The letter follows:

BELOIT COLLEGE,
Beloit, Wis., May 11, 1970.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT RICHARD M.

NIXON

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a college president, a past scholar-teacher, and one who

has consciously devoted his whole life to the cause of higher education in the conviction that it offers the greatest hope for social progress and the elevation of man to his highest potential, I wish to apologize to you and the nation for the grotesque failure of the academic community at this hour of national trial and turmoil.

I am fully aware of how extremely presumptuous it is for one to represent himself to apologize for the many, but I am constrained to do so nonetheless for the shame I feel for the community with which I have been so intimately related for so long and in which I have placed so much confidence in the past. Those who do not agree with me will, of course, be able and willing to speak for themselves.

Let me establish a point about myself at the outset so that my position can be more accurately interpreted. I was a conscientious objector during World War II, and were I of draft age now I would be a conscientious objector again. But my moral opposition to war, however deeply and conscientiously held, does not entitle me on any ethical or moral grounds to take violent action against those who disagree. I must bear witness to truth as I see it, but I must also respect the right of the other person to do the same. Certainly, I must never hurt or demean another simply because he won't go along with my own conviction.

This commitment to respect for the individual, intellectual openness, and freedom of inquiry is the transcendent value to which an academic community must be subservient. In fact, it is the only value to which the academy can pledge allegiance if it is to be consistent with itself. To elevate any other value is to break faith with this transcendent value and it is at this point that we have violated our public trust as professional educators: we have given in to violence and threats of violence in support of a particular point of view, and in doing so we have allowed the academic integrity of our individual institutions and the academic community at large to be violated.

Being a conscientious objector to war and one who would issue such an open letter as this, I clearly am not opposed to dissent and protest. But I am vigorously opposed to violence in any form and for any reason, and most of all I am opposed to would-be leaders capitulating to intimidation and violence. Those who respect violence when used against them will inevitably employ violence when it suits their cause.

We in the colleges and universities have tolerated unspeakable intimidation and thought control on the part of radical students, faculty and others, and yet when Vice President Agnew speaks out forcefully against such the only voices that are heard from the academy are those who castigate him and you for repressing dissent. There are few college campuses, if any, where Vice President Agnew, or any member of your cabinet for that matter, could speak without disruption and even physical abuse and intimidation. But a convicted murderer, dope peddler, or one committed to the forceful overthrow of the government will receive not only a respectful hearing, but will be paid a handsome honorarium in addition. In the light of his high position, I have been embarrassed by some of the Vice President's intemperate language. But surely he has as much right to dissent and to be given a respectful hearing as any of the criminal element of our society.

Much of the academic community is now telling you how to settle the war in Vietnam and being critical of your effort to protect lives and shorten the war by moving troops into Cambodia. I find it highly unbecoming of us to presume to tell you how to fight the war in Vietnam when we aren't even able

to settle the wars on our own campuses. Nor do I use the word *war* in the context lightly. The throwing of missiles to do physical harm, the throwing of firebombs to burn buildings, the use of guerrilla tactics via arson and vandalism, the shooting and killing of combatants and noncombatants is every bit as much war as that which prevails in Vietnam, Cambodia, and the Near East. I have often wondered sardonically how many protestors of napalm have themselves thrown fire bombs or engaged in arson.

I have also been appalled by a certain arrogance and inconsistency on our part with regard to the way we are free to tell you and others how to handle your jobs but become deeply resentful, insulted, and even hostile when there is any suggestion of your intrusion into "our" domain. I am quite sure that I am able to run Beloit College better than you, but by the same token I am sure that you are able to deal with the issues of the Presidency of the United States, including fighting the war in Vietnam, better than I. The widespread propensity of members of the "intellectual" community to make judgments without benefit of facts is one of my greatest disillusionments and embarrassments.

As a matter of fact, my early naivete led me to embrace the academic life because of my belief that members therein were committed to intellectual honesty, rational behavior and humanistic concern and compassion. Recent incidents have merely confirmed all the more what my life's experiences have suggested. Academic man is as much motivated by vested interest, is as much controlled by base emotion, and reasons as much from prejudice as any other mortal. My readings of Ecclesiastes, the New Testament and the life of Mahatma Gandhi should have prepared me for this, but they didn't.

We who work closely with young people and should know and understand them best have not been very helpful to them or to you and others of the adult community in serving as a vehicle of communication. We have too often taken sides ourselves and been critical of one group or the other and not been sufficiently discriminating in our communicative role.

Maybe we can be forgiven on the grounds that the task is such a difficult one. I know that the great bulk of college students are genuinely concerned about the inhumanity and futility of war and deeply question the legitimacy of a life that sanctions and even glorifies indiscriminate killing and maiming. I also know that the great bulk of adults and members of the establishment are sincere, dedicated individuals with the same hopes and aspirations as the young. But I also know that in each group there are examples that support the worst stereotype of each. The great frustration of the day is that despite this great community of interest and concern there is a growing separation based upon the sinful tendency to judge by stereotype and preconception. We in the academic community are frequently party to this sin even though our training should particularly help us to know better.

Although my own sentiments are basically with the young people, I must admit that there is a general pandering to the young at the present time that is both disgusting and irresponsible. Disgusting because it prostitutes normal respect and affection. Irresponsible because it is creating an unrealistic cleavage between age groups.

Of course, young people on the whole are wonderful, but what's new about that? The great reward of college work is the opportunity it affords to associate regularly with this age group. The idealism, absolutism, intellectual honesty and great aspiration of the young are the eternal attributes of this

age group upon which society is dependent to preserve its vital, dynamic quality. These attributes are the standards of behavior to be expected, not glorified as unique in any narrow time span of human history.

Young people are first and foremost people. Those who are young today will be old tomorrow and having to relate to those who are younger than. As people they represent all types, some taller than others, some fatter than others, some with higher IQs than others, some more criminally inclined than others, some more saintly than others, some more hostile than others, some more vocal than others, etc. There is no general virtue attributable to youth any more than there is general evil. We have done all young people a great disservice in recent years by suggesting to them that they are of a different breed from the rest of us and beyond reproach. They are nothing more than the fresh blood being pumped into the human society, just as we were in the past and their children will be in the future. We in Academe should have known this better than anyone else and not have failed them and you in your common need for understanding.

We have been quick to tell you that you are alienating the youth of America, but we seem to pay little attention to the way we are alienating our own constituencies by our failure to protect the authentic academic integrity of our institutions. Implicitly we are also alienating the youth of America over the long run by our failure to be faithful to our leadership responsibilities.

The pain that hurts most of all is the realization that I bear partial responsibility for the unnecessary deaths of four young people on the campus of Kent State University. The National Guard troops should never have been there in the first place, because we should never have permitted the conditions to develop which necessitated the presence of troops. Once this die was cast, it was simply a matter of time before tragedy would strike. If fault lies anywhere for the Kent State deaths it lies not with you and the Vietnam War but with the radical acts and excesses we have tolerated in the name of dissent.

I am sure you know, Mr. President, that I do not say these things with tongue in cheek to placate others, to curry favor, to advance partisan interests, or to defend your war policies. Last fall I joined with a number of other college presidents to urge your rapid withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. I reaffirm this plea. But when I consider the whole matter fully and objectively, I have to concede that you have been more faithful to your leadership responsibilities than we in Academe have been to our own.

With respect for the tremendous burdens you must bear for the rest of us and the conscientious way you are bearing them and with apology for the cruel injustices that have been foisted upon you by the professional community of which I am a part, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

MILLER UPTON.

SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S
ACTION IN CAMBODIA

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, David Lawrence makes a strong case in support of the President's authority for the Cambodian action. In his column published in the Washington Evening

Star of Thursday, May 21, 1970, Mr. Lawrence points out that the Senate ratified the Southeast Asia Treaty to aid allies who are victims of aggression.

Both the House and the Senate overwhelmingly passed the Gulf of Tonkin joint resolution to permit the United States to help Southeast Asian countries to fight against aggression. Mr. Lawrence further emphasizes that all U.S. Presidents have adhered to the doctrine to protect American lives without obtaining the consent of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lawrence's column be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

DANGER SEEN IN CAMBODIA CURB PLAN
(By David Lawrence)

Lots of people throughout the country—including some members of the Senate and House—seem to think that only Congress can "declare war." They construe the words "declare war" to mean that the United States cannot defend itself without the consent of Congress. But how would they answer this question:

Supposing a foreign government fired in this nuclear age an intercontinental ballistic missile and destroyed many American lives? Would the president of the United States, who is also commander in chief of our armed forces, have to wait for Congress to be called into session—it might actually be in recess—before he would have authority to take the necessary steps to defend the American people?

Incidentally, Daniel Henkin, assistant secretary of defense, told a meeting of the Aviation and Space Writers Association on Tuesday that the launching of a satellite confirms the technological progress of the Red Chinese. He warned that "prudence requires that we continue to credit them with near-term capability to fire their first intercontinental ballistic missile."

All presidents have adhered to the doctrine that it is the duty of the commander in chief to guard the territory of the United States and also to protect American lives and property abroad whenever endangered, without obtaining the consent of Congress beforehand. The Senate, however, is debating a measure which would prohibit federal funds from being used by the President in any way for U.S. ground or naval operations in Cambodia after a certain date, presumably June 30. President Nixon has already announced his intention of removing American forces by that time.

This action could do more than just affect the Cambodian situation. It could have an impact on America's military operations in the future. It could raise doubts whether American citizens abroad, who hitherto have been assured of protection when hostile countries have threatened them, can depend upon such a safeguard in the future. It also could mean that aggressor countries could attack smaller nations without fear of immediate counter-moves by the United States, because of the long delay that might ensue before Congress could give its consent to a military action.

The controversy is basically political, and those who are espousing the idea of limiting the President's powers think they are making votes at home. Actually, they are building up obstacles to the exercise of American military strength where it may be needed in other parts of the world to halt aggression and fulfill American commitments.

The Senate, for instance, has ratified both the Southeast Asia Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty, under which the United States has made commitments to aid allied countries that are the victims of aggression. If the pending measure in regard to Cambodia is passed, however, there may be doubts whether the United States will honor its pledges. In other words, all treaties will be subject to considerable question as to their effectiveness if Congress now undertakes to limit the power of the commander in chief to initiate military steps when he deems them necessary to carry out American obligations.

There has always been a close interrelationship between Congress and the President when military operations start. As the war in Vietnam began to expand, former President Lyndon B. Johnson asked Congress for specific authority. Both Houses, by an overwhelming majority, passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to permit the United States to help Southeast Asian countries to fight against the "systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors."

Once the Cambodian operation is completed, which probably will be by the end of June, the anti-war sentiment may stimulate groups in Congress to push legislation to require the termination of our participation in the Vietnam war itself by compelling a withdrawal of all our troops by a certain date. This would be a risky step for the United States, and could encourage aggressors to start more trouble in Southeast Asia and elsewhere. The administration will certainly oppose any such legislative moves and will point out to the American people the dangers involved.

THE ENERGY SHORTAGE

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, today's edition of the Wall Street Journal carried an article entitled: "Power Crisis: Shortage of Energy Threatens Industries, Homes in United States." The author, Mr. Thomas Lindley Ehrlich, explains some consequences and causes of the electrical power crisis.

For many months now, industry spokesmen and concerned Members of this body have warned of an impending electrical power crisis brought about by shortsighted policies in the field of power generation. There have been "red-letter" signs in the past few years of impending crisis—power burnouts across the Nation and the big Northeast power black-out of three summers ago.

Despite these warnings little was done and now the crisis is upon us.

Nonetheless, it is a crisis that can be confronted and surmounted if we begin to act now to create and develop a coherent and sound national energy policy. The United States has adequate supplies of both capital and natural energy resources to insure power supplies to meet every demand of our citizens for both commercial and home power.

I insert Mr. Ehrlich's article at this point:

POWER CRISIS: A SHORTAGE OF ENERGY THREATENS INDUSTRIES AND HOMES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

(By Thomas Lindley Ehrlich)

(Demand already tops supply in some areas; electricity, gas, coal, oil all tight—for some: Long, hot summer.)

This country—an insatiable, power-consuming culture of electric toothbrushes, power lawn mowers, gas-fired barbecues and air-conditioned homes with electric garage doors—is suddenly faced with a broad energy shortage.

For the first time in history, the nation's energy supply is falling to keep ahead of the ever-growing demand. America's factories and consumers are increasing use of electricity, natural gas, coal and other fuels faster than the suppliers of energy can boost the output. Some analysts see the problem as temporary, but others view it as a historical turning point in which the energy resources that always have been taken for granted become a limiting factor in national growth.

The impact of this "energy gap" is spreading through industry and is beginning to touch consumers. Its scope and seriousness are emerging in scores of scattered but related symptoms:

Fuel and power shortages are interrupting factory operations, increasing manufacturers' costs and hurting their profits. The shortages also are influencing corporate plant-location decisions and crimping industrial-expansion hopes of some areas.

Consumers and homeowners are being threatened with less-reliable utility service, including the prospect of summer power failures. While rates rise and service grows chancier, some are beginning to wonder whatever happened to Reddy Kilocatt, that nearly vanished symbol of cheap, dependable, instant electricity.

Utilities are cutting back on promotions they traditionally have used to increase their business. New York and Philadelphia power companies, for instance, have stopped promoting air-conditioner sales. Meanwhile, utility executives are scrambling to boost capacity and are hoping for breaks with the weather.

"CRISIS AMID ABUNDANCE"

The problem worries Washington officials. "What we have is a crisis amid abundance," declares S. David Freeman, director of the energy-policy staff of the White House Office of Science and Technology.

As the Federal Government's top planner in the energy field, Mr. Freeman lately has been raising provocative questions: Though doubling of power use every decade always has been a sign of progress, isn't it now a "mixed blessing"? Aren't utility salesmen "doing a better job than the producers"? Should utility rate structures, which have always favored the big customers (the more you use, the lower the rate) be changed to "flat or even regressive," which would penalize bigger-volume users?

Some experts speculate that the energy gap, if it persists, will have major, long-range consequences. "Lack of energy is going to start inhibiting our economic growth and perhaps our standard of living," says E. F. Andrews, purchasing vice president of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, Inc., a steelmaker.

"You may have some industries that will be operating seven or eight months a year" due to energy shortages, speculates Robert M. Fletcher, Armco Steel Corp's director of raw materials purchasing.

THE GOOD LIFE

Presidential adviser Freeman suggests that the affluent society might have to curb its appetite for more goods that consume energy. "Electricity has helped bring the good life

to many Americans," and it isn't possible to stop its growth, but "the rate of growth... is subject to discussion and action," he remarked in a recent speech.

The energy gap stems from what Mr. Freeman calls a "runaway market" for energy at a time when suppliers have been hit with a multiplicity of troubles ranging from construction delays and labor strife to bad weather and antipollution crusades that stall projects.

One big problem is that energy suppliers simply underestimated growth in demand. For many years, energy use had been growing at about 3% a year, but starting in 1965 demand growth jumped to 5% annually. Especially startling were the 9% annual spurts in electric-power use in 1968 and 1969.

The pinch affects all major sources of energy and has become an interlocking problem. Thus, attempts to switch from one energy source to another seldom help.

A lag in natural gas exploration, which producers blame on prices set "unrealistically" low by Government regulators, is tightening supplies. For the past two years, consumption of gas has outrun new discoveries, which puts a drain on the nation's gas reserves. Some major pipelines are strained to capacity. Last winter's extreme cold severely depleted supplies at some storage areas.

Coal shortages stemming from recurring labor trouble at the mines, a crackdown on mine safety that has closed some mines and a lag in new mine openings, have grown severe. Mining concerns are unable to boost production quickly, and users' stockpiles have greatly dwindled.

AN ILLUSTRATION

Antipollution pressures are affecting demand as well as supply. "Companies we've been trying to sell gas to for years without much success are now knocking at our door wanting gas to substitute primarily for coal," which pollutes the air more, says Robert E. Seymour, executive vice president of Consolidated Natural Gas Co. The company, like other gas distributors, can't fill all the orders. Similar requests are inflating demand for low-sulphur fuel oil, which also has become hard to get.

The severe disruptions that this situation can cause a big energy user can be seen in the case of PPG Industries Inc., the Pittsburgh based maker of paint, chemicals and glass.

This winter, PPG's glass division had gas service reduced at various plants on two dozen occasions; utilities had curtailed service to industrial customers to keep pumping fuel to homeowners on extremely cold days. In some cases, the PPG plants had to close and send workers home, and in others the plants hastily switched to fuel oil or liquid propane to keep operating—but that caused product-quality problems such as flaws in the glass, company officials say.

The cold-weather woes are behind it, but PPG now is faced with hot-weather problems. John White, a vice president of the PPG glass division, says one major utility that supplies electric power to the plants recently called to ask what operations the company could close down in the event of power shortages this summer. So now the division, which has disaster plans for storms, fire and war, has had to draw up one for "a call from the electric company," says Mr. White.

That's not all. PPG is expanding its three fiber glass division plants, but it can't get gas to run the expanded plants. Facing the prospect of letting big new facilities sit idle, the company is considering the possibility of installing costly equipment to use liquid propane or fuel oil—but both would be more expensive than gas and the change-over could

delay the start-up of the facilities, officials say.

To top it off, PPG's fiber glass plants in Shelby and Lexington, N.C. just got a letter from Duke Power Co. saying their rates will be rising 18% because the utility, to fight pollution, is buying more-expensive low-sulphur coal to power steam generators.

A DRAIN ON EARNINGS

As the PPG case illustrates, the energy shortages can hit companies in many ways. It all adds up to another drain on profits. In reporting first quarter earnings this year, several companies blamed declines partly on higher fuel costs and on plant shutdowns due to gas shortages. U.S. Steel Corp., Koppers Co. and Republic Steel Corp. were among these companies.

Lukens Steel Co. blamed part of its 40% drop in first quarter earnings on operating troubles caused by fuel shortages. Out of 84 operating days in the first quarter, Lukens' gas supply was cut by as much as 45% on 26 days, forcing outbacks in operations. "We certainly feel very strongly that there's a general energy shortage," says W. E. Mullestein, Lukens' president.

The gas shortage was one reason Armco Steel recently decided to build a steel plant in Texas—where gas from nearby fields is plentiful—rather than in the Midwest, where supplies are tight.

A number of gas suppliers have told industrial customers they're clamping a lid on new business. Usually, that means any customer can expect to receive only as much gas this year as he received in 1969. Some utilities are actually cutting back. Pittsburgh's Peoples Natural Gas Co., a unit of Consolidated Natural Gas, is holding industrial gas deliveries this year to 10% below last year's level.

The gas gap could hurt some communities' efforts to build up local industry, utility executives concede. UGI Corp., a Philadelphia-based gas distributor serving eastern Pennsylvania, figures that it needs to exercise "selectivity" in taking on new business "will discourage industries from moving into the area," comments W. C. McElroy, vice president for operations.

While shortages of gas, fuel oil and coal are primarily affecting industry, consumers will feel the effects of the electric power pinch.

The strain on electric capacity could become severe this summer. "If we have a hot summer, people will really be astounded at the amount of outages that will occur," predicts Robert M. Taylor partner of R. W. Beck & Associates, a consulting firm for utilities. "Utilities are hoping for a cold summer."

In many places, utilities' reserve generating capacity is precariously low. "Generally speaking, electric utilities are all sort of treading on the edge of a precipice," claims one industry analyst.

The Federal Office of Emergency Preparedness, which normally worries about such things as nuclear holocaust and natural disasters, now is worrying about power failures. A recent OEP study identified numerous areas of the country where reserve electric capacity is dangerously slim. These areas include New York City, Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis-St. Paul, the Pennsylvania-Maryland-New Jersey area and all of the Southeast except Florida.

(Some utilities say their reserve position is stronger than the OEP figures indicate, but the utilities generally are counting new or unproved generating capacity that the OEP contends can't be relied upon.)

Some customers in these areas can't be sure their air-conditioners will keep humming through summer's heat waves. If power-demand begins to strain capacity of New York's Consolidated Edison, for example, Con Ed plans to ask customers to turn off

air-conditioners when nobody's home, to keep lights off during the day and even to stop opening and closing the freezer door so often—all to curb the power drain.

"LOAD SHEDDING"

Other strain-easing steps at Con Edison will include reducing voltage, which could cause light bulbs and motors to function inefficiently, and asking large industries to cut back their power use.

If such steps fail, the utility will turn to what industry men call "load shedding"—which simply means your power gets cut off temporarily if you're in the area that's "shed." According to a plan adopted by the Public Service Commission of New York State, the blacking out would be done at substations, indicating large areas would be affected. Asked to give an example, Joseph Swidler, PSC chairman, replies: "Well, for instance, we might black out Westchester County"—a suburban area of about 900,000 residents.

Analysts say the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland power area is in worse shape than New York. Elaborate power pools designed to enable, say, Con Ed to buy excess electricity from as far west as Illinois will provide some relief this summer. But with capacity tight in nearly all Eastern states, a heat wave hitting several cities simultaneously would nullify these power-exchange arrangements.

The answer to the energy gap may be simple economics—making energy cost enough to encourage conservation in its use and greater investment in energy facilities. Presidential adviser Freeman suggests that a rate structure that increases according to volume used would help curb indiscriminate use of electric power, such as the practice of letting air-conditioners hum around the clock when they're not really needed.

"If energy began to cost more, people would think of better insulation, building houses to utilize the heat of the sun" and other steps to conserve energy, Mr. Freeman says.

Whether or not anything as drastic as a "regressive" rate structure materializes, it's clear energy costs will rise sharply as energy suppliers absorb higher costs and expand facilities to overcome shortages. Utilities have greatly increased the pace and amount of rate boosts over the past year or so, and many more increases are probable. Environmental considerations will boost fuel costs, too, as more users are pressured into switching to higher-cost, cleaner-burning fuels. Coal companies unable to keep up with demand and hit by higher costs due to new safety rules are making price boosts that industry sources figure may total 30% or more by year's end.

THE REDIRECTION OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, these are trying times for the American people and the country is presently divided over the President's redirection of the war in Vietnam.

As I have indicated many times on this floor already, I strongly support the President in his recent decisions on the war and I have also cited the great percentage of letters and telegrams supporting Mr. Nixon that I have received in my office.

During frequent contacts with my fellow South Carolinians, I am impressed

by the staunch support given to the President by the majority of the people there. They cannot be characterized as "middle Americans" because the sample that I am discussing is an "all-American" sample. The group constitutes the rich and the poor, the highly educated and the poorly educated, and Democrats as well as Republicans.

A reflection of that South Carolina support is very well described in an editorial in the May 2, 1970, edition of the State newspaper entitled, "Nixon's Rubicon: The End of a War—And a Beginning." The editorial praises the President's courageous action and commends him for accepting the direct responsibility for the war's outcome.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NIXON'S RUBICON: THE END OF A WAR—AND A BEGINNING

Richard Nixon has crossed the Rubicon just as certainly as did Julius Caesar. For, like Caesar's enemies, Nixon's left him little choice. To have drawn back in fright from the Cambodian border would have meant the probable collapse of the Lon Nol government, now battling for survival against tremendous odds.

This is not the justification given, to be sure. The President, in his television address to the nation, described a swift surgical operation of limited military objectives. We would destroy the North Vietnamese sanctuaries and then get out.

Perhaps. But if this is the excuse, why did the decision come when it did? These sanctuaries, the secure outposts from which the Communists plan and sometimes execute their assaults against South Vietnam, are nothing new. They have been there all along, frustrating every American attempt to make lasting headway in the pacification effort.

Mr. Nixon now has decided to take them out, and part of the reason surely has to do with the danger they pose to South Vietnam. As long as the enemy hid across the Cambodian border, ready to pounce, the contemplated withdrawal of all American troops entailed greater risks than Mr. Nixon may have been prepared to accept. This is not new either. What is new is the ouster of Red-leaning Prince Sihanouk and the sudden realization, in Washington and Hanoi, that Cambodia is up for grabs.

Seen in the narrow perspective of South Vietnam alone, the President's decision is not as spectacular as the President, by word and emphasis, clearly suggested. The Cambodian invasion—Mr. Nixon shied away from the description, but an invasion is what he ordered—is no momentary hot pursuit, limited in objectives and soon to be forgotten. This is no longer the war in Vietnam. It suddenly has become officially what reality made it long ago: the war in Indochina. This new war, the President went to some lengths to explain, belongs to him.

That may easily go down as the most significant statement the President made last Thursday night. Heretofore, Mr. Nixon has been content to find a graceful exit from the mess his predecessors left behind in Southeast Asia. Unable to undo the compounded errors of the past, he would simply get us out. It was not much, perhaps, but Lyndon Johnson had kept so many options open for so long that getting out seemed one of the few opportunities left.

Cambodia changed all that. A President

who had steeled himself to retreat from Vietnam was unable to accept the surrender of Cambodia as well. With Cambodia gone, what chance had Vietnam and Laos to survive? And how long could Thailand, thus surrounded, hope to last? With Cambodia about to be overrun, the whole equation changed, and it all added up to defeat.

So has Lyndon Johnson's war ended and Richard Nixon's war begun. And so, too, dawns new hope. The President seemed content to put any kind of finish to Mr. Johnson's bunglesome adventure. Now that the war is his, the President plainly aims to see it through to a satisfactory end.

He deserves the nation's unequivocal support.

PENNSYLVANIA—THE CIGAR STATE

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the cigar industry is a major business in Pennsylvania. Over 51 percent of all cigars manufactured in the United States in 1968 were manufactured in 51 cigar plants in Pennsylvania. Over 48 percent of all cigar leaf grown in the United States in 1968 was grown in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is the leading State in the Union in both cigar tobacco growing and cigar manufacturing.

In the colony of New Sweden as Pennsylvania was known in colonial times, a vigorous effort was made to encourage the cultivation of cigar tobacco. Farmers in all parts of Colonial Pennsylvania grew cigar tobacco for home consumption. Cigar tobacco was frequently used to pay debts, there being little or no currency.

In 1828, several Lancaster County farmers growing cigar tobacco and rolling it into cigars for their own use began to dispose of any surplus at local stores and taverns for 1 cent each. These foot-long cigars became a favorite of the drivers of the Lancaster-made Conestoga wagons; thus the name "stogies" was originated.

Cigar tobacco culture in Pennsylvania was given impetus by the Civil War. In 1863, it was stated: "the extraordinary high price of tobacco consequent on the rebellion has drawn the attention of Pennsylvania farmers to this crop." At that time, it became an important branch of farming in the counties of Lancaster, Chester, Berks, Lebanon, York, and Cumberland.

Most cigars were handmade until after 1890. Today almost all cigars are machine made. Over 51 percent of all cigars manufactured in the United States are manufactured in 51 Pennsylvania cigar plants located around the State in such towns and cities as Philadelphia, Red Lion, York, Windsor, Scranton, and many others.

There are over 250 tobacco distributors in the State of Pennsylvania and tens of thousands of tobacco retailers. Many of the basic suppliers to the cigar industry, including machinery and labels, are located in Pennsylvania. The cigar industry in Pennsylvania includes cigar

tobacco growers, cigar tobacco dealers and processors, cigar manufacturers, cigar distributors, and cigar retailers and are jointly one of Pennsylvania's leading industries, proud of their product, their State and their heritage.

Raymond P. Shafer, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is distributing, this day, a sample selection of cigars, all manufactured in Pennsylvania, to each Member of the U.S. Congress with the following message:

To the Members of the United States Congress:

These cigars, all made in Pennsylvania, come to you with the compliments of the proud State of Pennsylvania and its cigar industry leading the Nation in the growth of cigar tobaccos and the manufacturing of fine cigars.

Included in the gift cigar package, prepared by the Pennsylvania Cigar Council, are the following brands all manufactured in Pennsylvania:

Parodi Cigar, Parodi Cigar Company; Tip-arillo, General Cigar Company; Tipalet, Consolidated Cigar Corporation; Phillies Tips, Bayuk Cigars Incorporated; LaCorona, American Cigar; and Archers, House of Windsor.

Pennsylvania, the Cigar State, is proud of its cigar industry and the fine cigars manufactured in Pennsylvania.

RECOGNITION OF JAMES K. BRABOY

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State, the morning newspaper of Columbia, S.C., has written a heartening editorial commending the selection of James K. Braboy by *Look* magazine as one of the top five teachers in the Nation.

Mr. Braboy is a Lumbee Indian and a native of South Carolina from the Dillon area. From humble beginnings, this talented teacher has fought his own 42-year war on poverty. He is thoroughly devoted to the children who have been in his charge.

I wish to add my own note of commendation to Mr. Braboy for a career of dedication and well-spent labor. I am delighted to see that he is getting well-deserved national recognition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Deserved Recognition," published in the State of May 28, 1970, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

DESERVED RECOGNITION

South Carolina's "teacher of the year," James K. Braboy, the Lumbee Indian from near Dillon placed in the top five in *Look* magazine's national teacher of the year competition.

He was among four teachers on the "Honor Roll" just under the winner, a physics instructor from Walla Walla, Wash. *Look* said that "any on the Honor Roll would merit the national title."

Speaking of Mr. Braboy, the magazine further said that he "rates a doctorate in dedication for his 42-year war on ignorance and poverty in the Carolinas."

It was a wonderful showing by a humble man who has overcome uncounted adversities to educate his people. The contest brought his inspiring story to national attention. All of us who have heard it are a little better for it.

NIXON-CONGRESS COMPROMISE?

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, many are concerned over the legality and constitutionality issues involved in Cambodia and Vietnam. I think the following article is useful in considering that question:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 23, 1970]

POLITICAL SETTLEMENT WOULD AVOID LEGAL SHOWDOWN: NIXON-CONGRESS COMPROMISE?

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—There is surely a political crisis over Cambodia. Whether there is a constitutional crisis—that is in doubt.

The President acted arbitrarily in the judgment of a significant number of Americans. He ordered the invasion of Cambodia with a minimum of consultation, either with Congress or his own officials. He personally assumed the risk of so doing, and frankly told the country so.

His opponents say this violated the spirit of the Constitution, which was written to end the rule of kings. That is a political judgment.

The spirit of the Constitution is a matter of history—the Federalist papers, the debates, when the Constitution was formed and adopted, and the weight of subsequent practice. Congress and the people can interpret the spirit of all this as they wish.

But legally—that is another matter.

The President can command his troops to march or stand still. Congress can declare war and raise money for the armies—or it can refuse. So says the Constitution.

The President moved into Cambodia without asking for a declaration of war. The Constitution offers no specific objection.

Congress, if it wants to, could cut off his funds and force him to order the troops out. Or it could impeach him. The Constitution offers no objection.

This is as clear as an unclear matter—the constitutional relationship between Congress and the Executive—can be.

In the field of foreign policy, of war and peace, the Constitution throws most questions into the political rather than the legal arena. That is the primary function of the nation's basic document: to set limits to the power of the three top institutions of government and thereby to drive conflicts into the arena of political adjustment.

In general, the President acts, and Congress responds. The adjustment between the two depends partly on presidential leadership and partly on the judgment of Congress and the country on the merits of the issue.

So a compromise is emerging between President Nixon and the opposition leaders in the Senate.

The President's immediate position remains intact as long as he withdraws from Cambodia—unless something changes the basic situation. The issue is whether Congress will attempt to bind his actions as Commander in Chief in the future, or force him to consult more widely. The outlook is for the latter, not the former.

It would be very surprising—after the furor over the neatly timed and hastily steam-rolled Tonkin Gulf resolution, which President Johnson took as authorization for bombing North Vietnam and for generally escalating the Vietnam war, and after the similar furor over the narrow range of President Nixon's consultation in the case of Cambodia—if Mr. Nixon or any other president failed to consult more widely another time.

The political costs are too high, and the political risks too dangerous.

These costs and risks, now are being strongly impressed on Mr. Nixon and on the country at large by the debate over the various resolutions to ensure a larger role for the Senate in the future.

If this is the way it works out, the nature of the crisis is much more political than it is constitutional.

That is the general sense of the situation in Washington, in both legal and political circles. It is borne out by the fact of compromise and the avoiding of a clearcut legal showdown by both the Senate and the Executive.

COMPLICATING FACTOR

There is a complicating factor in the present situation which the general public poorly understands and which has been very little discussed.

At the present moment in history declarations of war are rarely being used, and there are specific cases in which they are generally considered undesirable. This increases the President's room for maneuver, as his supporters would say, or his arbitrary action in the view of his critics.

For the main congressional brake on the President, in matters of foreign policy, is fixed by the Constitution precisely on the declaration of war. If the President does not ask for a declaration, there is nothing which compels him to do so, and Congress has to resort to less-definite means of putting limits on the President.

HOW ISSUE IS FUZZED

The American military actions in Korea, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia have been regarded by successive administrations as police actions rather than war. The goal has been to force an aggressor to withdraw from another country and remain behind his own borders—not to invade and defeat him, overthrow his government, occupy his country, and impose a settlement dictated by the victor, which are the normal aims of war.

The last thing that would have been desired by the Senate liberals, who opposed general war in Indo-China and tried to block the escalations of Presidents Johnson and Nixon, was a commitment by Congress to invade North Vietnam and destroy the power of its government.

It might have led to nuclear war.

So the constitutional issue is fuzzed today by the peculiar nature of an era of "limited war" where a formal declaration of hostilities is undesirable and presidents do not ask for it.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 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 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

TRUST IN ECONOMIC SYSTEM UNSHAKEN

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there have been many statements in the press in recent days about the state of the economy. I would like to bring to the attention of the House one of those statements, by the noted columnist, David Lawrence. In the Evening Star, which published his column on May 27, the headline reads, "Trust in Economic System Unshaken." Mr. Lawrence was speaking for many of us when he wrote that column, and I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

TRUST IN ECONOMIC SYSTEM UNSHAKEN

(By David Lawrence)

Talk of "recession" or "depression" continues throughout the country, and gloom persists among those who watch the stock market decline. But fundamentally the pessimism is due mostly to a feeling of uncertainty as to what the future has in store.

While there are many factors that cause concern, public confidence in the stability of the economic system and its financial institutions has not been shaken, as happens when there is a real depression. The cost of living is still high, and inflation is painful. Wages and inflation is painful. Wages have gone up and so have prices. The unemployment rate, however, is not as large as it was even on many occasions in the 1960's when the words "recession" or "depression" were rarely mentioned.

The Democrats—for political purposes, of course—are emphasizing the economic downturn of the moment and doing everything they can to put the responsibility on the Republicans.

But some of the administration supporters are beginning to reply. Rep. Robert Michel, R-Ill., commenting on attacks by Democratic leaders, points out that, while there is a 4.8 percent unemployment today, there was a 6.7 percent rate of unemployment in 1961, 5.5 percent in 1962, 5.7 percent in 1963 and 5.2 percent in 1964—all under Democratic administrations.

The current unemployment is by no means as serious as the unemployment of the 1930s, and hence what is going on today can hardly be called a "depression."

The most important thing to be borne in mind is that the cure for a bad economic situation had not been prepared by the government in the 1930s when unemployment rose to record heights. Today the administration can send into the national economy a flow of funds at any time to stimulate business expansion and decrease unemployment.

There is no doubt that the President is well aware of the gloomy comments being made about the economic situation and that he wants to see business conditions change for the better. He is anxious, on the other hand, not to allow inflation to take a sudden upturn. If wages and prices continue to rise, the inflationary ill effects will be multiplied.

The power of the federal government to pump money into the economy and to fix interest rates and even allocate new projects in certain areas can produce a complete psychological readjustment across the country with respect to the whole economic outlook. Such a development might come during the summer months, and some persons in the government are predicting that the economy will show definite improvement beginning in September.

Meanwhile, President Nixon is being urged

to call conferences with leaders of business and labor in order to keep prices and wages from being raised. While he undoubtedly would like to exert an influence in that direction, he recognizes how difficult it is to do so in any economy as complex as one containing so many big industries in America today.

Unquestionably the Vietnam war is directly related to the economic situation. If there is a curtailment of expenditures for the war in Southeast Asia, the general assumption is that much of the money will be promptly be spent at home and that the national economy will be strengthened by a distribution of many billions of dollars in domestic projects.

While American military operations in Vietnam are slowly being diminished, it is not likely that the full effects on the economy will be felt for at least a year. But even the expectation of huge sums of money from the U.S. Treasury for domestic purposes may create an optimism with respect to American business enterprises and build up confidence in their future.

The present era is undoubtedly a painful one. Aside from the political partisans who see an election coming and wish to blame the incumbent administration for everything that has happened, however, there is an encouraging attitude among the impartial economists that the battle against inflation and the problems that have been created can be successfully handled without a serious recession.

LET US GET THE FACTS STRAIGHT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. WYMAN, Mr. Speaker, basic to any objective considerations of the true significance of the war in Indochina is the fact that war was taken there by the Communists, not by the United States. It is the Communists who are the aggressors, who attack South Vietnam, who infiltrate the Vietcong, who are the aggressors in Cambodia and Laos. It is the Communists from North Vietnam with help in supplies and money from the Soviet Union, who are responsible for the war in Southeast Asia, for its continuation, and for many—although not all—of the horrors perpetrated upon the peoples of Vietnam who must endure this conflict.

War in Indochina—or war in the Middle East for that matter—is succored, nurtured, aided, and abetted by communism. It is the Communists who are supplying Nasser of Egypt with planes, tanks, guns, and now pilots. It is Red China who waged war in Korea and who now stealthily encourages various incidents that at the appropriate time in the Communist timetable may be permitted to erupt into a so-called peoples revolt but which is really just another front between the forces of communism and freedom.

Whether a particular segment of the world's surface area is or is not as vital as another is legitimately arguable. Whether it is strategically or tactically advisable to commit troops to fight far away in a hostile environment and with a 10,000-mile supply line is obviously questionable. But let it not be said that what is going on in Vietnam is a civil

war and that we should let brother take it out on brother there. The aggressor in Vietnam is communism by design and deliberate attack. Those supplies and weapons do not just appear there. They had to be ordered, to be planned for, to be received, to be requested, long in advance.

Neither, as the following editorial points out, is victory President Nixon's objective in Vietnam. Our President is honoring the commitment made by this Nation to South Vietnam under a predecessor President. He can do no less. He is acting as the Examiner states, "with courage and statesmanship" and he deserves the support of the American people.

The editorial follows:

THE COURAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

(By Charles L. Gould)

President Nixon did not take the fighting to Cambodia.

The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese did.

In both world wars hundreds of thousands of American troops fought across Europe. They were not concerned with invisible national boundaries. They were concerned with meeting the enemy and destroying him.

In 1917 and again in 1941 our nation made open declarations of war. War-time rules were imposed at home. Dissent was stifled. Battle goals were established. And power at our command was used to achieve them.

Had we fought Hitler as we have fought Hanoi, our troops would still be mired down in the battlefields of Europe. Or—we would be saluting the swastika.

For six long years our men have fought in Vietnam under a weird, one-sided code of Marquis of Queensbury rules.

Our men were not permitted to fight to achieve victory. Our fighting men and their allies were not permitted to pursue the enemy into North Vietnam. They were not permitted to pursue the enemy into Laos and Cambodia.

Thus the enemy was given the right of initiative. He could pick the time and place and method of his attacks. He could strike and run.

Our men could lose but they could not win.

The danger of the fighting escalating into a worldwide conflagration was our alibi for not defining the enemy's defeat as our goal.

The danger that the war would erupt on a global scale was present the moment we committed our first fighting man to the conflict.

The same danger is implicit in each of the pacts we have with fifteen nations of Europe and with numerous other nations in Asia and the Middle East.

These pacts were established to protect weak friends and allies from the repeatedly declared aggressive aims of the Communists.

All should recognize that the danger of a third world war is ever-present. This danger was born the moment following World War II that the Communists again restated their goals of global domination.

If World War III comes it will come when the Communists believe the time is right.

They may believe the time is right if our country is so hopelessly divided that we—as a people—fall to support our President in supporting our fighting men as he did last night.

Let it be clear that President Nixon has not established victory as a goal in Vietnam. Months ago he mapped plans for honorably extricating our troops from the conflict and turning the defense of South Vietnam over to the forces of that nation. He has not changed those goals.

However, if the Viet Cong and the North

Vietnamese were permitted to expand and perpetuate their sanctuary in Cambodia. President Nixon saw grave danger that his carefully planned timetable of de-escalation would be destroyed.

He saw a stepped-up threat to the safety of our fighting men. He saw the danger of expanded war through failure to act.

He acted with courage and statesmanship. He merits our support.

FOURTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I am seeking the views of my constituents on a number of important issues of the day. This is being accomplished by sending to postal patrons a questionnaire, the content of which I include in the RECORD at this point:

I WOULD LIKE YOUR VIEWS—FOURTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Since I cannot talk with many of you personally, this type of survey has proved the next best way to obtain opinions.

Your views have been of great assistance to me in considering the complex problems of the times. Again I am asking for your help in telling me your thinking about difficult legislative issues and matters of national and worldwide concern.

Your ideas are very important to me. They help greatly in the decisionmaking process. Though the final decision is solely mine, your thinking is always taken into consideration as I cast my "yea" or "nay" vote.

Thank you for your help!

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT.

1. Do you approve the President's military decision to send U.S. troops into Cambodia?
Yes —
No —
2. Do you favor:
(a) Immediate withdrawal from Vietnam?
Yes —
No —
(b) The President's withdrawal plan through Vietnamization?
Yes —
No —
(c) A decisive U.S. military victory?
Yes —
No —
3. Should college deferments be phased out to provide a larger pool of draft eligibles?
Yes —
No —
4. Do you favor replacing the present draft lottery system with an all-volunteer military service if manpower requirements permit?
Yes —
No —
5. Do you favor continued negotiations with the Soviet Union to limit development of nuclear weapons?
Yes —
No —
6. Do you favor a federal study on U.S. population growth and possible methods of control?
Yes —
No —
7. Should the present welfare system be replaced by a federally-financed minimum family income and work training plan as provided in the Family Assistance Act of 1970?
Yes —
No —
8. Should the Post Office Department be reorganized as an independent agency of

government, removed from all direct political control by Congress and the White House?

Yes —

No —

9. Do you believe present economic conditions warrant wage, price, credit, and rent controls?

Yes —

No —

10. Should a percentage of federal income tax money be shared with state and local governments, to be used on programs which they designate?

Yes —

No —

A FED-UP PROF STRIKES BACK

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are very much disturbed and distressed over what has been taking place on our college campuses throughout the country. And not without good reason.

All recognize the right of dissent. But the right to dissent does not include the right to destroy. Nor does it include the right to interfere with the rights of others. Freedom is not license. Freedom is ordered liberty under law. Otherwise we have no freedom at all for anyone. We would have anarchy.

Many factors account for what has been taking place on our college campuses. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting an article by Prof. K. Ross Toole, of the University of Montana, which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, May 31. I believe that the point of view he expressed is shared by the vast majority of the American people.

The article follows:

A FED-UP PROF STRIKES BACK

(By K. Ross Toole)

I am 49 years old. It took me many years and considerable anguish to get where I am—which isn't much of any place except exurbia. I was nurtured in depression, lost four years to war, am invested with sweat, have had one coronary, am a "liberal," a square and a professor. I am sick of the "young generation," hippies, Yuppies, militants and nonsense.

I am a professor of history at the University of Montana and I am supposed to have "liaison" with the young. Worse still, I am father of seven children. They range in age from 7 to 23.

I am tired of being blamed, maimed and contrite; I am tired of tolerance and the reaching out (which is always my function) for understanding. I am sick of the total irrationality of the campus "rebel," whose bearded visage, dirty hair, body odor and "tactics" are childish but brutal, naive but dangerous and the essence of arrogant tyranny, the tyranny of spoiled brats.

I am terribly disturbed that I may be incubating more of the same. Our household is permissive, our approach to discipline is an apology and a retreat from standards, usually accompanied by gift in cash or kind.

It is time to call a halt; time to live in an adult world where we belong and time to put these people in their places. We owe the "younger generation" what all "older generations" have owed younger generations—love, protection to a point and respect

when they deserve it. We do not owe them our souls, our privacy, our whole lives, and above all, we do not owe them immunity from our mistakes, or their own.

Every generation makes mistakes, always has and always will. We have made our share. But my generation has made America the most affluent country on earth; it has tackled, headon, a racial problem which no nation in the history of mankind had dared to do. It has publicly declared war on poverty and it has gone to the moon; it has desegregated schools and abolished polio; it has presided over the beginning of what is probably the greatest social and economic revolution in man's history.

It has begun these things, not finished them. It has declared itself and committed itself, and taxed itself and damn near run itself into the ground in the cause of social justice and reform.

Its mistakes are fewer than my father's generation—or his father's, or his. Its greatest mistake is not Vietnam: it is the abdication of its first responsibility, its pusillanimous capitulation to its youth and its sick preoccupation with the problems of the young.

WHO'S IN CHARGE HERE?

Since when have children ruled this country? By virtue of what right, by what accomplishment should thousands of teen-agers, wet behind the ears and utterly without the benefit of having lived long enough to have either judgment or wisdom, become the sages of our time?

The psychologists, the educators and preachers say the young are rebelling against our archaic mores and morals, our materialistic approaches to life, our failures in diplomacy, our terrible ineptitude in racial matters, our narrowness as parents, our blindness to the root ills of society. Balderdash!

Society hangs together by the stitching of many threads. No 18-year-old is simply the product of his 18 years; he is the product of 3,000 years of the development of mankind—and throughout those years, injustice has existed and been fought; rules have grown outmoded and been changed; doom has hung over men and been avoided; unjust wars have occurred; pain has been the cost of progress—and man has persevered.

As a professor and the father of seven, I have watched this new generation and concluded that most of them are fine. A minority are not—and the trouble is that this minority threatens to tyrannize the majority and take over. I dislike that minority; I am aghast that the majority "takes" it and allows itself to be used. And I address myself to both the minority and the majority. I speak partly as a historian, partly as a father and partly as one fed-up, middle-aged and angry member of the so-called "establishment," which, by the way, is nothing but a euphemism for "society."

Common courtesy and a regard for the opinions of others is not merely a decoration on the pie crust of society; it is the heart of the pie. Too many "youngsters" are egocentric boors. They will not listen, they will only shout down.

Arrogance is obnoxious; it is also destructive. Society has classically ostracized arrogance without the backing of demonstrable accomplishment. Why, then, do we tolerate arrogant slob who occupy our homes, our administration buildings, our streets and parks, urinating on our beliefs and defiling our premises? It is not the police we need; it is an expression of our disgust and disdain. Yet we do more than permit; we dignify it with introspective flagellation! Somehow it is our fault. Balderdash again!

Sensitivity is not the property of the young, nor was it invented in 1950. The young of any generation have felt the same impulse to grow, to reach out, to touch stars, to live

freely and to let the minds loose along unexplored corridors. Young men and young women have always stood on the same hill and felt the same vague sense of restraint that separated them from the ultimate experience—the sudden and complete expansion of the mind, the final fulfillment. It is one of the oldest, sweetest and most bitter experiences of mankind.

Today's young people did not invent it; they do not own it. And what they seek to attain, all mankind has sought to attain throughout the ages. Shall we, therefore, approve the presumed attainment of it through heroin, speed, LSD and other drugs? And shall we, permissively, let them poison themselves simply because, as in most other respects, we feel vaguely guilty because we brought them into this world?

Again, it is not police raids and tougher laws that we need, it is merely strength—the strength to explain, in our potty, middle-aged way, that what they seek, we sought; that it is somewhere, but not here and sure as hell not in drugs; that, in the meanwhile, they will cease and desist the poison game. And this we must explain early and hard—and then police it ourselves.

"WE ARE NOT BLIND"

Society, "The Establishment," is not a foreign thing we seek to impose on the young. We know it is far from perfect. We did not make it; we have only sought to change it. The fact that we have only been minimally successful is the story of all generations—as it will be the story of the generation coming up.

Yet we have worked a number of wonders. We have changed it. We are deeply concerned about our failures; we have not solved the racial problem but we have faced it; we are terribly worried about the degradation of our environment, about injustices, inequities, the military-industrial complex and bureaucracy. But we have attacked these things.

We have, all our lives, taken arms against our sea of troubles—and fought effectively. But we also have fought with a rational knowledge of the strength of our adversary and, above all, knowing that the war is one of attrition in which the "unconditional surrender" of forces of evil is not about to occur. We win, if we win at all, slowly and painfully. That is the kind of war society has always fought—because man is what he is.

Knowing this, why do we listen subserviently to the violent tacticians of the new generation? Either they have total victory by Wednesday next or burn down our carefully built barricades in adolescent pique; either they win now or flee off to a commune and quit; either they solve all problems this week or join a wrecking crew of paranoids.

Youth has always been characterized by impatient idealism. If it were not, there would be no change. But impatient idealism does not extend to guns, fire bombs, riots, vicious arrogance and instant gratification. That is not idealism; it is childish tyranny. The worst of it is that we (professors and faculties in particular), in a paroxysm of self-abnegation and apology, go along, abdicate, apologize as if we had personally created the ills of the world—and thus lend ourselves to chaos. We are the led, not the leaders. And we are fools.

As a professor, I meet the activists and revolutionaries every day. They are inexcusably ignorant. If you want to make a revolution, do you not study the ways to do it? Of course not? Che Guevara becomes their hero. He failed; he died in the jungles of Bolivia with an army of six. His every move was a miscalculation and a mistake. Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh led revolutions based on a peasantry and an overwhelmingly ancient rural economy. And yet they are the pattern makers for the SDS and the

student militants in our modern, technological society.

I have yet to talk to an "activist" who has read Crane Brinton's "The Anatomy of Revolution," or who is familiar with the works of Jefferson, Washington, Paine, Adams or even Marx or Engels. And I have yet to talk to a student militant who has read about racism elsewhere or who understands, even primitively, the long and wondrous struggle of the NAACP and the genius of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., whose name they invariably take in vain.

An old and scarred member of the wars of organized labor in the United States in the 1930s recently remarked to me: "These 'radicals' couldn't organize well enough to produce a sensible platform, let alone revolt their way out of a paper bag." But they can, because we let them destroy our universities, make our parks untenable, make a shambles of our streets and insult our flag.

I assert that we are in trouble with this younger generation not because we have failed our country, not because of affluence or stupidity, not because we are antidiluvian, not because we are middle-class materialists—but simply because we have failed to keep that generation in place and we have failed to put them back there when they got out of it. We have the power; we do not have the will. We have the right, we have not exercised it.

REAPPRAISAL NEEDED

To the extent that we now rely on the police, Mace, the National Guard, tear gas, steel fences and a wringing of hands, we will fail.

What we need is a reappraisal of our own middle-class selves: our worth and our hard-won progress. We need to use disdain, not Mace; we need to assess a weapon we came by the hard way, by travail and labor, firm authority as parents, teachers, businessmen, workers and politicians.

The best place to start is at home. But the most practical and effective place right now is our campuses. This does not mean a flood of angry edicts, a sudden clampdown, a "new" policy. It simply means that faculties should stop playing chicken, that demonstrators should be met not with police but with expulsions. The power to expel (strangely unused) has been the legitimate recourse of universities since 1209.

A university cannot function without rules for conduct. It cannot, as society cannot, legislate morals. It is dealing with young men and women, 18 to 22. But it can and must promulgate rules. It cannot function without order—and therefore, who disrupts order must leave. It cannot permit students to determine when, what and where they shall be taught; it cannot permit the occupation of its premises, in violations both of the law and its regulation, by "militants."

There is room within the university complex for basic student participation but there is no room for slob, disruption and violence. The first obligation of the administration is to lay down the rules early, clearly and positively and to attach to this statement the penalty for violation. It is profoundly simple—and the failure to state it, in advance, is the salient failure of university administrators in this age.

This is neither new nor revolutionary. Expulsion is merely the reassertion of an old, accepted and necessary right of the administration of any institution. The failure of university administrators to use it is one of the mysteries of our permissive age—and the blame must fall largely on faculties because they have consistently pressured administrators not to act.

Suppose the students refuse to recognize expulsions; suppose they march, riot, strike? The police? No. The matter by prearrangement, publicly stated, should then pass to

the courts. If buildings are occupied, the court enjoins the participating students. It has the lawful power to declare them in contempt. If violence ensues, it is in violation of the court's order.

Too simple? Not at all. Merely an old process which we seem to have forgotten. It is too direct for those who seek to employ Freudian analysis, too positive for "academic senates" who long for philosophical debate and too prosaic for those who seek orgasmic self-condemnation.

This is a country full of decent, worried people like myself. It is also a country full of people fed up with nonsense. We need, those of us over 30, tax-ridden, harried, confused, weary and beat-up, to reassert our hard-won prerogatives. It is our country, too. We have fought for it, bled for it, dreamed for it and we love it. It is time to reclaim it.

IDA PHILLIPS CASE

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, a sensitive article written by Molly Sinclair of the Miami Herald on the case of Ida Phillips shows you with great exactness the discrimination in employment practices against women. It should show you also the cost of this discrimination to both families and taxpayers and, finally, it demonstrates completely the incredible stupidity of the Federal judiciary. I remind you again that this is at least the second instance in which the Federal judiciary has refused to enforce the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ban on sex discrimination. Their excuses are flimsy, ill-considered, and unbelievable. I would like to say also the women with real courage in this country in seeking employment rights have been southern women.

The article of May 24, 1970, follows: IDA PHILLIPS HAS A CASE—JUDGE CARSWELL SAID NO. WILL SUPREME COURT SAY YES?

(By Molly Sinclair)

JACKSONVILLE.—Ida Phillips doesn't look like much of a fighter.

She's small and a bit stooped and she sags around the middle from eight pregnancies. She's also reserved and a little shy.

But underneath, Ida Phillips is tough. Tough from the corn and cotton fields of South Carolina where her sharecropper parents and their kids had to scratch out a living.

Tough from trying to feed her own children, after their father left, on the tips she earned as a waitress.

And tough from fighting a space and defense contractor all the way from its Orlando plant to the U.S. Supreme Court when management refused to consider her job application because she had a preschool child.

"They thought I'd give up," she says. "But I never did. Anything I've ever set my mind to, I stuck with. I just don't give up easy."

Maybe, she adds with a rare show of humor, "because I'm Capricorn." That's the zodiac sign astrologers associate with courage and earthiness and inflexibility of purpose.

The Supreme Court agreed in March to hear the case brought by Mrs. Phillips against the Martin-Marietta Corp. When the justices rule, after arguments next fall or winter, it will be the first time the nation's highest court takes a stand on a sex

discrimination suit filed under Title 7 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The case went up on appeal after the Fifth Circuit Court, by a 2-1 vote, decided against Mrs. Phillips and a request for a rehearing before all 13 circuit judges was denied. Among those voting not to hear it in full court was G. Harrold Carswell, who has since been labeled a "sexist," been refused a seat on the Supreme Court, resigned as a circuit judge and announced as a candidate for the U.S. Senate.

"Old Carswell has got to feel bad about this," says Mrs. Phillips, who intends to vote against him just as he voted against her.

With a flat country twang and disarming candor, the 36-year-old mother says the whole thing started on a cool September evening four years ago in Orlando, where the family was living at the time.

NEWSPAPER AD TOLD OF JOBS

"I'd seen this ad in the Orlando paper for 100 assembly-trainees at Martin-Marietta that said to apply between 6 and 8:30 p.m.," she says.

She went to the plant with Tom Phillips, the 46-year-old mechanic she married a few months earlier that year. He was her second husband. Her first one left in 1964, after 14 years and seven children, and she supported them with her waitress earnings and \$80 a month welfare aid for two years, until she and Phillips married.

"Tom is the stepfather," she explains. "Yeah, a bad stepfather," he adds with a wink.

Phillips waited in the car that night while she went inside to apply.

"There were lots of people, and I had to wait in line a long time. Somebody there said they really wanted 200 trainees but had announced openings for only 100 because they didn't want so many people coming out to apply.

"I COULD SEE ME WORKING THERE"

"I filled out the application and gave it to the receptionist. She looked at it and put it to one side and told me she was sorry but women with preschool kids weren't going to be hired. So I thanked her and went back out to the car."

Phillips, a big, handsome man with crew-cut sand-colored hair and tanned skin, interrupted his wife.

"I told the Mother they couldn't do that. I said it was a violation of the sex law.

"I said to stop on the way home and we'd get some good stationery—cause with seven kids we didn't have anything decent at home to write on—and we'd write somebody about this.

"She was drivin', and I wasn't paying attention because she's a good driver.

"But all of a sudden we noticed the signs were backwards. She said, 'I believe I'm going the wrong way.' And she was. We were going the wrong way on the main expressway. Thank the Lord nobody was coming at us. She made a U-turn right quick and we got off that road.

"But that's how upset she was about the thing."

He paused, and Mrs. Phillips picked up the conversation.

"I never was so letdown over anything in my life like that job turndown. I could just see me working there and being able to do things for my kids. I knew the pay was good, maybe \$4,000 a year more than I was making at my waitress job, and it would mean regular hours and employe benefits. I could see how well people who worked at the plant were doing."

"LAW FOR ALL OR JUST A GROUP"

When they got home that night, they wrote two letters. One to President Johnson, a copy to Martin-Marietta.

"We said in the letter," Phillips remembers, "what happened at the plant and we

said "Is the law passed for all the people in this nation or just for a group?"

Martin-Marietta never replied, but four days later there was an answer from the President's office saying that the Equal Employment Opportunity office would get in touch with Mrs. Phillips, and two days later there was a form from EEO to fill out and return.

By the time federal investigators concluded sufficient grounds existed for a lawsuit against the plant, two years had passed and the Phillipses had moved to Jacksonville where he had lived once before and where mechanics' wages were better.

Now, with Peggy, 19, the oldest child married, there are only six kids at home, and three of them work. Ronnie, 17, puts in eight hours a day as a cook from 3:30 to 11:30 p.m., after school. Brother Al, 15, is a dishwasher at the same restaurant, Vera, 16, and her mother wait tables at a nearby Ranch House.

ALL BUT THREE CHILDREN WORK

"The kids wanted to work" Mrs. Phillips says. "The oldest boy got a summer job as a dishwasher as soon as he was old enough."

That fall she went with him to buy school clothes. "He picked them out, and while I was there waiting, I thought how this was the first time he'd ever had anything he really wanted. Always before, I'd had to buy only the cheapest clothes and nothing they ever wanted."

When the younger children saw "what Ronnie had done for himself by getting a job, they all wanted to work, too."

And now, with all but three in the family working, "We're doing pretty good."

Much better, she adds, than a few years ago after her first husband left and the family financial condition was so bleak.

She remembers a minister suggesting to her then that she "farm the kids out in foster homes."

"It made me cry just to think of that. I told him I wasn't going to break up my family, that if we were going to starve, we'd starve together."

The federal government, which joined with Mrs. Phillips in the case, has said Martin-Marietta's refusal to hire her "is contrary to the federal policy of encouraging unemployed women with preschool aged children to seek gainful employment as an alternative to welfare payments."

Mrs. Phillips agrees.

"I didn't like being on welfare. I never would have taken it if I could have gotten work that paid enough. I've applied for other jobs besides waiting tables, but nobody much wanted to hire me."

Not, she said, because she had preschool children, but because she had so many children. "They figure you won't show up for work half the time."

It isn't usually stated, she says, but employers feel a mother should be at home with her children. "But what mother wants to stay at home when her kids are hungry and need clothes? No, you want to work and get the things your kids need."

When she married Tom, she stopped accepting welfare, "With me and Mother working and making enough to get by, it wouldn't be justice to take it," he says.

At present she works six and sometimes seven days a week, from 6:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. "I haven't missed a day in I don't know when," she says. "And when I get home, I go like crazy cleaning and doing things around here."

"Here" for Mrs. Phillips is a modest white brick house on Redberry Lane in the Arlington Hills section of Jacksonville, a few blocks from Jacksonville University on the east side of the St. Johns River.

It is a neat, well-kept home with a big shade tree in the backyard. The gold-upholstered furniture in the living room and the

table and chairs in the dining room look brand new, though they are three years old. "You're only about the third person to ever sit on that couch," Mrs. Phillips explains. "People say we're crazy, but we don't use these rooms."

The furniture was bought a piece at a time. "We can't pay cash for anything big and we don't charge. We paid it out \$10 a week."

One of eight children, Mrs. Phillips was born and reared on a farm near Lynchburg, S.C. The "next to the baby" in the family, she worked in the fields after school like the others.

"I didn't finish school," she says. "I dropped out after the 10th grade and got married."

She didn't plan to have a big family, she says. "The first baby died. After that, the kids just came. I didn't know how to control it. You know how old-fashioned people were then. You didn't talk about that sort of thing."

After awhile she and her first husband and children moved to Maryland and then to Orlando. The youngest child, Gracie, was two and the only one not in school when Mrs. Phillips applied at Martin-Marietta. Kenneth, now a fifth grader, was 6 and Bryan, now a seventh grader, was 9.

Next to winning this case, Mrs. Phillips has two goals in life. One is to finish her ironing, and the other is to go to South Carolina this Christmas for a family reunion.

"My parents will be married 50 years if they live till Dec. 26," she says.

"I was kind of a disappointment to my mother, dropping out of school and all. She's kind of big society, belonging to the home demonstration club and the civic league and that sort of thing."

"She had dreams of me being somebody . . . maybe a home demonstration agent or something like that."

LAND REFORM IN VIETNAM

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a recent news dispatch from Saigon which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of May 22. This article, written by the distinguished journalist, Mr. John N. Reddin, details in clear and logical terms the necessity for moving forward as quickly as possible with an effective land reform program in South Vietnam.

Mr. Reddin's story also demonstrates the need for congressional consideration of House Resolution 17117, a bill which I have cosponsored with 10 other colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

House Resolution 17117, is designed to speed up a meaningful land reform program in Vietnam. I would encourage cutting the present timetable from 4 to 2 years. Most importantly perhaps, this legislation would hasten the "Vietnamization" of the war and the withdrawal of American forces, thereby saving precious lives and billions of dollars in war costs.

Mr. Reddin's article follows:

LAND REFORM NEEDED IN VIETNAM, BUT FAST
(By John N Reddin)

SAIGON, Vietnam—One reason the Vietcong managed for so long to control large areas of the South Vietnamese countryside was

that the peasants living there had little reason to defend their homes.

"They did not own the land they worked. They paid huge proportions of the rice and other crops they raised to landlords for rent. The Vietcong promised them land."

President Nguyen Van Thieu is embarking on a new land reform program that would turn two million acres of riceland over to the farmers who now operate as tenants. The program was started late in March in the rich Mekong delta—and Thieu called it the "happiest day of my life."

REFORM WAS SLOW

Americans who have watched one failure after another in land reform since the mid-1950s are simultaneously hopeful and doubtful. They welcome President Thieu's enthusiasm, but one of them said: "The president has good intentions right now, but the question is whether he will still have them four or six months from now."

Before the French were driven from Vietnam in 1954, most of the farmland was owned by Frenchmen or rich Vietnamese. Most farmers were tenants and paid 45% to 55% of all crops to landlords.

Decrees in 1955 attempted to limit rents to 25% of crops, but that level never was reached. Landlords continued to milk their tenants. Another decree in 1956 limited riceland holdings to 250 acres an acreage over that was expropriated.

In 1958 the government took over all French riceland, 1.7 million acres, and started to redistribute it. But the concern of the government over its own political survival plus bad administration and a deterioration of security against Vietcong raids and influence brought the program almost to a standstill. In the 1962-1967 period only 6,000 acres were turned over to tenants.

GOVERNMENT WILL BUY

Cao Van Than, minister of land reform and agriculture, started pushing early in 1969 for a new land reform program. He was encouraged by the United States aid mission, which pledged an original \$10 million to get the program started and said it would seek another \$30 million for the project. At the same time, the Americans began to aid in aerial photography of farm areas to make redistribution easier.

Under the program just started, it is hoped to redistribute 3.2 million acres to about a million farmers, with families totaling six million people. The government will buy the land, paying cash for 20% of the cost and giving bonds for the remaining 80%. The price is set at 2½ times the value of the annual crop.

One American official told me:

"Landlords won't get much out of it, but they don't seem to be griping. Many of them have long since put their money into urban projects. Few have much faith in the future—they figure that if the war is won they'll lose the land anyway, and if it is lost they will get nothing for it from the Communists. So they are willing to accept 80% payment in bonds that are not negotiable and that have no payment date, and consider it good riddance. They do not even seem to complain about the 10% interest the bonds will pay—even if it is less than the rate of inflation."

COSTS \$400 MILLION

The total project will cost about \$400 million. Some Americans feel that it would be a good deal even if the United States paid the whole bill.

"Give a man some land of his own and he will be more prone to defend it and less prone to listen to Communist propaganda," is the way one American puts it. "That \$400 million is a drop in the bucket compared to what our military operations cost us—it would keep the military going only about

a week. If land reform can increase security, it is a military as well as a political gain."

"HAS TO WORK NOW"

Americans worry about the capacity of the government, and its long term commitment, to move land reform fast enough. Some point out that it took three years before any of the land listed for transfer was distributed after 1957, and four years to distribute former French holdings.

"We don't have that much time now," an official warns. "If the program is going to do any good, it has to work right now."

Coupled with the land reform program is a training program that got well underway last year. By the end of 1969 some 63,000 village officials went through programs designed to teach them how to get their people to work for economics, social and political improvement.

For some time such programs have included building roads, digging wells, putting up bridges and providing schools and dispensaries. But the fact is that many such projects are too big for villages to handle, and district and provincial officials have to get into the act.

The trend now is to get villagers to work on minor projects—such as building cement floors for piggeries, fish ponds, chicken coops and such projects.

OVERCOMING THE CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Samuel DePalma, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, recently addressed the biennial convention of the United Nations Association of the United States.

His speech, "Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence," was most illuminating and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

OVERCOMING THE CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

I welcome this opportunity to speak to this eminent gathering of the United Nations Association of the USA because I have long wanted to thank you for the support and encouragement you have given us throughout the years. I hope you will not think me ungrateful, however, if I hasten to call on you for further assistance. Your help is needed in overcoming the crisis of confidence from which the United Nations is now suffering.

There is no need to belabor the point. We all know there is a crisis of confidence, but it may help to illuminate the areas where some remedial action can be taken if we look at the way the UN is viewed by the public, the Congress and this Administration.

I. THE PUBLIC

There is ample evidence that public support for the United Nations has been declining. Nevertheless, judging by the polls and other indications, a majority of Americans is still very favorably disposed and sees the Organization, with all its faults, as the best hope for mankind. However, it also believes that the UN has not achieved its central purpose—the maintenance of international peace and security. Certain groups of our people who are particularly interested in the outcome of specific conflict situations have grown rather bitter about the UN's fail-

ure to deal effectively, or even fairly, with those situations.

The general public is vaguely aware of the "good works" performed by the UN system in economic, social, and technical areas, but—with a few exceptions, such as UNICEF—it is very inadequately informed about the actual work being done, and particularly how it benefits the United States. Much of the continuing and constructive work of the UN system is obscured from the view of the general public by the smoke-screen of oratory and confrontation which emanates from UN meetings. The public's attention is caught by the loud disagreements voiced in UN debates and seldom focuses on the work programs which continue, almost despite the oratory.

Among our youth, interest in the UN is spotty, although I have the impression that there is much enthusiasm and idealism which could be enlisted if only young people were persuaded that the UN had a vital role to play in world affairs.

The academic community these days includes relatively few specialists who find the UN worthy of concentrated attention, though happily they are among its most effective supporters.

II. THE CONGRESS

The Congress shares the view that the United Nations has not carried out its primary mission to keep the peace or to restore breaches of the peace. The Congress, as a whole, tends to pay little attention to the economic, social and technical activities of the UN system, though many members of Congress continue to give it strong support and to prod the Executive Branch to pay more attention to it.

Congressional Committees have become increasingly critical of the steady and substantial rise in the costs of the United Nations system. The assessed budgets of the United Nations and its family of specialized agencies have risen from \$130.3 million in 1960 to \$371.5 million in 1969. During the same period the total of voluntary contributions to the UN system for economic development and relief activities grew from \$109.7 million to \$441.7 million.

Above all, Congress is concerned that the United States has so little influence on the size of budgets and the shape of UN programs, and that, as a result, the Congress cannot demand the kind of accountability for the uses made of our contributions to UN programs which it does for other forms of US expenditures. Having read only sketchy summaries of the Jackson Capacity Study, the Pearson Report, and similar studies, the Congress has come to feel that rising UN costs are at least partly the result of mismanagement, duplication and a lack of priorities.

You who have the time or inclination to follow UN affairs closely know that there are sound answers to many of these criticisms and concerns. However, I believe that some of the concerns felt by our public and the Congress must be taken seriously.

The UN is no longer an infant organization. Nor is the UN system particularly small in size. The United Nations system has, in fact, become a rather big business. It is a sizable conglomerate, employing in all a staff of about 30,000 throughout the world, plus some 15,000 local employees in relief and development activities. But it is a conglomerate which lacks a central board of directors. Its affiliated agencies are responsible, in the first instance, to separate constituencies of medical, agricultural, educational, scientific and other interest groups and specialists. The member governments, which pay the bills, are often unable to impose a unifying discipline on their own specialists who represent them in the governing bodies of the various agencies. They tend, as a result, to shift the

blame to the international agencies for the lack of coordination, the failure to set priorities and the rising costs which many of them regard as excessive.

The answer, surely, is not to seek to impose any one government's order of priorities or budget ceilings on these agencies, but to insist that the UN system should organize itself so as to provide more information to member governments, more central direction and a common order of program priorities. Failing this, there is bound to be greater resistance to rising costs and a further decline in the support.

Perhaps what is needed now is an increased sense of accountability to member governments on the part of the administrations of the UN specialized agencies and programs. Not that they are not already fully subject to the decisions of their member governments, decisions which, as I said, too often reflect inadequate coordination in terms of national priorities. But this difficulty is compounded if the international administrations do not make available to the governments the information they need as a basis for reaching sound judgments on program priorities and costs.

It is no longer permissible to expect national delegations to act on the basis of late and sometimes totally inadequate documentation. Governments should not be expected to approve illustrative programs which may or may not turn out to be the activities on which funds are actually expended. Nor can they be expected to accept on faith the value of on-going programs which are either not evaluated for actual results or, if evaluated, the results are not reported to governments. It is not enough to argue that the sums expended by international organizations are small in comparison with national budgets or as measured against needs. What matters is how effectively available funds are utilized—and since the funds are clearly inadequate, it matters even more.

I want at the same time to commend the initiative and drive displayed by most UN agency and program administrations. This is one of the most heartening and promising signs on the UN scene, particularly in the face of the disillusionment felt in other quarters. But they must also see to it that member governments are given the information needed to evaluate their performance and to share their enthusiasm.

They must also begin to see their roles more as members of the UN system and less as independent entities. Ways must be found to overcome the disadvantages of what we now see as an excessive degree of decentralization in the system. The UN Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly must assert their responsibility to assess overall priorities throughout the UN system.

I have felt it appropriate to mention these facts of life here because I know I will not be misunderstood by an audience dedicated to supporting the UN. I hope you agree with me that constructive criticism is needed from its supporters if any organization is to grow and maintain its vitality.

There is another point to be made about the feeling of disillusionment felt today about the UN. Much of it reflects confusion about the essential purpose of the United Nations. Let's recall what it is all about: It was established to promote the building of a world order which can promote peace, justice and progress. Philosophers have thought in these terms throughout the ages, but only in this century have nations actually engaged in practical cooperation to implement this vision. This is a venture even more bold, complex and difficult than, say, the conquest of outer space.

Yet, whereas we understand the need for a systems-wide approach in the application of new technologies to the conquest of outer space, we often appear to be seeking short-

cuts in the task of creating a world order. The fault lies not in the Charter, which established a solid framework for this venture, but in our expectations, which were distorted by the anguish of the Second World War and succeeding conflicts. Somehow we came to believe that if only we had the proper machinery, we could assure peace. So we began creating machinery to enforce the rule of law throughout the world before we had created the conditions necessary for the acceptance of that law.

There is no cause for disillusion if we remember what we are about. The need for the effective functioning of the UN as a peacekeeper is urgent. Our successive military involvements abroad are proof of the desperate need for an effective multilateral system of peacekeeping and for the accepted procedures for the pacific settlement and adjudication of disputes. Moreover, new tasks for international cooperation are emerging, of which the most readily understood is the need to deal with threats to our environment—a multilateral task if ever there was one.

But we must think more realistically about the future. What do we want the United Nations to be doing five, ten, twenty-five years from now? What are the obstacles? How can we remove them, or get around them? What actions can the United States take, by itself, to strengthen the Organization?

III. THE ADMINISTRATION

Let me say a word about the attitude of the Administration of President Nixon. President Nixon and Secretary of State Rogers have, at every appropriate opportunity, reaffirmed their belief in, and support for, the United Nations. In September 1969, the President made a major policy address at the General Assembly and suggested some specific tasks for the United Nations, including action to discourage hijacking of airplanes, to encourage international voluntary service, to foster the related objectives of economic development and population control, to protect the environment, and to share the benefits of the exploration of outer space.

To this list he added, in his February 19, 1970 Foreign Policy Report to Congress, the need to develop international law in regard to the breadth of the territorial sea and the boundary between the continental shelf and the deep seabeds, and the need for international agreement on a regime for exploitation of the deep seabed resources.

Secretary Rogers, in his speech on April 25 to the American Society of International Law, called in particular for increased reliance on the International Court of Justice—one of the six "principal organs" of the United Nations—and made a number of suggestions to increase the influence and effectiveness of the Court.

Under Secretary Richardson, in his address on April 29 to the Convocation on the Challenge of Building Peace, stressed the need for utilizing fully procedures for maintaining the peace which are available both through regional organizations and the United Nations. He called for prompt action to break the impasse on UN peacekeeping procedures, stressing that agreement should be reached on procedures that are politically responsive, efficient in administration and adaptable to rapidly evolving events. He also called for efforts to revitalize Articles 14, 33 and 36 of the United Nations Charter relating to methods of adjustment of international disputes. He drew attention to the possibilities for constructive action open to the Secretary General under Article 99 and to the desirability of making the Security Council a greater center for world consultations by holding periodic meetings at the foreign ministers level.

We have given solid evidence of our support for the United Nations and the UN

system by ratifying the Privileges and Immunities Convention, seeking an appropriation of \$20 million as our contribution to the expansion of United Nations Headquarters, requesting sizable increases in our contributions to the United Nations Development Program, and by submitting the Genocide Convention for the advice and consent of the Senate.

The President has today just announced that he is proposing that all nations adopt, as soon as possible, a treaty under which they would renounce all national claims over the natural resources of the seabed beyond the point where the high seas reach a depth of 200 meters and would agree to regard these resources as the common heritage of mankind. The President further proposed that the Treaty should establish an international regime of the exploitation of seabed resources beyond this limit and that this regime should include the collection of substantial mineral royalties to be used for international community purposes, particularly economic assistance to developing countries. The regime should also establish general rules to prevent unreasonable interference with other uses of the ocean, to protect the ocean from pollution, to assure the integrity of investments and to provide for peaceful and compulsory settlement of disputes. Coastal nations would act as trustees for the international community in an international trusteeship zone, comprising the continental margins seaward of 200 meters depth off their coasts and agreed international machinery would authorize and regulate exploration and use of seabed resources beyond the margins.

The United States will introduce specific proposals to these ends at the August meeting of the UN Seabeds Committee. Pending agreement on a treaty, the President has indicated we would be prepared to join an appropriate number of other states in an interim policy under which all permits for exploitation of the seabeds beyond 200 meters deep would be issued subject to the international regime to be agreed. During the interim period a substantial portion of the revenue derived by a state from exploitation beyond 200 meters should be turned over to an appropriate international development agency for assistance to developing countries.

In his talk last Wednesday Ambassador Yost outlined to you the areas in which we are conducting intensive studies and exploring the possibility of early initiatives. I can assure you that we in the Government are not paralyzed by the crisis of confidence in the UN. We are determined to do something about it.

We are taking our cue from a directive which President Nixon had issued on January 8 of this year. It stressed that the President believes it should be the special aim of his administration to make our participation in international organization affairs as effective as possible. In calling upon the Secretary of State to supervise and coordinate all activities of the executive agencies relating to our participation in these organizations, the directive stated:

"In this connection, he anticipates that you will keep under constant review how our worldwide responsibilities can best be served through such participation, identifying priority areas for the investment of our resources and efforts in international programs, formulating the United States position on programs and budgets, conducting a continuing evaluation of each major organization's program performance, and recommending measures designed to improve their effectiveness."

I am sure you will agree that this is a timely and appropriate directive. We need to take our bearings with care as we approach the next quarter century of the

United Nations so that we do not again lose sight of the need to create the necessary infrastructure for the world order we seek. It can only be achieved through patient, persistent effort. The time has come to stop chasing the mirage of instant peace and to apply ourselves more effectively to the concrete tasks we now see plainly before us.

From my observations, the crisis of confidence in the United Nations can be overcome:

If the United Nations adopts the needed internal reforms;

If it takes other steps to adjust its procedures and programs to the political, social and technical realities of today; and

If the Congress and the public are convinced that the United Nations is doing things that need to be done and that benefit the United States as well as other nations.

Convincing the public and the Congress that the United Nations is successfully carrying on needed activities is a task particularly suited to the UNA. The UNA and its member organizations and affiliates are, insofar as United Nations affairs are concerned, the most knowledgeable NGO's in the country. As such, you have an extraordinary opportunity—may I say responsibility—to let our citizens know what the United Nations actually does in its many fields of action, and to show how these UN activities are of benefit to the United States and to the world.

In my opinion, the work of the UN Specialized Agencies has not been adequately explained in terms of United States interests. We know that the World Health Organization is carrying on a vast anti-smallpox campaign, but who bothers to explain how it relates to the absence of smallpox here? How many people know that the WHO is responsible for those yellow health cards we carry abroad which testify to the standardization of inoculations achieved by that organization?

It might be useful for our citizens to learn a little bit more about the history of the international agencies. They should, for example, know that it was Abraham Lincoln's Postmaster General, Montgomery Blair, who called the first international conference to straighten out what was then an international postal mess. Out of this grew the Universal Postal Union and the convenience we all enjoy today of mailing a letter and being reasonably sure that it will be delivered abroad no matter what its destination. They should know that when they tune in the local radio station they are spared interference from other stations thanks to the allocation of frequencies accomplished by the ITU.

How many of our citizens understand that there exist international standards governing the operation of planes and ships, that there exist agreed signals for take-offs and landings on international air routes, that we have rules of the road to govern traffic at sea and that international organizations established these safety regulations? Only yesterday President Nixon submitted to the Senate two treaties drafted last year by the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, another UN body. These treaties are designed to guard against pollution of the seas.

I hope that the UNA will continue to give us your views, your suggestions and proposals for both United States and United Nations policies. I hope you will continue to keep the public informed about the work of the entire UN system. Only through such concerted efforts can we assure that the United Nations remains relevant to the present needs of the world community, that it is seen to be relevant and actively engaged in meeting those needs and that, as a result, it receives the full support it requires from the United States and other members.

QUESTIONS ON VIETNAM: VI. EXAGGERATED FEARS OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF A PULLOUT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, many people argue about the reasons for the United States to stay in Vietnam. Two of the arguments used by those who favor the continued presence of the United States in Vietnam are the "bloodbath" idea and containing the spread of communism. These two points are answered by the Concerned Asian Scholars at Cornell University, as follows:

If we pull out won't there be a bloodbath?

There already is a bloodbath in progress in Vietnam. It must be remembered that the present fighting in Vietnam results in a civilian total of over 100,000 casualties per year (see U.S. Senate Sub-Committee to Investigate Problems Connected with Refugees and Escapees), and that Vietnamese military combat deaths (both sides included) have totalled more than 700,000 since 1965.

No one can guarantee, of course, what will happen when the U.S. leaves Vietnam, and because of U.S. complicity in the prolongation of the war in Vietnam, the U.S. bears heavy responsibility for any killings which may occur as a result of the intense hatreds which have developed within Vietnam over the past 15 years. Asylum, as provided in the Hatfield/McGovern amendment, could and should be offered to those Vietnamese so compromised by their association with the U.S. that their lives are endangered. (Since the U.S. has provided asylum to some 500,000 refugees from Castro's Cuba, it should not find it difficult to receive 50,000 to 60,000 refugees from Vietnam.)

Further, looking at the question in historical perspective, there is reason to doubt the likelihood of a bloodbath. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 (following 9 years of warfare between France and Ho Chi Minh's Vietminh) prohibited political reprisals, and provided for the International Control Commission machinery to supervise this provision. The ICC received ten times as many reports of reprisals in the South as in the North. The Diem government itself admitted in 1960 that it had arrested more than 48,000 political prisoners.

Killings (an estimated 10-15,000) did occur in the North in 1956 in connection with a land reform program, but were not undertaken as political reprisals for collaboration with the French as has sometimes been alleged. Ho Chi Minh removed the responsible officials and took over direction of the program himself, and the killings ceased.

The other example sometimes cited by proponents of the bloodbath theory is the so-called Hue massacre. During the 1968 Tet offensive Hue was held by Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops for three weeks, and was recaptured by U.S. marines in severe fighting. At the time it was estimated by U.S. officials that 3600 civilians had been killed in the fighting. Of these, South Vietnamese officials at the scene estimated that 200-300 had been deliberately executed; General Westmoreland estimated 1000. Many of those executed were members of the police and secret police, not innocent civilians as the Administration now claims. Most of the executions in Hue were committed in a heat of battle situation, and are not indicative of what is to be expected following an armistice. The only precedent for this is the above mentioned experience following the 1954 Geneva Agreements.

Aren't we helping to prevent the spread

of communism through our action in Southeast Asia?

(1) The strongest barrier to the spread of communism is nationalism. Official U.S. policy in Asia has been to build up strong nationalist governments; however, the means used have undermined the objective. The U.S. has given massive and unconditional aid and support to anti-communist governments in Vietnam, Thailand and Laos. As these governments have become increasingly dependent on U.S. aid they have come to rely on U.S. support rather than the backing of their own people. They have thus become increasingly insulated from and responsive to the demands of their citizens. U.S. aid has not only weakened what democratic impulses these governments may have had, but has directly contributed to exceedingly high levels of corruption. Even the facade of democracy has disappeared as military regimes have come to power throughout the area. This is a situation in which popular unrest has traditionally occurred and which now provides ready-made followers for communist leaders. Despite the fact that many of the most patriotic Vietnamese were forbidden to run in the carefully controlled elections of 1967, the U.S. backed government in South Vietnam received only 35% of the vote; nearly half of Laos is under the control of the pro-communist Pathet Lao; and Thailand faces growing rebellions in the Northeast, North and South.

U.S. fear of neutralist governments as an easy prey for communist movements led it to engineer the overthrow of the Souvanna Phouma government in Laos in 1958—leading to a civil war in that country, as a consequence of which the communist Pathet Lao gained in strength and can today threaten at will to capture the capital city. In Cambodia, Prince Sihanouk was able to maintain an independent nationalist government against communist pressures by following a neutralist policy in international affairs and by refusing aid from or close ties with the U.S. His overthrow in March 1970 by the Lon Nol-Sirik Matak coup and the U.S.-South Vietnamese intervention in Cambodia have not only ended the possibility of a neutralist government there, but have widened the Vietnam war to encompass yet another country.

(2) The U.S. attempt to cope with the threat of communism in Southeast Asia through military means and by backing the extreme right-wing rather than the broadly-based, generally neutralist middle, has eliminated the possibility of moderate elements determining the destiny of their country. In Vietnam only the communists and the South Vietnamese military have access to arms; as long as the struggle is waged on the battlefield there is no role for the "third force"—the moderates, nationalists, Buddhists and others—who want an end to the war and the establishment of a truly nationalist government. In a military struggle the communists may well win; in a political struggle they are less likely to do so.

(3) The war in Vietnam has caused widespread destruction of the country and the creation of conditions of chaos and devastation in which communism has always found its greatest opportunity to pose as the only force able to meet the real needs and desires of the people. The ending of the fighting, and the use for purposes of reconstruction of even a fraction of the amount now being spent on the war, would permit the development of conditions of peace, reduced poverty and greater stability in which communism would have less appeal.

(4) A united Vietnam would be the strongest barrier to the extension of Chinese power in Southeast Asia. Although North Vietnam shares the Marxist-Leninist ideology with China, China and Vietnam are traditional enemies. It is significant that three of the four battles commemorated in the national museum in Hanoi are battles against

the Chinese (the fourth is Dien Bien Phu—against the French). Were Vietnam to be reunified, even under the leadership of the communists in the north and the south, the country would more closely resemble Yugoslavia's nationalist—and strongly independent—government, rather than the puppet regime of East Germany.

DIRECT AIR SERVICE BETWEEN PORTLAND-SEATTLE AND TOKYO

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter and a copy of a petition supporting briefs by Pan American and Braniff for direct air service between Portland-Seattle and Tokyo. These applications are presently before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The petition for expeditious action was submitted by the city of Portland, Portland Chamber of Commerce, Portland Freight Traffic Association, and the Port of Portland. The State of Oregon also is a party through the public utility commissioner and the transportation department.

Mr. Speaker, the document makes some cogent arguments in favor of the pending applications that would provide Portland with its first direct service to the Orient. Let me relate just a few of them.

In the first place, Portland is a metropolitan area of close to 1 million population. Yet the city has no single plane service to the Orient. Portland is a major gateway to the Far East. Portland and the State of Oregon have long had a strong community of interest with Japan. As a major port, Portland is a major distributing center of Japanese manufacturers.

The discrimination in direct airline service is hurting the economy of the area. Seattle has two daily nonstops to Tokyo, Minneapolis has two direct daily flights and Cleveland and Washington have once daily direct service.

Northwest Airlines provides connecting service in the westbound direction only—one connection in Anchorage with a 3-hour layover and an afternoon connection with a 2-hour layover in Seattle. Not only must Portland-Orient traffic change planes, it must experience substantial delays in connections, thus making the elapsed time longer than its competitive gateways.

That this inconvenient service inhibits traffic can be demonstrated when you compare the greatly increased Orient traffic at other large cities with single plane service.

In 1965, Portland generated much more Tokyo traffic than either Cleveland or Minneapolis—at that time without a direct airline link. There were 672 boardings from Portland, 396 from Cleveland, and 444 from Minneapolis. Yet by 1968 Cleveland's traffic increased 454 percent and Minneapolis' 353 percent with the direct plane service. Portland jumped 189 percent, but fell below the two cities in the number of boardings.

There is a wealth of other supporting

data supporting Portland's application for direct service. The evidence is on file with the CAB, and I am confident there will be a ruling favorable to the city for improved air service to the Orient.

COURT EXECUTIVES IN CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the increasing dissatisfaction with the operation of our courts, due in large measure to undue delays in the administration of justice, has brought about a recognition of the growing need to provide our courts with persons trained and experienced in modern management techniques. Although the Federal circuit and district courts processed a total of 115,000 cases in fiscal year 1969 and expended \$106 million in a system employing more than 7,000 people, there is no provision for management personnel except on the national level through the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

Mr. Speaker, I introduce legislation today to provide for the creation of the position of court executive for each of the eleven circuits. The concept of the court executive has been endorsed by the Judicial Conference of the United States and by the American Bar Association. In a report of the American Bar Foundation—"Accommodating the Workload of the U.S. Court of Appeals"—it was stated that the administrative facilities of the courts of appeals should be greatly strengthened. The court should have an administrative officer responsible to the circuit council having authority and responsibility for the administration of the court's business.

In an address before the American Bar Association, the Chief Justice voiced his strong concern about procedural delays in the administration of justice and said that principal underlying causes of these delays was "a lack of up-to-date procedures and standards for administration or management, and the lack of trained managers" for the courts.

The bill that I introduce today would assure that the proposed circuit executives will be persons who have the requisite managerial expertise. The bill provides for the establishment of a five-member Board of Certification which would establish the qualifications for certification as well as certify applicants. The circuit council would appoint the circuit executive from the list of certified applicants. Properly utilized, the circuit executive will relieve the chief judge of the circuit of most of his administrative burdens, conserving the judge's time for the exercise of the judicial function.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, designed to modernize our court operations, should prove to be effective in expediting the business of the courts for the benefit of the public.

DRUGS AND YOUTH

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the question of drugs and drug abuse and how to deal with it is one for which we have yet to find an adequate solution. Various experts have advanced theories ranging from increasing the severity of sentences to making drugs readily and legally available; but the problem remains unsolved. The growth of the market for illicit drugs is astounding, and most of this demand is in the United States. Certainly we can all sympathize with the adult addict who must barter his soul and very often his freedom to be able to buy his "daily fix." However, all parents and concerned people must be shocked and dismayed by the recent evidence of an increasing number of youths who are drug users. Without speculating on the likelihood of progression from the so-called soft drugs to the hard drugs, we can all unite in our revulsion against the drug pusher standing near the schoolyard dispensing drugs to our children. Without meaning to cast my lot with the alarmists, I do believe that drug abuse is quickly becoming a problem of national significance and should be a matter of national concern.

It is for the purpose of bringing the full scope of this problem to the attention of my colleagues that I offer the following article which appeared in the Cornell Alumni News which vividly points out the extent of this problem among our youth:

A NEW ATTITUDE ON DRUGS

(By Allan J. Mayer)

"They see you moving about and they come up acting real hip and ask, 'You straight?' And I say 'Yeah' and then get on to dealing. They're big on pills and marijuana, but they'll buy heroin just to show you they're hip."

There are now 25,000 drug addicts in New York City under the age of 19. They are shivering in Harlem alley-ways and they are wiping their runny noses on Mom's decorator-design Scott towels in Forest Hills. Some of them have been shooting up since they were in the sixth grade. Two hundred twenty-four of them died last year, most from overdosing, a few from shooting roach powder into their veins. Twenty of them were under fifteen, one of them, a cute but shy kid named Walter Vandermeer, was 12. By this summer, says Dr. Julianne Densen-Gerber, the director of Odyssey House, there will be more than 100,000 young addicts dying their slow and miserable death in New York City.

We have been talking quite nonchalantly about drugs (or dope, or stuff, or whatever it is they're calling it these days) for a number of years now. We make jokes about it on television, we make films about it in Hollywood, and we marvel at its apparent wide-spread acceptance. But for those wags who turned the old political promise inside out and had it come out reading "Pot in every chicken," the chicken is once again coming to roost. As a teacher at Charles Evans Hughes High School (known in New York as "The Market") bitterly observed, "now that heroin is getting out of the ghettos, everybody is beginning to see it as a problem."

Smoking grass may not lead directly to shooting smack, as many argue, and you

could probably name dozens of people you know who turn on but who wouldn't go near "hard stuff." Yet, sadly, the argument doesn't ring true when you go home to Queens, as I did a summer or two ago, and see the 13-year-olds giving out Seconals and Amyl Nitrate capsules like they were candy, and the 14-year-olds shooting up in the handball courts at Russel Sage Junior High School at 4 in the afternoon. Sage is not a ghetto school and the kids weren't poor. And that was all a year ago.

Young kids are always imitative of their older brothers and sisters. What the college kids are doing they want to do—and then some. When I was a freshman two years ago, high school kids who turned on were still somewhat of a novelty. But the social anthropologists tell us that the difference between generations these days is less than three years, and it seems to be true. Anyone going back to visit the old playground now to see what the neighborhood kids are into who doesn't feel out of it is only fooling himself.

Rego Park, a neighborhood in Queens right next to the one where I grew up, is now known as "Sales City." I remember, when I was 15 or so and shooting pool at a "billiard emporium" called the Cue Club, that there was some dealing going on there. It was mostly grass and when I was 16 a big stink was made of it when they installed two-way mirrors in the bathrooms to discourage dealers. All it accomplished was that the dealers moved upstairs to Queens Boulevard. Now you can go down the block and buy anything you want and the frightening thing for me is that most of the pushers are guys I used to play ball with in junior high. What's more frightening is the desperate look on everybody's face. No one smiles there, except when they're nodding. When I went back after my freshman year most of the dealing was in pills and acid, but now, after two years, heroin has moved in—and moved in solidly.

Petty thefts are up in Forest Hills and Rego Park, the sign that there are junkies frequenting the area—but you don't have to consult the police blotter to know that a lot of kids are on smack. Everybody laughed when a pharmacist opened a store called Drug City. "Hell," one 15-year-old said, "I guess the pushers are moving inside again."

It's not really funny, not when the so-called "good kids" who are messing up their lives with junk are kids that you know, kids you've gone to school with, kids whom you see when you come home on vacation and who say to you, glassy-eyed and shivering, "Hey man, what's happening?" It's not funny because the things you're into are a million miles away from anything they're interested in; and it's not funny when you ask them the question back and they give you a vague smile and say, "Nothin' much. I got burned last week but there's some good stuff around now."

Whose fault is it, you ask? Well, to begin with that's the wrong question but if you want an answer it's that it's our fault, it's the fault of a society in which pill taking is a way of life ("... for headache take aspirin, for tension take ..."), it's the fault of the self-proclaimed Messiahs who are so busy pushing the good side of their product that they forget about the bad side. Mostly, though, it's our fault because we are the people who made grass hip, who admired the guy who tripped, who made it fashionable to say, "Yeah man, I've tried smack. It's okay."

The people who've dealt with the problem all their lives know it's no joke. The Black Panthers of Corona, a poorer section in Queens, weren't fooling around when they passed out a leaflet listing the names of the neighborhood pushers—the leaflet was headed, "Pushers Wanted for Murder."

But, as frightening as the street evidence is, what's more frightening is that nobody

is quite sure what to do about it. Methadone treatments, allowing physicians to prescribe narcotics for patient-addicts, these are not solutions—they are merely stop-gaps. The solution, ultimately, will have to run deeper, it will have to do something about our attitudes, our smugness, our concern with what's hip.

Perhaps no one has the right to take away our personal pleasures, perhaps the cop who busts you for possession is also depriving you of an inalienable right—but, then, did 12-year-old Walter Vandermeer have the right to die, alone, of an overdose of heroin in a Harlem bathroom?

CALIFORNIA FARMWORKERS EARN TOP INCOME

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that recently appeared in the Bakersfield News Bulletin reporting that California farmworkers earn well over the national average of \$2.24 an hour for farm laborers. Many people have tried to discredit agriculture by saying farmworkers in California earned only \$1.60 an hour. The survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Statistical Reporting Service and reported in this article verifies that California farmers pay the highest wages in the Nation.

Not only does California produce some of the best agricultural crops in the Nation, but our farmers pay the highest wages to their workers.

I include the article entitled "California Farmworkers Earn Top Income," at this point in the RECORD:

CALIFORNIA FARMWORKERS EARN TOP INCOME

The average American hired farm workers paid by piece-rate earned \$2.24 an hour in January, according to Kern County Farm Bureau.

This is indicated in a new quarterly probability farm labor survey issued for the first time this month. The survey, conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Statistical Reporting Service, supplements the Department's regular farm wage rate data, said KCFB manager, Paul Franklin.

He said publication of wage rates for piece-rate workers comes four years after Farm Bureau first requested this service from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman in 1966. In April, 1969, Farm Bureau renewed the request in a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin.

Franklin said the hourly-wage-only method of reporting farm earnings made typical farm wages look lower than they actually were, especially in California where most harvest workers receive piece-work payment.

"Propagandists looking to discredit agriculture have been taking the old average per-hour figures and passing them off as typical farm labor earnings in California," said Franklin. "The \$2.24 average per-hour wage for piece-work is for the nation as a whole. California farmers pay even more, which demolishes the frequent charge that farm workers in this state receive only \$1.60 an hour."

Franklin also pointed out that the hourly average not only includes workers in lower-paying farm states, but also many house-

wives, student and other casual harvest workers whose production is such that they do not earn the \$2.24 hourly average.

"These new figures from USDA substantiate wage information that farmers have been trying to get across to the public," said Franklin. "It can now be seen that reports of earnings of \$4.00 per hour and more by many skilled harvest workers are no exaggeration."

SPOKE—A NEW YOUTH MOVEMENT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1970, a group of Fairfax County high school students announced the formation of a youth movement called SPOKE, by news releases sent to most of the Washington area new media.

As no notice was carried in the papers or on television concerning their group, they have requested that I make public their formation as well as their goals. I feel sure our colleagues will agree that theirs is a peaceful and constructive approach to becoming involved in local and national issues, and I would hope that youngsters elsewhere in our Nation would want to follow their lead in this direction.

As I want to make the goals and activities of SPOKE known to all who read this RECORD, I insert their news release in full at this point in the RECORD:

NEWS RELEASE OF SPOKE

A group of Fairfax County high school students recently started a youth movement called SPOKE. The organization is designed to emphasize to the students their rights and duties as citizens. Their major emphasis will be on the duties of a citizen. The SPOKES do not intend to be anti-anything except that they do wish to oppose the actions of the militants who seek social change through violent and unlawful demonstrations. They are Students who want to accomplish their objectives through Participating in the legal procedures, to show that they are responsible youths by Observance of the laws, to become involved in current issues by obtaining the necessary Knowledge for an intelligent viewpoint and to enlighten all students and their voting parents through Education in the form of assemblies, discussions, etc.

The nucleus of the SPOKE movement has been started with ten student charter members. These charter members are now attempting to establish chapters in their local high schools. With this official recognition the SPOKES will begin the movement to inform the students and their parents of local and national issues. Two current local issues, student representation on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and the moratorium on building permits are examples of the type of expected student involvement.

The SPOKES are working eagerly to become established before the summer vacation in order to also become involved in the political campaigns; they do however intend to neither support nor oppose any of the political campaigns, they do however intend to study the issues involved, and then individually attempt to influence their parents' votes or at least discuss the paramount issues. With active discussions between parents and students, of the issues at stake, perhaps the generation gap may be narrowed.

Voter apathy in local elections has permitted local vested interests to make decisions which have not always been best for the average citizen.

This station supports this SPOKE movement and upon request will provide additional information about organizing your own student group.

SPOKE—STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN OBSERVANCE, KNOWLEDGE, AND EDUCATION: CHARTER

Whereas, we are Students who wish to oppose, without violence, the actions of militants who seek social change through violent and unlawful demonstrations, and

Whereas, we wish to accomplish our objectives through Participating in the legal procedures, and

Whereas, we wish to show that we are responsible youths by Observance of the laws, and

Whereas, we wish to become involved in current issues by obtaining the necessary Knowledge for an intelligent viewpoint, and

Whereas, we wish to enlighten all students and their voting parents through Education in the form of assemblies, discussions, petitions, newspapers, radio, television and small, nonviolent demonstrations in accordance with the law,

Be it therefore known that we resolve to accept our individual and collective responsibilities and duties as citizens and for this purpose to do and perform every lawful act and thing necessary and expedient to be done or performed and which will be convenient and advantageous for the efficient conduct of the activities of SPOKE.

Dated this 4th day of May 1970.

REPRESENTATIVE WHALLEY'S CONSTITUENT HIGHLY HONORED FOR MUSICAL ACHIEVEMENT

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Carlton Chaffee a former resident of Windber, Pa., and of my congressional district, has been notified that an operetta on which she has collaborated has been accepted for publication by Coach House Press. The work, "Mr. Crinkle's Magic Spring" was written especially for elementary children.

Mrs. Chaffee, a professor of music at the University of South Dakota in Vermillion, S. Dak., formerly was associated with teaching elementary music in the public schools of South Dakota and Iowa, as well as Pennsylvania.

She has been active in South Dakota music affairs on the State level and recently was appointed north-central district representative at Music Educators National Conference Committee on Music for Early Childhood.

Mrs. Chaffee is the former Beatrice Shaffer, daughter of Mrs. Elsie Shaffer, 818 Main Street, Scalp Level, Pa., and the late P. W. Shaffer. She graduated from Windber Area High School and Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Her children are: Mrs. Catherine Baird, a teacher at LaSalle, Colo.; Lee, an engineer, Denver; and John, a student at the University of South Dakota.

We congratulate Mrs. Chaffee in this notable achievement.

YOU CAN'T TALK INFLATION TO DEATH; JAWBONING'S A JOKE

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there have been many proposals in recent weeks for Presidential "jawboning" to halt inflation. A constituent has sent me the text of the April 18, 1970, edition of the New Republic, in which Edwin Dale, Jr., the distinguished economics writer for the New York Times, discussed the idea. The headline on the story reads: "You Can't Talk Inflation to Death; Jawboning's a Joke."

Mr. Speaker, this is an informative summary of the problems involved in such a plan and I ask unanimous permission that the article be printed in the RECORD:

YOU CAN'T TALK INFLATION TO DEATH; JAWBONING'S A JOKE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

There is a very widespread belief among persons of good sense and good will that some form of federal government, or Presidential, intervention in the process of private price-setting and wage-setting could make our inflation problem less severe. The issue is not wage and price controls, which are not backed by anyone with experience of the problem, but rather a wide variety of possible techniques aimed at bringing the "public interest" to bear on private decisions.

Two first-rate former chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers, Arthur Okun and Walter Heller, trumpet the idea at every opportunity. Both Republican and Democratic members of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee have just embraced the principle, though their plans are very different. The Republican embrace has aroused particular interest because of apparent past philosophical opposition. This will be an effort to show that by whatever name it is called—"guideposts," jawboning, arm-twisting, exposure to the light of public opinion—government intervention into private price and wage decisions will smell as bad. It won't work, particularly in the prices that count for all of us in our daily lives.

But first, it is only fair to clarify the confusion created by one's opponents. A delightful vagueness surrounds this subject. Economists usually talk with some precision, though their ideas differ. Politicians seem to feel, mainly, just that the government should "do something."

The Democrats on the Joint Economic Committee (those who bothered to sign the report, which was not all) proposed, for example, an elaborate scheme including "quantitative standards for price and income changes" established by the Council of Economic Advisers and then a new Federal Productivity, Price and Incomes Office that would decide "the extent of compliance with the price and incomes standards set by the Council of Economic Advisers."

The Republicans had a different idea. No general "standards," no new federal office; instead, the Administration should "immediately announce the inflationary implications of unusually significant wage and price decisions." The Council of Economic Advisers should "calculate and make public how much each price increase adds to the wholesale or consumer price index, and indicate other prices which would be adversely affected by such an increase." And so on.

Okun has suggested some kind of federal

"umpire" to call "foul balls." Heller has proposed a revived form of the old guideposts, which tried to keep wage increases within the bounds of the growth of productivity, though he now says a cost-of-living factor should be added. The one thing all the plans have in common is the effort to make private persons do something different from what they otherwise would have done.

Let us, as a starter, take up some real-world examples that have a lot more to do with the cost of living than the sort of thing these plans have in mind—say, whether the United States Steel Company raises the price of hot-rolled sheets.

The Mothers of Mercy hospital in Peoria raises its rate for a room from \$40 to \$50 a day. Is the President's Council of Economic Advisers supposed to intervene?

Fred Richards Auto Body Shop raises the charge for fixing a fender in Richmond from \$20 to \$30. Is President Nixon to call Fred Richards to the White House?

The Permanent Trust savings and loan association of Denver raises its mortgage interest rate to 8½ percent from 8 percent. Will Mr. Okun, or Paul McCracken, his current counterpart, fly to Denver?

The Maryland State insurance commissioner authorizes higher fire insurance premiums on homes because there are more fires and the cost of repairs has risen and the companies are losing money. Is the "Federal Productivity, Price and Incomes Office," as proposed by the Joint Economic Committee Democrats, supposed to haul the insurance commissioner before it?

There is a freeze in Florida and the price of orange juice goes up, raising the month's consumer price index by one-tenth of one percent all by itself. Does the Attorney General bring an antitrust suit against the orange growers?

The Washington Senators raise the price of seats to the ball game—also in the index. Does the President announce that he will go to no more ball games?

The New York subway, after years of a phony effort to keep down the fare by avoiding maintenance, finally raises the fare by 50 percent after a union settlement, and an effort at maintenance begins. Does the President tell John Lindsay he is a fink because he has raised the consumer price index for the nation, which he has?

Eternal strikes in Chile and Zambia and a lack of transport in the Congo cause a chronic supply shortage in copper, and eventually the American producers raise their domestic "monopolistic" price to about three-fourths of the world price. Is the President to tell them they are naughty for not raising the price as much as they really should in order to "clear the market?"

Joe's barber shop in Tucson, the best-known in town, raises the price of a haircut from \$2 to \$2.50, and the others follow. The cost of living of the citizens of Tucson, at least the male citizens, rises. Should Mr. McCracken let his hair grow?

We have all been hypnotized by the idea that the price of steel or chemicals or copper or sulphur or paper—and the bargained wage increases won by unions—are the "cause" of inflation, or at least the major cause. Heller and Okun have never fallen into this trap. They have always said that past mistakes in government fiscal (budget) and monetary policy were the real culprit in our inflation. But their continued belief that jawboning in various forms by the federal government can help, now that fiscal and monetary policy are on the right track, contributes to the hypnosis.

Okun, in a careful analysis that has won many converts in Congress, sought to show early this year that the sorts of prices that Presidents might be able to influence, and that President Johnson and his Council of Economic Advisers did influence, rose a good deal more in 1969 than in the preceding three

years. Secretary of Labor Shultz, in an equally careful but almost entirely unnoticed paper presented to the Joint Economic Committee, has sought to show all the special factors involved in the various products that cast doubt on the Okun analysis. This is no place to go into the merits of either case. But the important point is that the most Okun could claim was that, if the Nixon Administration, the government, had used its power of persuasion or pressure or exposure to public opinion or whatever, the wholesale price index last year would have risen only by between one-half and one percentage point less than it did—not the consumer price index. And Okun made no claims at all about wages and unions. Nor did he mention the fact that in some of these supposedly "key" industries, like steel, profits were actually down last year despite the price increases, and the industries might have told the President, in a word, to go to hell.

Let us face it. "Incomes policies"—the broad term for voluntary guidance by government on supposedly "key" or "major" wage and price decisions—have been a flop in Europe. The policy is breaking down completely in Britain this year, but the pound remains strong, mainly because Britain's monetary and fiscal policies remain reasonable. In the United States we are, in fact, lucky: only a quarter of our labor force is unionized and a "wage explosion" is made very unlikely by our habit of long-term contracts. In this exceptional year of many major contracts, the 5 million workers involved amount to less than seven percent of the labor force. Heller and Okun and the Congressional advocates of various methods of inducing "restraint" might well say, thank God! For of course they have never been able to demonstrate a willingness on the part of unions, at a time of inflation, to show any restraint at all.

Is this what the preacher or politician would call a "counsel of despair?" The answer is yes. There is no point in expecting results that cannot be achieved. In addition, there is always some danger that the public will begin to believe that the wage increase of the auto workers or the price of copper "cause" inflation, if the President or the Council of Economic Advisers or some other government body is always fussing about them. While the analogy is not quite fair, President Johnson twisted steel, aluminum and sulphur arms to the tune of page-one headlines while the budget drifted quietly into the biggest deficit in history except for World War II. We had inflation as a result. The congressman who thinks Alcoa or Jersey Standard—or the Teamsters—causes inflation is the congressman who will vote for more spending and less taxes and will urge the Federal Reserve Board to pump up the money supply.

Alas, Herbert Stein of the present Council of Economic Advisers was surely right when he said in early April: "The basic premise upon which these policies (guideposts, etc.) rest is not easy to believe. People who want to raise their own prices and wages have not only a strong selfish interest in doing so; they almost always have a strong conviction that what they do is morally right and good for the country. We are asked to believe that people will suppress these interests on the basis of calculations made by some economists in Washington and appeals by the President without legal standards or sanctions."

The main case against this easy option of government "intervention" is, obviously, that it is very unlikely to work, despite an occasional temporary success in rolling back a given headline price increase for something like aluminum ingot. But all is not lost. Most of the prices that really affect us are not set by "big business" and "big labor." This country has had long periods of fairly stable prices when the government's fiscal and monetary policies prevented excess demand,

or spending. The Mothers of Mercy in Peoria and Joe's barber shop in Tucson will not have to raise prices if the economy as a whole is not inflationary. To say that "monopolistic" situations in parts of industry and parts of the labor force exist is true; to say that they cause inflation, or that appeals to monopolists' better nature will significantly slow inflation, is a delusion.

AS I SEE IT

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent newspaper column which appeared in the Medford, Mass., Daily Mercury, "As I See It," by Mr. Robert H. Goldman.

Mr. Goldman is a distinguished lawyer and a thoughtful and concerned citizen. I think his comments will be of interest to Members of the House and I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Medford (Mass.) Daily Mercury, May 27, 1970]

As I See It

(By Robert H. Goldman)

Incidents involving the lowering of the Flag of our country have recently caused heated controversy. Should Governor Sargent or Mayor Lindsay, as the case may be, have ordered the flag lowered in memory of the four slain Kent students? What kind of precedents do such incidents set?

Then, too, the Flag has been involved in other controversies:—thousands of construction workers, carrying hundreds of flags, battle peace groups in front of New York's City Hall and on Wall Street, and cry out as they do so, "We love our Flag!" "We protect our Flag!"

Those who "support" the war, proclaim their deep loyalty to the Flag, and often some of them—not all of them but some of them—attack those "opposing" the war as "unpatriotic."

The rhetoric on all sides rises to new pitches of intensity.

I have never considered that the Flag of our country is merely a symbol of victory in war, or of war itself. Certainly it stands for those who have died in America's conflicts, from our Revolution down to today's undeclared war in Vietnam and Cambodia. Those who gave their lives in any of America's wars, whether we have agreed, or now agree with the particular conflict, deserve our deepest respect. For this beloved soil of America shall one day bury us all, young and old, white and black, poor and rich. We bowed our heads this last Memorial Day to those who died in the wars of our country, most of whom rest now in the cemeteries across our land.

But our Flag stands as a symbol of our nation, and our nation owes its true greatness not to its wars, but to its work for Peace. It is the peaceful progress of America through the ages, in art, in literature, in medicine, in science, in education, in creating the highest standard of living this world has ever seen—that peaceful progress of our nation is also symbolized by the Flag.

I love this land for what it means to be an American—and, to me, being an American means that I regard the "greatness" that has come to America, that "greatness" of which President Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy spoke, the true greatness of America

and its Flag, as comprising American leadership towards a world of Peace.

I do not deny that we must remain armed in today's world—but I pray for the day when the name of America and the glory of our Flag will be looked up to by all men as representing the leadership of all mankind—not in War, but in the exploration of outer space; not in War, but in the pre-eminence of American science in conquering the great diseases—cancer, heart disease, a host of others; not in War, but in solving the great problems of ending poverty and hunger and human misery.

So, I am angry when the Hawks try to appropriate the Flag to themselves—it is not theirs anymore than it belongs to any one faction of our citizens. And I am angry when I see how the Doves, "the dissenters," too often fail to realize that they have as much right in their non-violent advocacy of peace to "Stand behind the Flag" as the most hawkish hawk.

For our Constitution guarantees difference of opinion—and the Founding Fathers argued long and hard among themselves before they came out with a great "Compromise Solution"—that Constitution itself. Peaceably and sincerely to disagree—and to even very strongly disagree—with our government, the administration in power, or with other Americans, is to exercise one of the highest functions of American citizenship. Thus, a young Congressman made anti-war speeches in the House, saying the war was "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced"—and lost his seat in Congress as a result. The war was the Mexican War of 1848 and the Congressman was Abraham Lincoln.

So I say to the Dissenters—this Flag is your Flag, and when you peaceably dissent you honor the Flag—which, again, stands for all Americans. And all Americans don't agree on most issues. But we must agree on the means by which we exercise those disagreements.

Let then those who oppose the war carry the Flag proudly—and peaceably—in demonstrations—and let them not allow the Hawks to claim it as their sole possession.

We love our land for what she is, with all its faults. But we should love it even more for what it is to be—what it can be—a beacon to all the nations, not of progress in War, but of a great age of Peace to come.

POSTAL WORKERS

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, last night the New York State Association of Letter Carriers held their annual dinner here in Washington.

They are, of course, members of a profession that assures that the wheels of the Nation's commerce and communication keep rolling. Their unselfish service over the years has frequently hidden the fact that they have carried out their responsibilities without the fanfare that pervades much of the public debate these days. At a time when so much dissent is characterized by thetic gestures and irrational threats the postal workers have resorted to the time-honored method of collective bargaining to redress their grievances which are real indeed.

It is shocking that men who work so hard are frequently forced to supplement their income with relief funds. Because

of our preoccupation with the senseless war in Indochina, student dissent and unneeded supersonic aircraft, we have ignored the plight of those who seek only to provide themselves and their families with a comfortable and dignified life. This will not be possible for them until Congress provides the money. The recent steps to give a modest 6-percent increase was long overdue and postal workers income will not reach a sufficient level until the additional 8-percent increase is assured.

I therefore call on both Houses of Congress to dispense with delay and enact this needed legislation forthwith. These men and women must no longer be the forgotten Americans.

WHY NO WAR DECLARATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I receive many inquiries as to why our men are fighting a war which has not been declared by Congress.

A declaration of war does provide the citizenry with advantages as well as disadvantages. In the present conflict our citizens are living in a state of war without the protections and advantages of a formal declaration.

I include a list of the laws effective upon declaration of war relating to treason, subversion, and curtailment of free speech; a portion of 1967 Armed Services Committee hearings containing the rationale of former Secretary of Defense, Robert Strange McNamara—presently World Bank President; and a report by David Lawrence, as follows:

PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW EFFECTIVE UPON DECLARATION OF WAR BY CONGRESS RELATING TO TREASON, SUBVERSION, AND POSSIBLE CURTAILMENT OF FREE SPEECH; EXECUTIVE ORDERS

A. TREASON

Const., Art. III, Sec. 3, Cl. 1: "Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort . . ."

18 U.S.C. 2381: "Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason . . ."

The first form of treason, levying war against the United States, is beside the point here; no declaration of war would ever be necessary. The second form is less clear. There has never been a conviction for treason on account of giving aid and comfort to the enemy in the absence of a declared war. On the other hand there has been no acquittal of a charge of treason simply because the hostilities in which we were engaged were conducted in the absence of a formal declaration of war. Some take the position that no formal declaration of war is necessary to support a conviction now. See *Treason and Aiding the Enemy*, 30 Military Law Review 62 (October, 1965).

B. ACTIVITIES AFFECTING THE ARMED FORCES DURING WAR

18 U.S.C. 2388 punishes making false reports with intent to interfere with the armed forces and causing insubordination or mu-

tiny in the armed forces, "when the United States is at war." Although it was originally enacted to operate only when "the United States is at war" and, as enacted, might require the existence of a declared war to support a conviction under it, its provisions have been made operative by 18 U.S.C. 2391 until "six months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 . . . or such earlier date as may be prescribed by concurrent resolution of the Congress." This proclamation is still in effect.

C. ESPIONAGE

The espionage statute (18 U.S.C. 793) applies in peace and war, but the President may designate "prohibited places" in addition to those described in the act in time of war or national emergency.

18 U.S.C. 794(b) Whoever, in time of war, gathers defense data of the United States with intent that they be sent to the enemy, is punished with death or jail. Incidentally, sec. 795 forbids photographing, sketching, etc., military and naval installations where the President has, in the interests of national defense, defined them as vital installations requiring protection against general dissemination of information with regard thereto. However, no declaration of war on proclamation of emergency is necessary to this section.

D. EMERGENCY DETENTION OF SUSPECTED SECURITY RISKS

50 U.S.C. 811 et seq. provides for the emergency detention of suspected security risks upon proclamation by the President of an Internal Security Emergency, which he may do only if (1) the United States is invaded; (2) Congress declares war; or (3) an insurrection occurs within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy.

E. ALIEN ENEMIES, REGULATION, RESTRAINT, AND REMOVAL

50 U.S.C. 21-24 provides, in event of war declared by Congress, or the Presidential proclamation of a foreign invasion of the United States, for the forcible restraint and removal as alien enemies all subjects of the hostile power.

F. PRESIDENTIAL TAKE OVER OF FACTORIES IN TIME OF WAR

50 U.S.C. 82(c) authorizes the President, in time of war, to take over any factory for use by the Government.

G. VESSELS IN TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

50 U.S.C. 191-198 empowers the Secretary of the Treasury, under direction of the President, to regulate the anchorage and movements of vessels within the territorial waters of the United States, including the seizure thereof, and including foreign vessels, whenever the President declares a national emergency to exist because of actual or threatened war.

H. TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

50 App. U.S.C. 1-44, applicable during declared war. This law, however, has no relation to subversion and civil liberties.

I. SABOTAGE

18 U.S.C. 2151-2157 punishes, when the United States is at war, or in times of national emergency declared by the President or by Congress, the destruction of war material, premises, or utilities; production of defective war material. These sections (2153, 2154), in addition to coming into effect in time of war, shall remain in full force until six months after the termination of the 1950 emergency proclamation (Proc. No. 2914), or until such earlier date as Congress may set.

J. EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 11490

(Oct. 28, 1969; 34 F.R. 17567)

This order, to take effect upon the direction of the President (in times of emergency)

directs the heads of various Federal departments and agencies to draw up emergency plans for the operation of their respective organizations in time of national emergency declared by the President. The plans drawn up hereunder may vary from time to time and may only be put into effect upon approval of the President.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

DECLARED WAR VIS-A-VIS UNDECLARED WAR
Senator YOUNG of North Dakota. Would you yield for one question?

Senator SMITH. Yes.
Senator YOUNG of North Dakota. This may be a bit unfair and not the proper place to ask it, but from the military point of view, what advantages or disadvantages would there be to a declaration of war? This question is often raised in my mail. Why don't we declare war on North Vietnam?

Secretary McNAMARA. Senator Young, this is a highly technical question with legal overtones. I wonder if I might answer that for the record. I would be very happy to do so.

Senator YOUNG of North Dakota. Thank you. Will you supply that?

Secretary McNAMARA. I will be very happy to supply it to you.

Senator MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to receive a copy of that.

Chairman RUSSELL. I think you might offer it for the record, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary McNAMARA. I will do so.

Chairman RUSSELL. If there are any treaties that bind North Vietnam to Russia or China, that would bring Russia and China into the war automatically upon a declaration of war, I think you ought to state that. That to me is one very good reason.

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes.
(The information follows:)

The question has been raised whether it would be desirable for the President to seek a formal declaration of war against North Vietnam. This question should be considered with respect to both international and domestic considerations.

INTERNATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

From the international standpoint it seems undesirable to request a declaration of war for the following reasons:

1. The policy of the United States in Vietnam is to assist the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, at the latter's request, in thwarting an armed aggression from North Vietnam and to achieve a workable settlement of the dispute among the principal parties involved. This policy is pursued with limited aims, seeking to end the aggression against South Vietnam without threatening the destruction of North Vietnam, allowing a miscalculation by the enemy as to our intentions, or unnecessarily enlarging the scope of the conflict. The United States believes that the struggle must be won primarily in South Vietnam and is in that context a defensive military effort.

2. To declare war would add a new psychological element to the international situation, since in this century declarations of war have come to imply dedication to the total destruction of the enemy. It would increase the danger of misunderstanding of our true objectives in the conflict by the various Communist states, and increase the chances of their expanded involvement in it. Such a declaration would question the continued validity of the President's statements concerning his desire for a peaceful settlement allowing the various nations of the area, including North Vietnam, to live together in economic cooperation, and his reiteration that we do not threaten the existence of North Vietnam.

3. On balance, a declaration of war—which would be the first since the signing of the United Nations Charter—would significantly reduce the flexibility of the United States

tory action—the defending of American nations to seek a solution among extremely complex factors and reduce the chances that our adversary will take a reasoned approach to a solution, when U.S. policy from the beginning has attempted to avoid closing off any possible avenue of resolution and to make the North Vietnamese more rather than less rational in the situation.

4. There is nothing in modern international law which requires a state to declare war before engaging in hostilities against another state; nor would a formal declaration of war impose any obligations on an enemy by which he would not otherwise be bound.

5. Absence of a formal declaration of war is not a factor which makes an international use of force unlawful. The only relevant legal question is whether the use of force is justified. Examples of hostilities begun without prior declaration of war abound in recent history. The fighting in Korea from 1950 to 1953, that in Indochina from 1947 to 1954, that in and around the Suez Canal in 1956, and that in West New Guinea between the Dutch and Indonesians in the spring and summer of 1962 all took place without benefit of declarations of war. We are not aware that the absence of declarations of war in these cases has been alleged to constitute a violation of international law.

6. The legal rules of international law concerning the conduct of armed conflicts apply to all armed conflicts without regard to the presence or absence of declarations of war. All that is required is armed conflict between two or more international entities. The 1949 Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims were specifically made applicable to any "armed conflict of an international character" between two or more of the parties. The rules of war embodied in the Hague conventions formulated in the early years of this century are considered, in general, to be part of customary international law binding on all states, and their applicability is unrelated to declarations of war.

DOMESTIC CONSIDERATIONS

From the point of view of U.S. law it would be undesirable for the President to seek a declaration of war for the following reasons:

1. A declaration of war is not necessary either to authorize the actions that have been taken by the United States in Vietnam or to provide an expression of congressional intent on the Vietnamese situation. The President has power under article II, section 2, of the Constitution as Commander in Chief to deploy U.S. military forces to Vietnam for the purpose of assisting South Vietnam to defend itself from armed aggression by North Vietnam. Since the Constitution was adopted, there have been at least 125 instances in which the President, without congressional authority and in the absence of a declaration of war, has ordered the Armed Forces to take actions or to maintain positions abroad. Some of these historical instances have involved the use of U.S. forces in combat. Congressional intent is expressed by the joint resolution of Congress of August 10, 1964, passed by a combined vote of 504 to 2, explicitly approving all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, in the defense of freedom in southeast Asia. A much fuller presentation of the views of the executive branch on the question of the President's constitutional authority was published in February 1951, as a joint committee print of the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services.

2. A declaration of war does not seem necessary in order to provide emergency authority to the executive branch. Many laws become operative in time of national emergency or in time of war. Most of these are operative today by virtue of the state of emergency proclaimed by President Truman in December 1950. These laws give the executive branch increased power to deal with the

problems in Vietnam as well as other areas of the world. For example, they include special authority with respect to the movement of aliens in and out of the United States, the Armed Forces, Reserves, and the National Guard; procurement of material for the services; transactions in foreign exchange, Government contracts, security, and the protection of defense information; and defense transportation. A few emergency laws would not come into effect unless there were a declaration of national emergency or of war subsequent to the 1950 declaration of national emergency. However, there are only a few laws which can become operative only in time of war, and they have not been found necessary for the conduct of hostilities in Vietnam.

IS A DECLARATION OF A "STATE OF WAR" NEEDED?

(By David Lawrence)

The Constitution explicitly says that Congress alone shall have the power to declare war. Why, then, are so many men of the land and air forces of the United States, as well as a substantial number of naval units, currently participating in the fighting in Vietnam, and why is there in official quarters now talk of increasing these forces—all without a declaration of a "state of war"?

Why, too, were five million Americans called upon to serve in a major war in Korea, beginning in 1950 and continuing into 1953, without a single resolution of Congress authorizing such combat operations?

These questions have been answered in the past partly by citing various precedents and partly by the argument that an emergency often necessitates instant action and that there is no time to wait for a resolution to be passed by Congress.

No two situations, of course, are exactly alike, but the history of the United States shows that Presidents have on a number of occasions sent forces to fight in neighboring countries—and recently overseas—without a declaration of war by Congress. As a matter of fact, the United States has, by its ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty, for instance, obligated American armed forces to respond instantly to an attack on any of the member countries of NATO.

Under this treaty, no action by Congress is required in advance. The signatory countries already have agreed that "an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all," and that each of them "will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

In a parallel agreement setting up the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—or SEATO, as it is commonly called—the obligation of the members is not as explicit. The treaty provides that "aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties" is recognized by each signatory party as endangering "its own peace and safety," and that each will "act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes."

When it originally signed the SEATO treaty, the United States made a special reservation by which this country's "recognition of the effect of aggression and armed attack and its agreement with reference thereto" is understood to "apply only to Communist aggression," but "in the event of other aggression or armed attack," the United States will consult with other members on what measures should be taken. The purpose of this is, of course, to give the United States an opportunity to decide for itself whether it wants to engage in military action.

A basic reservation of this same kind is

contained also in the United Nations Charter. The Security Council is empowered to make special agreements with member nations for the use of armed force to maintain peace. But these agreements are subject to ratification by the signatory states "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

Broadly speaking, the distinction between a situation where a declaration of war by Congress is sought by a President and one where action is taken without congressional authorization usually is related to the time factor. Thus, President Wilson in 1914 ordered U.S. Marines to seize the Customs House in Vera Cruz, Mexico. He had received word at four o'clock one morning that a vessel carrying arms which might be used against Americans was about to land at Vera Cruz and that instant action was necessary to prevent this. The President had actually requested of Congress the day before a resolution confirming his authority to use troops in connection with another incident in Mexico, but it wasn't passed until after U.S. forces had occupied Vera Cruz in a battle for the city.

President Truman in June 1950 ordered American forces in the Far East to go to the aid of South Korea when it was suddenly invaded by North Korea. There wasn't time to wait for the processes of the United Nations to go into operation to repel the aggression.

Mr. Truman never asked Congress for a resolution authorizing his action in Korea. The argument was that actually the Russians or Chinese or both had been violating in Korea an agreement reached as a consequence of the World War II peace conference, that many of the situations arising out of World War II had not been amicably settled, and hence military power originally authorized during the war could continue to be applied. This is still the basis for American military patrols in Berlin and vicinity.

It was contended, moreover, in the case of Korea that, whenever Congress appropriated funds to conduct the military operations there, it was, in effect, giving implicit approval and authorization for the use of the armed forces, and that a declaration of war wasn't necessary. Somewhat the same argument can be made with respect to appropriations by Congress to carry on the war in Vietnam.

President Johnson, however, was aware of the importance of getting special authorization for the use of armed forces in Southeast Asia. He requested and obtained from Congress in August 1964 a resolution approving the military action being taken there.

In a press conference on June 17, 1965, when asked about getting further congressional approval for sending increased forces to Vietnam, Mr. Johnson stated that "the authority of the President is very clear and unquestioned without a resolution—the Commander-in-Chief has all the authority that I am exercising." He added:

"But because of my desire to have the support of the Congress and to have them a part of any decision we make after consulting their leadership, exchanging viewpoints and carefully drawing a resolution, we submitted to the Congress language that we thought would make it clear for all time, to one and all.

"That language, just as a reminder to you, said the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President as Commander-in-Chief 'to take all—all—necessary measures to repel any—any—any armed attack against the forces of the United States' and 'to prevent further aggression.'"

The resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority of both houses of Congress on Aug. 10, 1964. The request was made by the President in connection with retalla-

tory action—the defending of American naval vessels against attacks that were coming from North Vietnam. While, therefore, in recent operations there has been ample authority, the question arises as to whether Congress should be requested to extend the authority, particularly if the Vietnam war is to be widened by participation of the Red Chinese.

The problem in South Vietnam is complicated by the fact that the United States was originally requested by the established government in Saigon to give it military assistance in resisting an invasion by hostile guerrilla forces. Normally, this would be regarded as international co-operation of a minor nature which probably would not require a request by the President for authority from Congress but would be covered by the precedents of Executive discretion.

Now that the war has been intensified, however, it is up to President Johnson to decide whether the use of American armed forces in South Vietnam is an obligation under the provisions of the Southeast Asia Treaty itself, which pledges the United States to cooperate with other powers in protecting the "peace and safety" of the treaty area. But even in such a circumstance, the President would appear to be on firmer ground if he were to get congressional authority.

Mr. Johnson has sought to make it clear that the United States is not engaging in a war on its own initiative but is, along with other nations, helping a victim of aggression. The President unquestionably would get immediate approval from Congress if he should ask for authority to carry out American treaty obligations in Vietnam as well as in the whole SEATO area.

One of the difficulties today is that, while North Vietnam is obviously the aggressor, a declaration of war by the United States against the Hanoi Government alone would hardly be adequate. On the other hand, the United States may not wish to be in the position of declaring war on either Red China or the Soviet Union. Any declaration probably would provide for resistance to aggression against South Vietnam, together with authority to respond by whatever means may be necessary to any attacks from North Vietnam or elsewhere.

By declaring a "state of war" to exist, the United States would be in a strong position to make illegal the further construction of Soviet missile bases in North Vietnam, whose Government is being aided largely by Red China in continuing the aggression against South Vietnam. For if the war is to be carried on in earnest, the United States must prevent its own forces as well as those of South Vietnam from being defeated by either the North Vietnam Government or its Communist allies.

While the President can certainly proceed today on the assumption that he has public sentiment back of him, he would be better advised to ask at the proper time for a resolution by Congress declaring a "state of war." This would not only conform strictly to the letter of the Constitution but would give the United States a position under international law which would permit measures to be taken to prevent any "trading with the enemy," including the Red Chinese. It would also demonstrate to the entire world that the American people are united behind their Government in the Southeast Asia war.

BUSTED BUDGET

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents have written me of their

concern about inflation and the need to balance our budget. I am sure the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of May 26, 1970, will be of great interest to them and to my colleagues.

BUSTED BUDGET

President Nixon's new estimate of a \$1.3 billion deficit in the fiscal year that begins July 1 was out of date less than 24 hours after it was made public.

The deficit will be bigger—and Mr. Nixon himself caused the first overrun.

As estimated in the first formal revision of the 1971 budget, spending was to total \$205.6 billion—up \$4.8 billion from the administration's February estimates—and the original thin surplus had turned into a thin deficit.

But this month's revised figures included only \$150 million in outlays under the President's promised \$500 million program of federal aid to school districts that are "racially impacted" or are in the process of desegregating.

That led to charges that Mr. Nixon was shortchanging his own program. The White House promptly promised that the whole \$500 million would be spent in fiscal 1971.

And there went the revised estimates.

AC ELECTRONICS DIVISION ROLE IN SPACE PROGRAM

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the heroic rescue of the Apollo 13 astronauts from the depths of space, the inertial guidance and navigation systems aboard the lunar module, Aquarius, and the command module, Odyssey, played a significant role.

Both of these precision guidance and navigation systems were manufactured by General Motors' AC Electronics Division in my district in Milwaukee, Wis. Both systems performed perfectly, and guided the astronauts safely back to earth.

The AC lunar module guidance system took over for the command module guidance system when it had to be shut down to conserve power. The LM guidance system controlled the attitude of the spacecraft and controlled the engine burn that put the spacecraft back on to a free return trajectory to earth. It also controlled the 4 minute and 20 second engine burn that accelerated the spacecraft's return by 10 hours.

Further, the LM guidance system accurately guided the astronauts from the moon to the earth, a task it was not programmed to do. Before entry to the earth's atmosphere, the command module guidance system was powered up, using battery energy. Although it had been exposed to extremely low temperatures not normally experienced, it worked flawlessly, guiding the astronauts through the critical entry corridor, and to a pinpoint splashdown in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin take great pride in the achievements of Wisconsin men and women working in the Milwaukee area who have designed, developed and manufactured the complex and delicate components that make

up Apollo's lunar and command module guidance and navigation systems.

The AC Electronics guidance and navigation systems aboard the Apollo not only performed tasks not normally expected of them, but also made possible a safe, pinpoint landing in the Pacific when our courageous astronauts returned to earth. These accomplishments were indeed a tribute to the talented, hard-working General Motors people of Wisconsin who helped make this safe return possible.

NOTED BANKER DIES AT AGE 81

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected, one of the most influential, and one of the most beloved citizens of Arkansas died last Thursday. W. W. Campbell of Forrest City was known affectionately by thousands as "Mr. Will."

There is no way that his contributions to his hometown, to his beloved State, and to his Nation could be enumerated. It can simply be said that he will be sorely missed.

His advice and counsel were sought constantly by the known and the unknown. His views and recommendations were honored and appreciated by officials throughout the country as well as by rural residents of St. Francis County. His goal was to help his fellow man, his philosophy was love for his fellow man, and his legacy will be an improved world because he was with us.

I include in the RECORD at this point several articles that appeared concerning the life of W. W. Campbell:

NOTED BANKER DIES AT AGE 81—BUILT REPUTATION AS FARMERS' FRIEND

FORREST CITY.—William Wilson Campbell, aged 81, a Forrest City banker who became an East Arkansas institution in his own lifetime, died Thursday.

Known affectionately to many as "Mr. Will," the lifelong Arkansan died at 1 a.m. at Methodist Memorial Hospital in Memphis after a lengthy illness.

He was Board chairman of First National Bank of Eastern Arkansas and was recognized throughout the nation for his banking expertise.

In 1947, the editors of Reader's Digest selected him the outstanding "Good Neighbor Banker" for his work in the field of industrial, agricultural, commercial and personal banking service in his community. Fortune magazine featured Mr. Campbell as the "Outstanding Country Banker" in November 1948. He was named Man of the Year in Service to Arkansas Agriculture by Progressive Farmer magazine in 1951.

Born on a farm atop Crowley's Ridge, Mr. Campbell knew the region's people and its problems. He was the son of S. C. and Jessie Griggs Campbell, pioneers of the area.

He foresaw the day the small farmer would be forced off the land by mechanization, and was a leader in the successful attempt to diversify the livelihood of East Arkansas residents. Because of him, many large industrial plants were erected around Forrest City.

He was a pioneer in planting rice in the area west of Crowley's Ridge. He formed the

first soil conservation district and pushed modern agricultural thinking.

When the chemicals and the mechanical pickers came and the exodus from the land took place and the welfare rolls lengthened, Mr. Campbell took up the banner of the little man.

In those early days, he acquired the reputation that has lasted until his death of being the banker who never foreclosed on a mortgage.

He thought this record important, an example of his philosophy.

"Bankers have the greatest opportunity to help people," he once said. "We don't want a man's land. We want him to work on it and make a living."

In later years, he encouraged the growth of truck gardens on former cotton land as a means of augmenting further the incomes of those who worked in the plants his foresight had brought to Forrest City.

"Those people can have a rich life," he told a reporter in 1964. "They have television, modern conveniences consolidated schools. And they can stay on the land. They were raised in the land. They like the freedom of space."

It was under Mr. Campbell's guidance that Forrest City was looked on as a leader in race relations until recent troubles there. Whites and blacks worked side by side in Forrest City industries in a time when other parts of East Arkansas did not even consider desegregation.

Born February 1889, Mr. Campbell was graduated from Forrest City High School, attended the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville and was graduated from Eastman's Business College at Poughkeepsie.

His first job after college was as bookkeeper for Russell-Graham-Alderson, a mercantile firm.

He came to the First National Bank of Eastern Arkansas as a cashier in 1909, becoming president in 1923 and remaining at that position until January of 1954, when he was named chairman of the Board, a position he occupied until his death.

Mr. Campbell had served on the Board of Arkansas Power and Light Company and the Board of Trustees of Arkansas College at Batesville. He was vice chairman of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission.

Mr. Campbell had served the Arkansas Bankers Association on various committees and was chairman of the Agricultural Committee for two terms. He was vice president of the Association in 1923 and was named president in 1928.

He held many high positions and served on many committees in the American Bankers Association, including chairman of the Agricultural Commission for four terms, president of the National Bank Division, member of the Executive Council, Special Planning Committee, Administrative Committee, Government Borrowing Committee.

He served as state chairman of the War Finance Committee during World War II.

He had served since 1941 as Arkansas state chairman of the United States Savings Bond program. He also had served as a member of the Federal Reserve Advisory Council of the Federal Reserve Bank for two terms and six years on the Board of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Memphis Branch. In January 1952, Mr. Campbell was one of 16 Savings Bonds chairmen in the United States elected by the Treasury and Defense Departments to tour France, Italy, Germany and England for the purpose of observing the progress made in the buildup of NATO forces and the efforts being made by the Europeans themselves in self help.

Mr. Campbell received a 25-year Savings Bond Volunteer Award from the American Bankers Association in 1966 for outstanding service.

He was a member of the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference of the United States Defense Department in 1957 and again in 1960. Mr. Campbell served as state chairman

of the Advisory Committee for the Arkansas Farmers Administration and as a member of the Cotton Advisory Committee of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Advisory Committee of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a Memphis and Little Rock agency.

Mr. Campbell also was a member of the White House Conference on Education; Memphis, Tennessee, and Arkansas Bridge Commission; Board of Governors of the Small War Plants Corporation, Kansas City Agency; Board of the Arkansas Tuberculosis Sanatorium for 12 years; chairman of the State Highway Finance Advisory Committee under three Arkansas governors.

He served on the Hoover Commission as a member of Advisory Committee on Government Lending Agencies; Board of the Arkansas Economic Council, State Chamber of Commerce; chairman of the Comptroller of the Currency and was an honorary member of the Soil Conservation Society of America.

Mr. Campbell was a member of the Board of Elders at the Graham Memorial Presbyterian Church, a trustee of the Forrest City Library; a 33d Degree Mason, and a member of the Higher Education Committee and the Quest Committee of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

In 1967, the Forrest City Chamber of Commerce presented him with the "Outstanding Citizen" Award, recognizing many years of service toward the betterment of Forrest City.

An honorary doctor of law degree was conferred on Mr. Campbell by the University of Arkansas in 1949 and he is listed in *Who's Who in America*.

As a *Gazette* editorial writer put it in 1954, when his son took over as president of the Bank:

"It would be hard to think of the National Bank of Eastern-Arkansas without W. W. Campbell. In fact it would be hard to think of Eastern Arkansas without W. W. Campbell. Mr. Campbell and Miss Victoria Mann, formerly of Marianna, were married on December 14, 1916.

Mr. Campbell is survived by his wife; a son, William Mann Campbell of Forrest City, and a daughter, Mrs. Ann Campbell Jaratt of Forrest City; a sister, Miss Annie Campbell of Forrest City, and two grandchildren.

The funeral will be by Rev. Robert Smith and Rev. Herndon McCain at 2 p.m. today at Graham Memorial Presbyterian Church. Burial will be at Forrest Park Cemetery by Stevens Funeral Service.

Pallbearers will be Tom C. Pope, Albert Laughinghouse, Charlie Woodfin, Tom Harris, Archie Ford, Wendell Weed, Marvin Ragland, John Mann, Ref Mann and Lon Mann.

AS WE SEE IT

(By Bonner McCollum)

How much can one individual mean to a community?

We could not help but ponder this question as we learned of the death early today of W. W. "Will" Campbell, chairman of the board of First National Bank of Eastern Arkansas.

Other than the love and respect we held for our own father, we have known no other man in our lifetime whom we respected and admired as much as we did "Mr. Will."

Any attempt here to convey to our readers the many, many contributions W. W. Campbell has made to Forrest City, to Arkansas and to our nation, would be merely scanning the surface; for it would take an in-depth, detailed study, covering a period of the past 80 years, to outline the contributions he has made to our society.

One outstanding quality which he possessed was an uncanny enthusiasm for life and the challenges and rewards it offered him. Throughout his lifetime he maintained an optimistic, enthusiastic outlook toward

everything and everyone. He always expected the best, both of people and events; and it is remarkable how often both met his expectations.

We have lost a dear, personal friend in his death; and Forrest City has lost one of its truly great community leaders.

WILLIAM W. CAMPBELL

No man in Arkansas stood higher in the profession of banking than William Wilson Campbell, who has passed away at the age of 81, and no man had finer personal qualities. He impressed everyone not only with his friendliness and understanding, but also with sincerity and forthrightness of character. While he followed the rules of sound and conservative banking, and made the First National Bank of Eastern Arkansas one of the state's outstanding financial institutions, he always showed sympathy for those who were in need of helpful consideration. Through the years he built for himself and his institution a strong structure of public confidence.

"Mr. Will," as he was affectionately known, built an enduring monument with his lifelong labors in the banking field, and he leaves a good name that will always be remembered.

WILLIAM W. CAMPBELL

It would be difficult to name a citizen of Eastern Arkansas who contributed more to his city and his region than William W. Campbell, of Forrest City, who died yesterday at the age of 81.

As employe and president, Mr. Campbell was associated with the National Bank of Eastern Arkansas for more than 60 years—a span of time that also measured his service to his community. People called him "Mr. Will," evidence of the friendly esteem in which he was held.

Banker Campbell must have had a formula for success based on the proposition that if a financial institution is to prosper, the community also must prosper. So, a good many years ago, he set about to make the formula work, which it did, to the benefit of everyone.

Mr. Campbell was a leader in promoting advanced ideas in agriculture, in encouraging small farmers, in supporting every civic enterprise that promised to upgrade the life of his neighbors. He had much to do with putting Forrest City on the map of 20th Century progress and was the subject of articles in such magazines as *Reader's Digest* and *Fortune*. We at *The Press-Scimitar* remember his valuable advice in helping us to promote our Save-Enrich Our Soil program a number of years ago.

Mr. Campbell was a man who respected tradition. He was the grandson of Eastern Arkansas pioneers; therefore, he had a duty to carry on. He was a banker; therefore, he had a responsibility to protect the community's economic health.

These high principles now pass to the hands of Mr. Will's son, W. M. Campbell, president of the bank once headed by his father.

YOUNG MAN SPEAKS FOR A GENERATION

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marshall Winn, the valedictorian of the class of 1970 at Dorman High School in Spartanburg, S.C., is in Washington this week

participating in the presidential scholar program. Mr. Winn will participate in special ceremonies at the White House tomorrow with 118 other presidential scholars from across America.

This week the Spartanburg, S.C., *Herald* printed an editorial which quoted parts of Mr. Winn's valedictory address at Dorman High School. In this age of dissent and trouble among many of our young people, I think this outstanding young man's words to his contemporaries are worthy of our attention. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share this editorial with my colleagues:

YOUNG MAN SPEAKS FOR A GENERATION

Marshall Winn, the valedictorian of the Dorman High School graduating class, believes in action as the only way of "attaining a desired end."

In his view, however, the concept has been abused in modern America.

"To many people," he told his class at graduating ceremonies, "action means simply doing whatever in their judgment is necessary to gain their goal."

Such a definition cannot be accepted by a civilized society, Mr. Winn declared to his fellow graduates. He continued:

"One of the marks of a civilized society is the ability to reason one with another without resorting to mob action and violence. . . .

"Dissent was the reason for the founding of our country . . . but (the Founding Fathers) made it clear that there were specific channels for dissent—that unorganized dissent, which amounts to anarchy, would not be tolerated. If this was to be a real nation, strong and free, then there had to be a strong system of justice and order. . . . Personal freedom had to be limited to that freedom which does not encroach upon the liberty of others.

"Accordingly, the freedom of dissent was emphasized, but limited to that which did not infringe upon the rights of other citizens to make their own free choice."

However: "We see more and more evidence that, across America, persons disagreeing with certain aspects of our society or system have little regard for the rights, or the opinions, of others not in agreement with them."

Mr. Winn declared, "This kind of behavior cannot be tolerated if we are to preserve our way of living. . . . Americans must not allow those who would tear down our society from within with no plan of their own for rebuilding or for improvement to destroy this proud and free system."

If Marshall Winn were exceptional in his generation for his views, his message would be worthy of attention. The fact that he articulates the attitude of most of his graduating generation across the nation makes it a particularly valuable message to be heard and understood.

The nation will be in good hands with this generation of young people.

Mr. Winn represents something else of special importance in South Carolina. He is a superb scholar and he has been sought of the country's finest universities—among them being Duke, Davidson, Furman and Harvard. The latter offered him a scholarship valued at \$15,600.

He is one of only 119 Presidential Scholars from the 50 states who are invited to the White House on June 4.

Dorman Principal Allen O. Clark announced at graduation exercises that Mr. Winn has decided to remain in his native state for his education. He will attend the University of South Carolina as one of 10 "Carolina Scholars" selected for scholarships this year.

He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph M. Winn, Jr. of Spring Valley Drive.

A QUESTION OF SUBSIDIES

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, a farmer from northeast Arkansas has recently brought to my attention an article in Cotton Farming concerning the continuing debate over farm subsidies. Because the article raises a point that deserves to be considered, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

A LITTLE CHAT

Look out, Reader's Digest is after you. Pick up a copy of the May issue. In it is an article entitled, "Time to Say No to Big Farm Subsidies." And cotton growers come in for a real drubbing. The article urges readers to write their Congressman immediately to insure payment limitations and a gradual phase-out of all subsidy. Don't look for any pro and con points. It's as subjective and vindictive attack as you'll probably ever see.

If we put aside all justifications of agricultural subsidies, it's still rather ironic for Reader's Digest to launch such an attack. Ironic because Reader's Digest is a recipient of one of the largest Government subsidies in the country . . . Second Class mailing.

Second class mail has a rather complicated weight-price formula but it all boils down to about seven cents a pound on the average as compared to 22 cents a pound for mailing bulk rate, third-class circulars, etc. The Post Office says it loses money on the 22-cents per pound bulk rate. Think what it's losing on seven cents per pound. That's a subsidy of at least 15 cents per pound. Multiply that by the Digest's usual weight, circulation, and 12 issues a year and the result is that Reader's Digest is probably subsidized somewhere between 12 to 16 million dollars a year by the taxpayer.

How about an article on that, fellas?

WALTER LITTLE, *Publisher.*

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, when a great man leaves public life, a void exists. The House of Representatives now realizes what greatness we have lost with the retirement of our distinguished speaker, Mr. McCORMACK.

The void Mr. McCORMACK leaves in the House will not be easily replaced. He has been a leader of matchless ability and dedication. He has firmly molded the House of Representatives so that it has been able to fulfill its constitutional legislative role.

The Speaker has been a man of integrity and has possessed a breath of vision not found in mere men. It is with regret that we see him leave the House after these decades of unequalled service. There will not be another like him. I join with my colleagues in saluting Mr. McCORMACK on his retirement. We all wish him well. We all thank him from the bottom of our hearts for all he has given to us, individually and collectively.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent decision to widen the war in Southeast Asia and in light of the widespread public dissent that followed it, a 1965 letter from President Nixon to the New York Times gains new interest.

The President observed in 1965 that "there are occasions—particularly in wartime—when the individual's rights and the Nation's security come in conflict." He asserted that "America's 20th century war Presidents, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, were forced to make this cruel choice and in both instances they properly concluded that in wartime preservation of freedom for all the people must take precedence over the rights of an individual to exercise freedom of speech when it would serve the enemies of freedom." And he concluded that dissension over the war in Vietnam posed at that time the conflict between the public good and an individual's right to free speech: "We must never forget," he wrote, "that if the war in Vietnam is lost, the right of free speech will be extinguished throughout the world."

Mr. Speaker, this letter now prompts questions about the President's position which deserve public answers. Does the President still view the failure to win a military victory in Southeast Asia as the apocalypse of global freedom? Does the current war situation still justify, in the President's mind, the abridgment of individual freedoms? What restraints does the President feel on his powers to limit freedom of speech in the United States?

I include the full text of Mr. Nixon's letter in the RECORD:

NIXON EXPLAINS STAND ON OUSTING GENOVESE
To the Editor:

In accordance with the great tradition of the Times for complete and objective coverage of the news you might want to carry statements I made on the Genovese case which were omitted in the Times news story of Oct. 25.

Every American is for free speech and academic freedom. The question is how do we preserve that freedom?

We do so by recognizing and protecting the right of individuals to freedom of speech.

We do so by defending the system of government which guarantees freedom of speech to individuals.

Unfortunately, there are occasions—particularly in wartime—when the individual's rights and the nation's security come in conflict.

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

Justice Learned Hand summarized it best when he said, "A society in which men recognize no check on their freedom soon becomes a society in which freedom is the possession of only the savage few."

In his recent speeches in New Jersey, Robert Kennedy, by contending in effect that the right to freedom of speech is absolute and unrestricted, confused the fundamental issue involved in the Genovese case.

He charged that Senator Dumont's demand for Professor Genovese's dismissal was the same as Governor Barnett's demand that

professors at the University of Mississippi who advocated integration should be discharged.

DISTINCTION EMPHASIZED

He completely missed the fundamental distinction between the two cases. No one has questioned the right of Professor Genovese or anyone else to advocate any controversial issue in peacetime.

The question in the Genovese case is whether a professor, employed by a state university, should have the right to use the prestige and forum of the university for advocating victory for an enemy of the United States in wartime.

The victory for the Vietcong which Professor Genovese "welcomes" would mean ultimately the destruction of freedom of speech for all men for all time not only in Asia but in the United States as well.

The question at issue, therefore, becomes: does the principle of freedom of speech require that the state subsidize those who would destroy the system of government which protects freedom of speech?

We are confronted in the Genovese case with this choice:

The responsibility of the state to protect the right of freedom of speech for an individual.

The responsibility of the state to defend itself against enemies whose victory would deny freedom of speech to all.

WARTIME CHOICE

America's twentieth century war Presidents, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, were forced to make this cruel choice and in both instances they properly concluded that in wartime preservation of freedom for all the people must take precedence over the rights of an individual to exercise freedom of speech when it would serve the enemies of freedom.

Reports from Hanoi and Peking conclusively indicate that the demonstrations against our policy in Vietnam encourage the enemy, prolong the war and result in the deaths of American fighting men.

Our recognition of this unhappy truth does not mean that we suppress the views of all those who may oppose the war in Vietnam for ideological reasons.

But there is a point at which a line must be drawn.

I say as long as the demonstrators and those participating in teach-ins are acting in an individual and private capacity no action should be taken to curtail their activities.

But any individual employed by the state should not be allowed to use his position for the purpose of giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the state.

Where the choice confronting us is between the lives of American men fighting to preserve the system which guarantees freedom of speech for all and the right of an individual to abuse that freedom, the lives of American fighting men must come first.

We must never forget that if the war in Vietnam is lost and the victory for the Communists which Professor Genovese says he "welcomes" becomes inevitable, the right of free speech will be extinguished throughout the world.

RICHARD M. NIXON.

NEW YORK, Oct. 27, 1965.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of your retirement from public of-

vice will deprive this House and this Nation of the services of a great American.

JOHN McCORMACK's remarkable career in this body is well known. For 42 years he has served in this House. The last 9 years he served ably and admirably as Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK has occupied the most powerful office in Congress and the third highest elective office in the land since 1962. His impending departure from the House will leave a large void in Congress.

Our country is a better place for the contribution he has made to it and to our American way of life. His vast experience and great ability have provided the House with excellent and effective leadership. Perhaps the real key to the high degree of integrity he has brought to his public service was the example of his personal life. His devotion to his faith and his wife is a model for us all.

I am particularly proud and privileged to serve with him. He has been a wonderful friend.

I wish the Speaker and his charming wife many more years of happiness, peace, and relaxation that they have earned so well.

A DAD'S LETTER TO THREE COLLEGE DAUGHTERS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a letter written by an Iowa father to his three daughters in college appeared in the Des Moines Sunday Register on May 17, 1970. It is a very wise and sensible letter. I wish all students received—and heeded—advice as sane and sound as it contains. It seems from the activities of the small but vocal minority of student radicals that they have not. And there is always the danger that the unthinking, passive majority will allow itself to be manipulated for the political purposes of the few. It is our duty to alert them to their responsibility. I, therefore, insert this letter in its entirety into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A DAD'S LETTER TO THREE COLLEGE DAUGHTERS

DEAR SUE, JAN, AND CAL: For the first time since each of you left for college, I feel some real concern for your safety and well being.

The events of the past few days at Kent State and Iowa are tragic and frightening but I certainly hope the nation's college students don't find in the ghastly mistake at Kent an excuse to prolong the violence.

I'm sure you know that I consider my own opinions of no great importance but I want to tell you how I feel about the current political situation just as some sort of counter balance to some of the inflammatory oratory you're going to be subjected to in the next couple of weeks.

THE CHOICES

No sensible American wants to continue the war in Vietnam and Cambodia for one more day.

I don't know of any responsible leader, who if given the choice today, would choose to become involved in Vietnam.

I also know of no American who, if placed

in the position of responsibility the President must occupy, would unconditionally admit defeat and withdraw our troops from Vietnam.

I doubt if even Bill Fulbright or Harold Hughes would take this action if they were in a position to make the decision. I'm sure the Jerry Rubins in our society would make such a decision but hopefully they'll never be in that position.

The Rubins, I'm convinced, really want to destroy the United States—or at least the society we've built here over the past 350 years. As imperfect as is that society, it's far better and offers hope to more people than the anarchy that would follow its destruction.

Perhaps we'll never find a way, but I'm convinced at least a majority of Americans believe that maintenance of the United States' integrity in the world requires some solution in Vietnam short of a complete Communist takeover.

Many of us also think that the new isolationism that is being advocated is not the answer as we know from experience that it was not the answer in the 1930's.

COULD BE WRONG

And, of course, we could be wrong—dead wrong. But the type of demonstrations we're seeing on the college campuses is not going to convince us we're wrong.

The name calling, rock throwing and building burning we've witnessed the past few weeks convinces most of us that too many college students are immature children throwing temper tantrums because they can't have their own way. The thought of following leadership like we've seen on the campuses makes us want to vomit.

The situation at Kent State was tragic—but in light of the type of rioting we've had on the campuses it was inevitable. Those who advocate revolution ought to realize that the society they want to overthrow has the ability to fight back. At Kent State it was a few frightened national guardsmen who used the weapons at their command to retaliate.

Mostly I'm amazed at the patience and tolerance with which society has met the student rebels. I'm getting quite impatient with college administrators who don't seem to have enough sense to expel so-called students whose only real goal seems to be the destruction of the university.

The four deaths at Kent were tragic. So are all the deaths of students in auto accidents and from drug overdoses. But why compound the tragedy?

AGREED IN 1950

One other thought. I agreed, when it was an issue in the 1950's, that college students should not be required to participate in ROTC training. But I think those that believe that no college student should have an opportunity to receive ROTC training are just as stupid as were those who insisted that all college young men must take the training.

Frankly, the intolerance of the vocal group on your campuses frightens me.

Well, I'll get off my soap box because I doubt if my hymn of discontent makes much sense.

My real concern is that each of you keep in mind what you came to college for and not let the side issues detract you from your goal.

Each of you may want to play an active political role in society in the future, but you'll be more effective in that role if you've proved your ability to play a useful role in that society—by acquiring training and skills useful to that society. So I guess I'm saying, in effect, do your darndest to keep out of the hot spots and out of the line of fire—if it comes to that.

All is well at home. Wags has not staged any protest demonstrations of his own—but

I expect he would if we didn't keep serving him his ground chuck.

I'm looking forward to seeing Cal this week and I'll be an awfully proud dad when Sue gets her degree on May 28. As a matter of fact, I'm awfully proud of each of you—as well I should be.

Unless instructions are changed, I'll plan to pick up Jan on the morning of the 26th and Cal the afternoon of the same day. Sue, will you be having any time off before graduation?

Love,

DAD.

NATIONAL DISGRACE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine recently called my attention to an editorial in the May 28 issue of the Hellenic Chronicle which places the recent tragedy at Kent College in its proper perspective. He feels, and I agree, that the editorial deserves the thoughtful consideration of all who read this RECORD. I include the entire text at this point in the RECORD:

NATIONAL DISGRACE

The Kent occurrence of last week is a national disgrace—and not for the reason the media would want us to believe. The failure of parents and educators was brought into sharp focus. The Benjamin Spock generation—supposedly bent on peace—has matured into a frightful ogre. Thanks be to God that a majority of youth have not been raised in the permissive atmosphere that spawns the tragedies we witnessed last week.

The youngsters, needled on by agitators of a very doubtful political stripe, went at this intemperance with the attitude this was a game of sorts whose rules they could manipulate at will. By the rules of this game it is perfectly correct to burn buildings at random, to deprive other students of their legitimate right to belong to the ROTC, to spew invectives and obscenities at the national guard called to protect life and property. The game takes a serious turn when, by account of one student observer from Vermont, the mob turned upon the National Guardsmen with rocks, railroad spikes and lengths of pipe. Those soldiers had a perfect right to defend themselves, even to the extent of firing into the crowd.

The deaths of four young people is a terrible tragedy, but it must be carried on the consciences of the people like the president of Yale University, the Mayor of New York City, the television personalities and others who have been promoting this confrontation. The extension of the war into Cambodia was accomplished a long time ago by the Communists. But, strangely enough, we have never heard the voice of Senator Fulbright raised against anything the Communists have done. The decision of the military to wipe out the sanctuaries of the Vietcong in Cambodia is a necessary prelude to a safe withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam. Were this not accomplished our men would be sitting ducks for the Communist gunners.

And since when must the national policy of this nation be formed on the streets and in the gutters by the Abbey Hoffmans? Those who speak of revolutions should not act so surprised when the cost of revolt is the lives of the front-line soldiers—in this case young college students. President Nixon is the president of the United States—not Johnny Car-

son or Merv Griffin. Yet their programs are frontal propaganda attacks on the President of the United States. They speak of a national decency, yet they are the main violators.

We can sympathize with the parents of the students who died needlessly. But they must also share the blame for the debacle which occurred. The difficulty is that too many parents, disciples of the Dr. Spock philosophy of raising children, have been so permissive with their children as to allow a complete disregard for authority. That, in effect, releases many lethal forces.

STUDENT UNREST

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in our extreme concern over recent student violence and riots, it is often too easy to lump all students together as troublemakers and radicals, when, in fact, a small, but well-organized, group of militants is frequently the activating force for violence. Many times these radicals do not even belong to the campus involved and conveniently depart the scene when law enforcement officials begin arrests. The new student body president of Stanford University, Pat Shea, of Lemon Grove, Calif., recently made some pointed observations on this subject in the San Diego Evening Tribune and I am pleased to share his comments with my House colleagues:

YOUNG AMERICA—STUDENT LEADER WARNS OF PERIL: DESTRUCTION CALLED GOAL OF MILITANTS

(By Monty Norris)

A Lemon Grove youth who recently took office as student body president of Stanford University is asking for community support in combating what he described as "professional revolutionaries bent on shutting this country's universities down."

"Most of them aren't students at all," said Pat Shea, 20, a junior philosophy major at the university. "They are transient radicals that drift from one campus to another, organizing demonstrations and encouraging violence."

He described the militant revolutionaries as "well-organized and efficient."

"When things get hot (meaning the arrival of police or National Guard units on campus) the leaders disappear and leave naive students holding the bag."

Shea, the son of Dr. and Mrs. Peter Shea of 2362 Golden Ave. in Lemon Grove, urged community support to help battle the kind of violence that has plagued the Stanford campus now for two weeks.

Shea, who took office last week in the top student post, said he hoped to rally the support of his fellow students to "choke off this violence before it shuts down the university."

Shea said: "If the community and alumni turn their back on us now they will be playing right into the hands of the militant revolutionaries."

The student leader said that issues such as U.S. involvement in South Asia are "not the real issues at all."

"The whole thing is really an attack on our society," Shea said in a telephone interview from the strife-torn campus. "Demonstrators want to shut the university down—they want to bring the terrors of war to the United States, and ruin the image of our great universities."

Shea likened the situation to a small country being subverted by foreign intruders. He said that if the violence does not end soon, the university will be forced to close down completely. Already, many classes have been canceled, Shea said, because of the rampage which began early last week.

Shea said that many students have dropped out of school because of the disturbances. Others have been taken out by their worried parents.

Shea, along with a team of students, faculty and administrators, has been meeting with officials in Washington about the nationwide spread of campus violence and its relation to military training and other key issues of campus dissent.

Student demonstrators are demanding an immediate end to Reserve Officer Training Corps—(ROTC) units on campus, a termination of government financed, war oriented research, a halt to military action in Southeast Asia and a release from prison of what the radicals describe as "political prisoners."

"Most students are concerned about increased military involvement in Southeast Asia," Shea said, "but the militants use these and other emotional causes as rallying points for violence."

"I've talked with several of the militants and they are interested solely in destroying our entire social structure as we now know it. They know the best place to begin is with the university."

Shea explained how the militants work, roaming from campus to campus and capitalizing on student unrest and peaceful demonstrations.

"They spread out during a sit-in and begin shouting obscenities and violent slogans and trying to rally support. They'll start scuffles and fights. Everyone gets emotional and panicky. Pretty soon one of the militants throws a brick or something through a window and then all hell breaks loose."

To support his evaluation of violent tactics, Shea described a recent roundup by police of 24 demonstrators. He said only 11 of them were students, and of the students arrested, nine were freshmen.

"That says something about what's happening," Shea said. "The militants stir things up and then cut out before the 'bust' (arrests)."

Shea described the usually picturesque campus as being a shambles since violence erupted early last week. He said there are few windows now left intact anywhere on the campus. Two research buildings, containing a decade of scholarly works, were damaged by fire believed set by arsonists last Friday about three hours after demonstrators were routed from another building.

Damage resulting from rioting and vandalism is now estimated at more than \$250,000.

The university administration has refused requests by demonstrators to grant amnesty to those responsible for the violence.

The violence took its most threatening turn last weekend when a shotgun blast ripped through the front door of the home of Col. Stanley Ramey, commander of the Stanford ROTC unit. No one was injured in the incident, although the pellets narrowly missed one of the officer's sons.

Shea emphasized that the university cannot last without the help and support of the community. He said he is trying to rally the support of students to "choke off this insane destruction."

But he said he doubted the university could do it alone now.

Demonstrations and sit-ins continued this week, with only sporadic outbreaks of violence and some window smashing.

Shea said smashing windows was known among militants as "trashing."

"It's a popular term up here," he said. "It's all part of their scheme to turn the university and our society into rubble."

Only about 1,000 of the 10,000 student population at Stanford are involved in demonstrations, Shea said. Perhaps less than 200 are in any way involved in actual violence. But, he said, outside agitators offer strength, cunning and know-how to the vandalism operation.

Shea said that 99 per cent of the students do not support violence of any kind.

COMPULSORY UNION FEATURE OF POSTAL REFORM BILL ATTRACTING WIDE COMMENT

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, despite claims in some quarters that right to work is not an issue in H.R. 17070, the pending postal reform bill, the press has recognized the true situation and editorial comment from throughout the Nation has been widespread. At this point in the RECORD, I shall insert comments from various newspapers:

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 2, 1970]

COMPULSORY POSTAL UNION PLAN BODES ILL FOR ALL

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Responsible reform of the U.S. postal system merits high priority on Capitol Hill, but the pending "compromise" bill is worse than no bill at all. This is no compromise, this is a sellout—and reforms the bill offers are not worth the price.

In the nature of things, primary attention has been focused on a raise for postal workers: How much of a raise and when would they get it? A great deal also has been written of a corresponding increase in postal rates; How much of an increase and who would fix it?

These issues are important, but they obscure the fatal precedent sleeping in this bill. Under the deal worked out between the Nixon administration and the AFL-CIO, it is proposed—fantastic as it seems—simply to sell out the freedom of thousands of non-union postal workers. The bill permits the writing of a union shop contract between the government and the postal unions. Under such a contract, every worker would have to join a union within 30 days or lose his job.

It beggars belief that a Republican administration could have made itself party to this deal. The Republican platform of 1968 expressly reaffirmed the GOP's commitment to a right to join, or a right to refrain from joining, a union of public employees. The concept of a union shop in public employment was repudiated by President Kennedy in his day. Labor Secretary Shultz opposed the idea as recently as last November. Former Labor Secretary Goldberg once told a union convention, "I know you will agree with me that the union shop and the closed shop are inappropriate to the federal government."

Why did Postmaster General Blount surrender? He was told, in so many words, that organized labor would throw its weight against any postal reform unless a union shop were authorized. He also was told that unless the impatient clerks and carriers got their raises, and swiftly, he could expect the postal strike to be resumed. Looking down this double-barreled shotgun, Blount caved in.

But one of the enduring facts of political life is that, while a president proposes, Con-

gress disposes. The agreement between Blount and George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, is not binding upon members of the House and Senate. They are free to reject this high-handed proposal not only on its merits but also for its effect on public employment everywhere.

Meany, to his credit, has been utterly frank about his intentions. He told the House Post Office Committee in April that he views the pending bill as "only the beginning." If he can win a union shop in the Post Office Department, with its 750,000 workers, he will seek the same kind of collective bargaining "for all civilian workers of the federal government."

The AFL-CIO News added the obvious echo: "What's good enough for Uncle Sam ought to be good enough for every state, county, and city."

It is one thing for a private corporation to negotiate a union shop contract binding its workers to union membership. Such contracts are forbidden in right-to-work states, but Taft-Hartley permits them elsewhere. In any event, a right to work for U.S. Steel is a qualified right.

But the right of a United States citizen to work for his own government approaches an absolute right. It cannot be conditioned upon the payment of union dues. If a man is otherwise qualified to carry the mail, it is simply none of the government's business whether he wishes to belong or not belong to a labor union.

Amendments to delete this intolerable provision from the bill were offered in committee, on both the House and Senate sides. The amendments were defeated, but they will be back on the floor. Members will want to understand clearly the magnitude of this issue. They will be voting on compulsory unionism in the government of a free society. The postal workers are first, but if the bill is passed, they will not be the last.

[From the Washington Daily News,
June 2, 1970]

"RIGHT" TO A POSTAL JOB

President Nixon's year-old effort to extract from Congress a workable reorganization of the decrepit Post Office now is threatened with another serious snag.

The issue this time is a section of the postal reform bill which would permit unions of postal employees to negotiate a closed shop. On the theory that if a union shop is negotiable the unions will get it, substantial groups of members in both the Senate and House are threatening to block enactment of the whole bill.

There are several pertinent objections to the union shop ideas.

The Post Office is a public service, and even under the reform bill would be financed in part by taxes. It ought not be subject to rule, directly or indirectly, by union politicians.

Government service should be open to any citizen who wishes to work for the government, who is needed and who can qualify for the job, whether or not he belongs to a union.

The bill would not permit union shops among postal employees who work in any of the 19 states which now have "right-to-work" laws. Either way you look at it, this creates discrimination among postal employees.

The bill also would eliminate the current practice of requiring postal unions to pay for the bookkeeping inflicted on the government by a dues checkoff. Why should the taxpayers pay for this?

The postal bill already does more for unions in the government than any legislation up to now. It officially recognizes unions as spokesmen for their members; it sets up a system for dealing with wages, working conditions and grievances; and it includes another pay raise of 8 per cent.

There are big gains in this for postal workers. And doubtless more to come if the Post

Office can be reorganized on a modern basis. Considering the neglect which has beset the postal service and its employees all these years, this is pretty good for starters. The compulsory union section is neither needed nor good business.

[From the Arkansas Democrat, May 28, 1970]
POSTAL UNIONISM

There are several things wrong with the Nixon administration's postal reform bill, which has now been approved by both the Senate and House post office committees. One of the most important ones is that the bill could create compulsory unionism in the post office.

The post office department would be replaced by something called an independent U.S. Postal Service, run by a board of governors, who would have broad authority to do such things as negotiate wage contracts with postal unions. Strikes would be illegal under the bill, but machinery for arbitration, with decisions binding on both management and labor, is established for settling all other disputes. The unions would be perfectly free to press for a union shop, which would mean that postal workers would have to join a union or lose their jobs. The U.S. Postal service could reject the demand, but when an arbitrator came in to hear the dispute, he could certainly rule for compulsory unionism.

This loophole plainly violates what President Nixon and his labor secretary, George P. Schultz, have said several times—they did not believe people should have to belong to unions to work for their government. We don't think so either. In fact, closed shops are against the law in Arkansas and in 18 other states that have right-to-work laws. What would happen in these states if the bill passed? It's not clear at this point, because while the state laws under Taft-Hartley are supposed to take precedent where there is a conflict over the closed shop, this principle has been violated in some instances. However, you would think the state law would dominate because it would be grossly unfair to impose compulsory unionism on some workers in a state and not on others.

Of course, we think it is wrong for a government employee in any state to have to join a union. To prevent this, Rep. David Henderson, D-N.C., tried to amend this bill when it was before the House committee. He wanted to insert this phrase: "Each employee of the postal service has the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join and assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right." In other words, Henderson, who comes from another one of the right-to-work states and is proud of it, sought to guard against compulsory unionism the same way that the administration sought to protect itself against strikes. But his amendment was voted down, 14 to 8.

He has vowed to re-introduce it when it comes to the House floor. We hope he will and that the amendment becomes a part of the bill. Compulsory unionism should have no place in a free government. Certainly if it is allowed in the post offices it could not be prohibited with justification in other branches of the federal government.

JOHN McCORMACK

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a relative newcomer to Congress, I have

not had the privilege of a long association with Speaker McCORMACK as many of my colleagues have had. However, it does not take long to gain an appreciation for this exceptional man.

Blessed with a keen mind and a wry humor, JOHN McCORMACK has brought to his job as Speaker an insight and ability of the highest order. His perceptive and able manner, combined with an uncanny insight into the workings of the Congress, have won him the admiration of all who know him. Long instrumental in getting enacted measures that would have otherwise been buried in the legislative process, he has been the force that got things done.

Today I join my colleagues in saluting Speaker McCORMACK for his long and outstanding service to the Congress and to our Nation, and extend to him my personal thanks for a job well done.

THE ARMS TRADE—PART XII

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues might be interested in an article which appeared recently in the Philadelphia, Pa., Sunday Bulletin.

Significantly, it is written by a military man and concerns itself with the new military reality of the atomic age—namely, that modern war is not necessarily nuclear war but guerrilla war, sometimes known as insurgencies or revolutionary war.

All the 56 wars since 1945 have been fought with standard military hardware such as rifles, pistols, grenades, tanks, patrol boats, helicopters, and jet fighter and bomber aircraft. None have been fought with nuclear weapons. Virtually all of the arms used in these conflicts have been supplied by the great industrialized nations.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if there ever is a nuclear war it likely will be triggered by a nonnuclear war escalating out of control. Colonel Heintz, the author of this article, notes that there are some 30 nonnuclear conflicts in progress at this very moment—each one of which is capable of provoking a holocaust.

There are absolutely no international agreements to limit and control the \$5-billion-a-year trade in these conventional weapons. While I do not subscribe to the notion that no arms would mean no wars, I do believe that many of these wars would be of shorter duration, of lower intensity and more easily controllable if the major suppliers—the United States, Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, and some 20 other countries—would not distribute their military products with such reckless zeal, particularly to the poor and backward countries which are the ones doing most of the fighting. Indeed, I am convinced that many of these wars would never have occurred at all if arms had been denied the disputants.

This article emphasizes once again the need to review our entire military arms

aid program, to have the subject of the arms trade debated in the United Nations, and to begin multilateral talks among the great powers on ways to check and control this most dangerous trade in death. The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Sunday Bulletin, May 24, 1970]

A WORLD AT WAR IN AN AGE OF "PEACE"
(By Col. R. D. Heini, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Although nuclear conflict is supposed to be the dominant mode of future war, there have been more than 50 significant international clashes since 1945, nearly twice as many internal armed struggles, and not a single nuclear explosion in battle.

Depending on how you count them, at least 30 conflicts worth calling a war are in progress today.

Yet, during the quarter-century since we dropped the atom bomb in 1945—some of the most troubled, violent and belligerent years in world history—the armed forces of the two most powerful states have come no nearer fighting each other than the Soviet-U.S. confrontation over the Cuban missile crisis in 1962. And, during this same quarter-century of continuous conflict, there has not been a single declaration of war.

Declared, formal war, governed in greater or less degree by international law and by rules of land warfare, fought on both sides by uniformed, professionally trained and oriented soldiers, appears to be nearly as remote from the 1970s as nuclear war, and possibly more so.

Very conceivably, both modes of war have lost much if not all their relevancy in an era when 15 or more political insurgencies crop up every 12 months. Not all of these blaze high enough to be called wars, but many do.

Nobody "declares war" any more, but men are shooting and killing each other today in 30 large and small conflicts all around the globe.

While all this has been happening, an entirely different kind of war—military action at the opposite end of the spectrum of force and the spectrum of law—has conquered more territory, engaged more troops and laid waste more national resources, than the so-far hypothetical "Third World War," the nuclear holocaust that hasn't happened.

This other kind of war—guerrilla war, insurgency, revolutionary war, "war of national liberation," as Khrushchev named it—is probably the most significant politico-military phenomenon of our century. Maybe it deserves to be called, as some French authorities already do, starkly and simply, "Modern War."

Out of some 250 recorded instances of revolutionary insurgency since the dawn of history, nearly a hundred have occurred in this century, two-thirds of them since the end of World War II.

People's war, or insurgency, is nonetheless not the exclusive mode of warfare practiced in our times. Unhappily, there have also been numerous conventional (if undeclared) limited wars fought out during the last 25 years. Examples are the Korean War, the Suez intervention by France and England, clashes between India and Pakistan, the wars of Israel, and China's aggressions against India.

Many phases of the most complex of all—Vietnam with its added Cambodian and Laotian aspects—represent (in terms of military techniques and organization, at least) conventional war at its most deadly and hard-fought.

Yet conventional (i.e., limited, non-nuclear) war must today be regarded as the exceptional (or at least minority) form of war on a world scene tormented by guerrilla insurgency, civil war and daily military coups.

What must be faced is that there is no peace in our time, nor has there been since 1941. We are caught up in what is already a Thirty Years War and what might well prove to be a Hundred Years War. In a word, most of the world is already engaged in some segment of World War III and has been since 1946.

"CIVILIZING" WAR

Besides overturning the rules and restrictions, we have laboriously contrived to tame or "civilize" war. The past quarter-century of conflict has blurred if not effaced the most fundamental distinction in war as we have come to view it.

This is the distinction between soldier and civilian, between combatant and non-combatant. The tendency to erase this distinction first arose with the airpower and strategic-bombing, city-busting dogmas of Douhet and Billy Mitchell prior to World War II.

During that war, with the "highest motives" (future world peace and freedom), the world's air forces wiped out civilians and cities just as routinely as the infantry wiped out pillboxes. Today, at the other extreme of warfare from airpower and city-busting, the whole character and effectiveness of revolutionary war, or people's war, also depends on erasing the distinction between combatant and non-combatant.

We have not yet really learned to cope with war in the absence of this distinction. My Lai proves this fact abundantly.

There is in further fact still some question that we have learned to think of war as anything but a matter of firepower. (General Westmoreland, for example, is even supposed to have said that the answer to guerrilla tactics is firepower!)

NO CONVERTS

We do not seem to have realized fully that bombing villages, or strafing people in a free-fire zone, has never yet won a convert. Indeed, we have not grasped to any extent the implications of J. F. C. Fuller's profound observation to the effect that, whereas we fight our wars to destroy our enemies, the Communists wage theirs to convert them.

We have still found no way out of the trap whereby our strongest weapon—modern firepower—is, by a hideous trick of psychological warfare, turned against the society we are trying to save.

In Korea, the Communist tactic in defending Seoul compelled us to flatten the city. Eighteen years later, a comparable stratagem by Communist defenders leveled American bombs, flame and artillery against Hue, the most lovely and historic city of Indochina.

Future histories by the Vietnamese may record that the Americans "saved" Hue in 1968. Those histories surely will record that we destroyed much of it. Whether those same histories, on the other hand, will record the ghastly mass graves of three thousand slaughtered non-Communist citizens at Hue, we cannot say.

Another monument to U. S. incomprehension of the dynamics of war today has been the clear-cut failure of "controlled escalation" as a strategy for fighting a limited and therefore political war.

Among many other reasons for the costly frustrations and failures of Vietnam, reliance on the controlled-escalation strategy (often advocated by Robert S. McNamara and his civilian advisors) will be ranked high.

Our carefully selective and gradually intensified bombing of North Vietnam after the Tonkin Gulf incident actually discredited both the underlying strategy itself and with it the ability of airpower to force political decisions, let alone win modern wars.

SOME ENCOURAGEMENT

Amid so much that seems futile and desperate in this era of war, there are, however, crumbs of encouragement.

One ground for encouragement is, of

course, that virtually all states—and especially the nuclear ones—seem to have tacitly committed themselves to controlling and limiting the use of force where force is unavoidable. Some states, alas, even seem to have concluded that forms of limited war can be made to pay.

Only 15 years ago, in Eisenhower times, U.S. officials commonly said and believed that once war occurs, it has no limits save those required to win an all-out victory. Today, we no longer talk that way.

Despite hysterical spasms of fear of nuclear war, the real wars we rationally and immediately consider are limited wars. This is a triumph of realism and possibly of reason.

NEED FOR CONTROL

Philosophically speaking, it can even be argued that nuclear war has, in today's materialistic age, replaced the fire and brimstone of old-fashioned hell.

But the nuclear era has not yet made armed conflict out-of-date. What it has done, quite successfully, is to turn world attention to the need to control and limit the dimensions of war.

THIRTY WAR AREAS OF 1970

At least thirty places are fields of war, conflicts and insurgencies today—in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America.

Name/locale and participants

Middle East War: Israel vs. Egypt, Libya, Sudan, Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Algeria, Saudi Arabia, South Yemen, and other Arab states.

Cyprus: Greek vs. Turkish Cypriots.

Lebanon: Lebanese government vs. Syrian Saeqa guerrillas.

Iraq Iranian border: Iraq vs. Iran (Kurdish guerrilla operations).

South Arabia: Dhofar Liberation Front vs. Muscat and Oman.

Sudanese civil war: Southern vs. northern Sudanese.

Angola: Portuguese vs. African insurgents.

Mozambique: Portuguese vs. African insurgents.

Portuguese Guinea: Portuguese vs. African insurgents.

Rhodesia: Zambian guerrillas vs. Rhodesia/S. Africa.

Mozambique-Angola: Zambian guerrillas vs. Portuguese.

Kenya: Somali "Shifita" bandits vs. Kenya.

Ethiopia: Eritrean Liberation Front insurgents vs. Ethiopia.

Chad: Civil war between local factions combined with anti-French insurgency.

Ruanda: Batutsi guerrillas vs. ruling Bahuti tribe.

Vietnam: South vs. North Vietnamese and Viet Cong; U.S. and allies vs. North Vietnam.

Thailand: Thai government vs. Meo, Chinese-Malaysian and North Vietnamese insurgents.

Malaysia: Chinese insurgents vs. Malaysia.

Burma: Chinese and indigenous insurgents vs. Burma.

Tibet-Nepal-N. E. Frontier of India: Chinese and indigenous insurgents vs. Nepal and India.

Cambodia: Kmer Serei and North Vietnamese vs. Cambodian forces; U.S. troops vs. North Vietnamese forces.

Laos: Laotian factions and U.S. vs. North Vietnamese and other insurgents.

Mongolia-Manchuria: China vs. USSR.

Korea: North Korean incursions vs. South Korea.

Philippines: Huk insurgency, Luzon.

Guatemala: Communist insurgents vs. Guatemala.

Venezuela: Castroite guerrillas vs. Venezuela.

Colombia: Castroite guerrillas vs. Colombia.

Uruguay: Urban insurgents vs. Uruguay.

Honduras-El Salvador: Border hostilities following "Soccer War."

FAMILIES OF WAR WOUNDED GET ANTIWAR PHONE CALLS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation paid tribute last weekend to its war dead in the traditional Memorial Day observances.

In preparing a pre-Memorial Day feature, the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News sent its Washington correspondent, Ronald J. Maselka, to visit area servicemen at Walter Reed Army Hospital.

The facts developed in his article cannot help but bring disgust to any reasonable person.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker: the men being interviewed had to ask that their last names be omitted.

Why? To spare their loved ones at home from antiwar telephone calls at all times of day and night.

As one of the men told the reporter in referring to the phone calls:

You know this takes a terrible toll on people's families. I never saw my mother with so many gray hairs. It's true, they also serve who only stand and wait.

Mr. Speaker, individuals who make such telephone calls can only be described as sick. They are a disgrace to humanity, picking unmercifully upon innocent families of men who have served their Nation and have suffered the physical consequences of armed conflict.

Following is Mr. Maselka's May 29 article:

FOR AREA MEN WOUNDED IN VIETNAM, MEMORIAL DAY CARRIES A SPECIAL MEANING
(By Ronald J. Maselka)

WASHINGTON, May 29.—"What do you say about Memorial Day that doesn't sound corny?", the Army captain asked.

The reporter shrugged, glancing at the young man's cane, the built-up heel on his left shoe, the white cast on the left hand where bullets had dashed in and out.

With the ongoing war in Vietnam, the holiday has special meaning. And with returning veterans, it has even more. That's why we came to Walter Reed Army Hospital. That's why we asked to talk with Sgt. Mike, 27, from Tonawanda, N.Y., and Specialist 4/C Dick, 21, from Akron, N.Y.

They wouldn't let us use their last names because their wives have received anti-war telephone calls—some obscene and some very early in the morning—after previous publicity.

Last Memorial Day, Sgt. Mike was in Vietnam guarding a jungle landing pad for U.S. helicopters, thinking about the family picnic he was missing back home. Today, he is in Puerto Rico for the week-end, compliments of the Disabled American Veterans. Sgt. Mike has lost both legs.

Specialist Dick is spending the week-end in Washington with his wife. He has lost some muscles in one leg, has no feeling in the other.

VICTIM OF MORTAR SHELL

A mechanic with an engineers' outfit, he was walking back from supper last November when a mortar shell exploded nearby. He had been in Vietnam about three weeks. He doesn't know how many operations lie ahead. Sgt. Mike stepped on a booby trap last

Fourth of July about 9:15 in the morning. He remembers the time because he saw his medical records and he was brought into the field hospital at 9:30.

"That chopper was right overhead at the time," he recalled, "and it couldn't have been 15 minutes before they got me to the hospital."

It was only seven weeks ago, after nine months of vain hoping, that Sgt. Mike's second leg was amputated.

Husky, with sandy brown hair, he isn't sure whether he'll try to go back to plant work or to school to become an industrial arts teacher.

"So I'm a double amp," he said. "It sounds like you're in real bad shape and you're gonna be confined to a wheelchair all your life. But you're not."

Noting that he has one artificial leg already and "can almost walk," he laughed when someone mentioned how he zooms around the hospital in his wheelchair, the "Ward 35" number imprinted on its canvas back like a racing car.

When he was home last week-end, Sgt. Mike took the phone off the receiver. There was anger for those who would badger his family, but no bitterness for the war.

TAKES IT AS IT IS

"I wouldn't say it changed my life," he argued. "Sure, I'm dependent on people for some things now. I can't climb up the roof. But last week-end at home, I carried out the garbage in my wheelchair, planted flowers. You make out one way or another."

Speaking of Memorial Day, he added: "You really realize that we're trying to commemorate the soldiers, not the wounded so much but those who have been killed. All those guys killed. What is it, 40,000 now? That's why I hate this talk of pulling out. That would mean a lot of those fellows lost their lives for nothing."

The young captain, 25, sat through the interview, watched the two soldiers in blue pajamas leave, one driving a wheelchair, one carrying crutches, just two of Walter Reed's average daily population of 700 Vietnam veterans.

Referring to the phone calls, he said: "You know this takes a terrible toll on people's families. I never saw my mother with so many gray hairs. It's true, they also serve who only stand and wait."

Then you talk about Memorial Day, the war, the graves, the pain. And then the future, the hope that someday Memorial Day will go out of style.

Maybe, just maybe, there won't be a war for so long that there won't be any soldiers' graves to put flowers on. And maybe they'll have Memorial Day just to mark another year of peace and there won't be any wounded to talk to.

ADULT LANGUAGE EDUCATION

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter which I received this week from Mrs. Olympia S. Pinto written in behalf of several citizens of Portuguese ancestry from Waterbury, Conn., who have completed an English language course offered as part of an adult basic education program.

It is deeply gratifying to know that the participants in the program are sincerely appreciative of the educational oppor-

tunity afforded to them and that they view their educational experience as enabling them to become better citizens of their city, State and country.

The letter from Mrs. Pinto follows:

WATERBURY, CONN.,

May 27, 1970.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Congress of the United States of America,
House of Representatives, Rayburn Of-
fice Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: As another successful year in Adult Basic Education and English as a Second Language Programs in the Evening Schools comes to a close it is important to write this letter and to let you know the following:

1. That the Portuguese Speaking People of Waterbury, attending the Washington Elementary Evening School, have asked me to take this opportunity to thank on their behalf the President of the United States of America, Mr. Richard M. Nixon, the Health, Education, and Welfare Departments, Governor John Dempsey of Conn. Honorable Mayor Edward D. Bergin, of Waterbury, Dr. Michael Wallace, Superintendent of Schools, Mr. James A. Dorsey, Consultant of A.B.E. and Mr. John Crowe Coordinator of Federal Funds, and Mr. James P. Tyrrell, Director of Adult Basic Education in Waterbury and especially you Mr. Monagan for your untiring efforts in obtaining the necessary funds to give them the opportunity of gaining an education to make them better citizens of our beloved City of Waterbury, State of Connecticut and this wonderful country of ours.

2. They are grateful also for the fine staff which was chosen so carefully to aid them in their English beginning and for the patience and confidence dispensed to them by this same staff who is made up of the following personnel, Mr. Edward Winslow, Mr. Louis Bosco, Mrs. Zelta Parks, Mr. John Hickey, Miss Eleanor Vollone and Mrs. Linda Vinhals.

3. The Portuguese People of Waterbury would be most happy if these thanks were to be put in the Congressional Record of the United States.

4. It has been my very happy privilege to be recruiter and organizer of these classes and to be part of the staff as a bilingual aide and teacher assistant.

5. With kind esteem and deep consideration for the many kind favors granted the Portuguese People of Waterbury and who will remain in your service as long as needed,

Very respectfully yours,

Mrs. OLYMPIA S. PINTO.

RECOGNITION OF CONGRESSMAN ARENDS' MANY YEARS IN CONGRESS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, when LES ARENDS first became Republican whip I was a 19-year-old soldier serving in the China-Burma-India Theater during World War II. That was a long, long time ago.

LES ARENDS is now my commanding officer in the whip organization. I can say with great sincerity that I never knew a man younger in spirit, more dedicated to his course, and so completely involved with the Congress he loves. I salute him with respect—and pleasure.

GEORGIA WOMAN'S SUCCESS IN
BUSINESS WORLD

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn that a constituent of mine, Mrs. Anne Kee, of Atlanta, Ga., was recently cited for special recognition for her accomplishments in the business world. She is unquestionably one of the very few women who has been so markedly successful with a franchise she holds from a large business enterprise.

Mrs. Kee is described by a close friend as "a gentle and warm person with a winning smile and a soft sincere voice." Others speak of her talent in "understanding and getting along with people," or being a discreet person, and always seeking to be helpful to others. She has a good deal of commonsense and a natural talent for leadership.

In our world of turmoil we often overlook the people who work hard and devotedly to make life a little better and a little happier. Our attention is distracted by those who shout loudest and contribute the least. We fail to take note of people like Mrs. Anne Kee, who do their chores day by day, quietly, resolutely, and thus accomplishing more.

A native of Macon, Ga., she was one of 12 children in a farm family. She studied evenings at a local college and worked during the day in a restaurant in order to maintain herself. In 1942, she came to Atlanta, where she worked for a film company. It was in Atlanta that she met her husband, Scott Kee, and they were married several months later. He was a law student and subsequently became associated with the legal department of a local company. They have a 17-year-old daughter.

Mrs. Kee has been associated with the business world all through her years in Atlanta. For many years she worked as consultant and later as division sales manager for Luzier Cosmetics, a subsidiary of Bristol-Myers Co. She supervised a team of 90 women who were in the top 10 in sales. Early in 1969, she became interested in a franchise with Bonanza International, Inc., and a short time later she opened this family steak house located in Stone Mountain, Ga.

Over the years, Mrs. Kee and her husband continued to take an active interest in church work and civic affairs. I have had the pleasure of meeting them on many occasions and they are also well known to my parents.

I have also been to their restaurant several times and on each such occasion I was impressed with their aim; namely, to provide a clean, friendly, happy place for all. This aim has been so successful during the past year that Mrs. Kee is now planning to expand the services and facilities. I have heard people ask: "What's Anne's secret to success?" The secret is simply perseverance: She sets her goal, she thinks of ways to fulfill it, and does not allow anything to deter her from that goal. She has always had the full support

of her family in her enterprises. They are deeply religious and their belief in God is reflected in their daily lives.

Last December, the Tucker Star, a newspaper published in Tucker, Ga., carried a fine story about Mrs. Kee and the very able way in which she operates her restaurant. It speaks well of this lady's business acumen and success. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD this brief article, which reads as follows:

GEORGIA WOMAN'S SUCCESS IN BUSINESS
WORLD

The true joy of Christmas is families sharing and doing things together; and what better way to gather one's family and friends than to dine at the Bonanza Sirloin Pit on Memorial Drive near DeKalb College.

In an atmosphere of congeniality, this reporter and family enjoyed all the pleasures of home while consuming beef steaks fit for any king.

It was very impressive watching the "little" lady smiling and greeting customers, and after several refills on coffee (at no extra cost) I had to tell her what a pleasure it was being there. The combination of good food and attentive service is noticed immediately.

Mrs. Anne Kee revealed to us that she had purchased the Bonanza franchise after an extensive search for a place in an area representing both change and growth. Located near the DeKalb College Campus, the Bonanza Sirloin Pit opened July 1 this year at 5 o'clock. Since that date and time, the volume of diners have been staggering. Mrs. Kee responds with warmth and dedication.

Mrs. Kee believes that many factors have played a part in the success of the "Pit". She says she has advertised in the newspapers some and that it has helped. And satisfied customers have carried the word back to their friends and neighbors. Anne continued to emphasize that pleasing her customers was the number one goal at her Bonanza "Pit".

She can be seen checking the quality of the food, both before and after preparation—and she continually moved among the diners pouring coffee and attending to the various chores that go with making a restaurant more than just another place to eat—a homey atmosphere. Pricing practices on their menus have been held in pace with the times. This has been done by employing skilled and industrious workers, thrifty purchasing practices and being involved herself.

The evening ended; my eye scanning the 200-seat facility as Anne ended the conversation—picking up a container of coffee in one hand and an extra supply of napkins in her other hand as she began to make another round through the dining area.

CAMBODIA AND THE WORLD
COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the opposition to the Cambodian campaign from the plush offices of the World Council of Churches was based on doctrine rather than theology.

The Reuters News Service reports that Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish socio-agitator of Brown against Topeka judicial fame, has reported the liberation of medical supplies valued at \$179,000 which had been given to the Vietcong

in South Vietnam. Myrdal, head of the Swedish Vietnam Committee to support "liberation" causes has also confirmed that 16 tons of medical supplies contributed by similar movements and the World Council of Churches were supplied during the month of February.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a newsclipping from Reuters for June 3, 1970, as follows:

SOUTH KOREA RULES OUT CAMBODIA
ARMS AID

In Stockholm, sociologist Gunnar Myrdal said Cambodia's new government had seized medical supplies worth about \$179,000 sent to the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

Myrdal, chairman of the Swedish Vietnam Committee, said 16 tons of medical supplies contributed by countries and the World Council of Churches was sent to the Cambodian capital Feb. 17.

BEHIND ENEMY LINES: A
REPORTER'S STORY

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD the third in a series of articles written by Robert S. Boyd, chief of the Knight Newspapers Washington Bureau. Mr. Boyd recently returned from North Vietnam and reports the following:

HANOI'S VIEW OF WAR: SAME WORDS,
DIFFERENT MEANING

(By Robert S. Boyd)

The North Vietnamese people have available to them a totally different picture of the war in Indochina than we are usually given in the United States.

The view from Hanoi is almost a mirror-image on the perspective from Washington.

Many of the words are the same—but the meaning is just the opposite.

This helps explain why North Vietnamese actions which seem illogical, unfair or cruel to Americans appear logical, fair and just to someone who lives north of the demilitarized zone.

You don't have to agree with them. But it's important to understand their point of view. Then you can see better why we're having such a devil of a time ending this war.

Here are some samples of the wildly clashing concepts Americans and North Vietnamese hold:

Who started the war?

We say North Vietnam did, by invading the south beginning in 1960.

They say the United States did, by picking up where the French colonials left off in 1954 and occupying the southern half of their country.

Who's winning?

We say we are. The north has been badly beaten and is now too weak to undertake sustained offensives. The Saigon regime is growing stronger all the time.

They say they're winning. They have already "won" the air war in the North by forcing the United States to halt large-scale bombing. They are gaining steadily in the south as U.S. forces go on the defensive and start to pull out.

What's the solution?

We say it's for the North Vietnamese to stop their "aggression" against the south, bring their troops home, and "let their neighbors alone."

They say it's for the Americans to stop our "aggression," take our troops home and "let

the Vietnamese people settle their affairs themselves."

Of course, the North Vietnamese version is the official party line. It's not necessarily the same as reality, any more than the "line" put out by the State Department and White House in Washington is 100 percent correct.

In some ways, it doesn't even matter which of these two versions of current history is more accurate.

Whether the ordinary man on a bicycle in Hanoi, or in a rice paddy in the countryside, believes his government's version doesn't matter either.

He probably does believe most of it. At any rate, it's the only version available to him. And besides, public opinion is of little importance in a country tightly controlled from the top, as most communist closed societies are.

The point is, the official pictures on display in the two warring nations simply don't mesh.

The differences go all up and down the line.

To the Pentagon, for example, the battles of Tet 1968 and Khe Sanh were glorious, if costly, victories.

In the Army museum in Hanoi, Tet 1968 and Khe Sanh are recorded as costly but glorious victories—for their side.

To Washington, the North Vietnamese are ruthless and untrustworthy. They failed to pull their troops out of Laos in 1954 as promised. They cannot be trusted with a share in a coalition government in Saigon.

To Hanoi, Americans are tricky and untrustworthy. They say we went back on a promise to let them hold nationwide elections in 1956. Nixon's "perfidy" in Cambodia is obvious.

According to President Nixon, his only non-negotiable demand is "self-determination" for the South Vietnamese. By this he means free elections conducted by an organization in which the present rules of Saigon as well as the communists have some say.

According to the heirs of Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi, "self-determination" is also their only non-negotiable demand. But by that they mean, "Yankee go home," and it's none of your business how we Vietnamese run our own society.

The fundamental difference in viewpoint, which distorts and destroys all attempts to reach mutual understanding, is over the question of just what Vietnam is.

To Washington, it is two states, North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The north must not be allowed to swallow up the south by force or guile.

To Hanoi, Vietnam has been one nation for 2,000 years.

North Vietnamese are fond, for obvious reasons, of pointing to the north's determination to reconquer the south in the American civil war.

Here, in brief, is how the war looks to the North Vietnamese:

America is a rich and powerful nation, inhabited by many decent, peace-loving people. Unfortunately, in the North Vietnamese view they are controlled by a small "ruling circle" which profits from war and foreign adventure.

These are the "imperialists" and "aggressors" who replaced the French colonialists in 1954. They are seeking to hang on to South Vietnam as a permanent colony of a new type.

At first, Hanoi contends, President Eisenhower and then Vice-President Richard Nixon foisted a puppet ruler on South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem.

When the South Vietnamese righteously undermined Diem, President Kennedy beefed up the U.S. "adviser" force, and launched a "special war" of counter-insurgency against the liberation forces.

After Diem fell and the communists were on the brink of victory, as the North Viet-

namese see it, President Johnson butted in. He sent half a million troops, installed a new set of puppets, Thieu and Ky, and expanded the war to North Vietnam.

When that didn't work and LBJ was chased from the White House, President Nixon tried still another tactic—Vietnamization. This is a trick, in Hanoi's view, to lull the American public by cutting down U.S. costs and casualties, and turning over the brunt of the fighting to Vietnamese.

But Mr. Nixon doesn't really mean to end the war, except on his own terms. He intends to keep a permanent occupation force of 200,000 men, plus the Seventh Fleet and U.S. Air Force nearby, to prop up Thieu-Ky and keep the Vietnamese from attaining their independence and unity.

The Paris peace talks are a fraud, according to the North Vietnamese—a smoke-screen to cover Mr. Nixon's real purpose, which is to continue the war in a vain quest for victory.

Mr. Nixon's plan won't work though, they say. It is bound to fail. Thieu and Ky are hopelessly corrupted by their dependence on foreigners. They are detested by all patriotic South Vietnamese.

As the U.S. troops are withdrawn, the Saigon regime will become weaker, and finally it will collapse or seek a deal.

The right course for North Vietnam, then, they contend, is simply to fight on. Victory will eventually be hers because history and injustice are on her side.

As they see it, this war is simply one more incident in 2,000 years of resistance against foreign invaders. Vietnamese are fighting on their own soil for their independence. They are not attacking the United States or harming Americans.

Some day finally, the United States will get tired, realize it has made a terrible mistake, and go home.

Only then, according to this view from Hanoi, can there be peace in Vietnam.

FEDERAL COURT CASELOAD

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Crime, I wish to commend the Department of Justice for its decision to reduce the Federal caseload on automobile theft prosecutions by leaving most of these crimes to State and local authorities. The Department has advised U.S. attorneys to concern themselves only with cases of car theft rings, or automobiles used in commission of other crimes, or vehicles that are sold, stripped, or grossly misused.

I approve the action because it will permit Federal investigative, prosecutorial, and correctional functions to concentrate on greater obligations. No one wants automobile thefts overlooked, but there is a reasonable need for new priorities for action when one of every eight Federal court cases has involved these Dyer Act violations, and one of every five Federal prison inmates is in prison because of stolen cars.

We in the Congress, working with the Justice Department, have sought to help the State and local agencies through the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency. One supporting reason for LEAA is that

if the other elements of the correctional system work to combat automobile thefts, our Federal prosecutors and courts can speed up action against organized crime, interstate conspiracy and fraud, illicit narcotics, and other major Federal violations.

I am advised by the Department that we should know by July what this new delineation has achieved. I hope and believe that we should find solid evidence of important progress.

A POSITIVE RESPONSE TO AIR POLLUTION AND SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in the 3 years since we debated the last air pollution legislation which became the Air Quality Act of 1967, all of us have become increasingly aware that massive air contamination in many regions of our country is becoming so dangerous that more drastic and immediate steps must be taken to clean up and protect the air around us.

As the appropriations provisions in the Air Quality Act expire this year, we must review the act in line with immediate needs for more comprehensive and accelerated action at the Federal level to reverse the trend of all-encompassing atmospheric contamination.

Therefore, I am introducing a bill today to extend the duration of the Air Quality Act, provide for national air quality standards, regulate fuels and fuel additives, improve controls over automotive emissions, and establish national standards for dangerous emissions from stationary sources.

Implementation of many provisions of the Air Quality Act of 1967 has been very slow. The existing program for regulating air pollution from stationary sources is particularly limited and its enforcement provisions are cumbersome and ineffective. This new legislation I have submitted proposes establishment of national air quality standards, giving the States 6 months to adopt implementation plans. It would also establish national standards for extremely hazardous pollutants and for new sources of pollution which would threaten public health and welfare.

Automotive emissions must be reduced drastically to halt air pollution from that source. The automobile is responsible for 60 percent of the air pollution in the United States in general, and up to 92 percent in urban areas. In the face of increasing numbers of motor vehicles on the roads, we must make sure that all automobiles off the assembly line have control devices in proper working order.

Accordingly, the bill makes testing of assembly line vehicles mandatory, rather than relying on the testing of prototypes. It also closes existing loopholes for imported automobiles, making compliance with national standards mandatory for all. In addition the bill provides

for the regulation of gasoline composition and additives to achieve pollution reduction from that source.

Turning to the problem of solid waste disposal, I am introducing another anti-pollution bill today, which authorizes the Council on Environmental Quality to conduct studies and make recommendations regarding the reclamation and recycling of material from solid wastes, and to extend the provisions of the Solid Waste Act.

The existing Solid Waste Act emphasizes the effective disposal of waste materials. Since there was little initiative for reuse some years ago, we are now forced to recognize that our natural resources are not unlimited, and that we must, therefore, recycle and reuse waste materials, often many times over. At the same time, the mounting volume of trash and refuse created by new consumer products and marketing practices forces us to turn to easily disposable, degradable materials.

My bill proposes the development of incentives and regulations for reusing wastes or reducing their volume by efficient disposal methods. Research would be directed toward techniques for recycling of materials and for producing easily degradable packaging.

In particular the Council on Environmental Quality would develop a system of incentives to insure prompt scrapping and reuse of junk automobiles. Attention would also be given to the disposal of abandoned cars from the city streets, a problem which is plaguing New York City at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the passage of these two bills would mean a step forward toward a more livable environment and I urge my colleagues to favorably consider both these measures.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF
JEFFERSON DAVIS

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House that today is the 162d anniversary of the birth of Jefferson Davis. Few men in American history have been so misunderstood. Most Americans are aware that Davis was the President of the Confederate States of America, a fact that Mississippians can be proud of since Davis lived in Mississippi after the first decade of his life.

Jefferson Davis had a long and distinguished record of service to the United States prior to becoming President of the Confederacy. A graduate of West Point, Davis served brilliantly during the Black Hawk and Mexican Wars in the U.S. Army. Later he was elected to the House of Representatives and to the U.S. Senate from 1847-51 and 1857-61.

As Secretary of War during the administration of President Franklin Pierce—1853-57—he was given the responsibility by Congress for commission-

ing the sculptor Thomas Crawford to create the Statue of Freedom which now graces the dome of this Capitol. At the time the statue was put into place in 1863, Davis was already the President of the Confederate States of America.

When Mississippi seceded from the Union in January 1861, Davis resigned from the Senate and returned to Briarfield, his plantation outside Vicksburg, Miss. Preferring to remain with his wife, Varina Howell Davis, he nevertheless accepted the Presidency of the new nation. He was elected in October 1861, and was inaugurated February 22, 1862. The harsh imprisonment this great man suffered following the war broke his health, but not his spirit. He lived in Mississippi until 1889 when he died at his gulf coast home, Beauvoir.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the second full year since the tragic death of Robert F. Kennedy, a man who knew as well as any man the horrible effects of violence, himself a victim of violence's irrationality, a man whose compassion and quiet strength could have made a difference in today's troubled America.

Robert Kennedy spoke of violence in a speech made in Cleveland following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. As a tribute to his noble spirit and as words of advice to a Nation torn by violence, I include the text of his remarks in the RECORD. I also include Richard Harwood's excellent June 3 Washington Post article.

SPEECH BY ROBERT KENNEDY AT THE CITY CLUB IN CLEVELAND, OHIO, APRIL 5, 1968

This is a time of shame and sorrow. It is not a day for politics. I have saved this one opportunity to speak briefly to you about this mindless menace of violence in America which again strains our land and every one of our lives.

It is not the concern of any one race. The victims of the violence are black and white, rich and poor, young and old, famous and unknown. They are, most important of all, human beings whom other human beings loved and needed. No one—can be certain who will suffer from some senseless act of bloodshed. And yet it goes on and on.

Why? What has violence ever accomplished?

What has it ever created? No martyr's cause has ever been stilled by his assassin's bullet. No wrongs have ever been righted by riots and civil disorders. A sniper is only a coward, not a hero, and an uncontrolled, uncontrollable mob is only the voice of madness, not the voice of the people.

Whenever any American's life is taken by another American unnecessarily—whether it is done in the name of the law or in the defiance of law, by one man or a gang, in cold blood or in passion, in an attack of violence or in response to violence—whenever we tear at the fabric of life which another man has painfully and clumsily woven for himself and his children, the whole nation is degraded.

"Among free men," said Abraham Lincoln, "there can be no successful appeal from the ballots to the bullet; and those who take such appeal are sure to lose their cause and pay the costs." Yet we seemingly tolerate a rising level of violence that ignores our common humanity and our claims to civilization alike. We calmly accept newspaper reports of civilian slaughter in far-off lands. We glorify killing on movie and television screens and call it entertainment. We make it easy for men of all shades of sanity to acquire whatever weapons and ammunition they desire.

Too often we honor swagger and bluster and the wielders of force, too often we excuse those who are willing to build their own lives on the shattered dreams of others. Some Americans who preach nonviolence abroad fail to practice it here at home. Some who accuse others of inciting riots have by their own conduct invited them. Some look for scape-goats, others look for conspiracies, but this much is clear; violence breeds violence, repression brings retaliation, and only a cleaning of our whole society can remove this sickness from our soul.

For there is another kind of violence, slower but just as deadly, destructive as the shot or the bomb in the night. This is the violence of institutions; indifference and inaction and slow decay. This is the violence that affects the poor, that poisons relations between men because their skin has different colors. This is a slow destruction of a child by hunger, and schools without books and homes without heat in the winter.

There is the breaking of a man's spirit by denying him the chance to stand as a father and as a man among other men. And this too afflicts us all. I have not come here to propose a set of specific remedies nor is there a single set. From a broad and adequate outline we know what must be done. When you teach a man to hate and fear his brother, when you teach that he is a lesser man because of his color or his beliefs or the policies he pursues, when you teach that those who differ from you threaten your freedom or your job or your family, then you also learn to confront others not as fellow citizens but as enemies—to be met not with cooperation but with conquest, to be subjugated and mastered.

We learn, at the last, to look at our brothers as aliens, men with whom we share a city, but not a community, men bound to us in common dwelling, but not in common effort. We learn to share only a common fear—only a common desire to retreat from each other—only a common impulse to meet disagreement with force. For all this there are no final answers. Yet we know what we must do. It is to achieve true justice among our fellow citizens. The question is whether we can find in our own midst and in our own hearts that leadership of human purpose that will recognize the terrible truths of our existence.

We must admit the vanity of our false distinctions among men and learn to find our own advancement in the search for the advancement of all. We must admit in ourselves that our own children's future cannot be built on the misfortunes of others. We must recognize that this short life can neither be ennobled or enriched by hatred or revenge. Our lives on this planet are too short and the work to be done too great to let this spirit flourish any longer in our land.

Of course, we cannot vanquish it with a program, nor with a resolution. But we can perhaps remember even if only for a time—that those who live with us are our brothers, that they share with us the same short movement of life, that they seek—as we do—nothing but the chance to live out their lives in purpose and happiness, winning what satisfaction and fulfillment they can. Surely this bond of common faith, this bond of common goal, can begin to teach us something.

Surely we can learn, at least, to look at those around us as fellow men and surely we can begin to work a little harder to bind up the wounds among us and to become in our own hearts brothers and countrymen once again.

[Washington Post article by Richard Harwood]

Two years ago today on the waterfront in San Francisco, Robert Kennedy made one of the last speeches of his life.

"We want something different," he said, "something better, for ourselves and our children.

"We want a country respected abroad by the force of its example of justice and liberty at home.

"We want a country where a child's wealth does not limit his opportunity; where schools teach him to learn and to challenge and to grow as an independent human being.

"We want a country where men and women respect the diversity between themselves; and where we see each other again as brothers and countrymen in a common cause."

The words seem old-fashioned now, almost naive. The graves of the students killed at Kent State and Jackson State are still fresh. So are the graves of the men of Augusta and of the policemen shot down in New York.

In the Senate of the United States, Margaret Chase Smith warns of an approaching era of repression. Washington's hip weekly, Quicksilver Times, offers (borrowed from the Black Panthers) its young readers an illustrated recipe for the home manufacture of fire bombs and hand grenades: "Fill with 3/4 black powder and 1/4 shot, small headed nails or anything to use for shrapnel . . . If thrown in the open it will kill within a 25-foot radius and maim within 100 feet. I suggest you familiarize yourself with this weapon by practicing with a sand dummy."

Alabama, in the year 1970, has witnessed a political campaign in which the literature included the following: "White Alabama, are you going to let the niggers take over our state?"

"Who doubts now," Andrew Kopkind writes in his radical weekly, "that the seeds of revolution have taken root; that they are planted everywhere; and that another May will come?"

The President of the United States writes a mindless epitaph on the campus slaughter in May: "Violence begets violence." And outside his windows, mindless tormentors cry out for "One more war—bring the war home."

It was brought home to Martin Luther King two years ago this spring and on that occasion Robert Kennedy spoke of the options for this country:

"In this difficult day, in this difficult time for the United States, it is perhaps well to ask what kind of nation we are and what direction we want to move in. For those of you who are black you can be filled with bitterness, with hatred, with a desire for revenge. We can move in that direction as a country, in great polarization. Black people among black, white people among white, filled with hatred toward one another.

"Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand and to comprehend, and to replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand with compassion and love . . .

"What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence or lawlessness, but love and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or black . . ."

On the next day, Kennedy spoke again of

the "mindless menace of violence in America which stains our land and every one of our lives. It is not the concern of any one race. The victims of violence are black and white, rich and poor, young and old, famous and unknown.

"They are, most important of all, human beings whom other human beings loved and needed.

" . . . We can perhaps remember—even if only for a time—that those who live with us are our brothers, that they share with us the same short movement of life, that they seek—as we do—nothing but the chance to live out their lives in purpose and happiness, winning what satisfaction and fulfillment they can. Surely this bond of common faith, this bond of common goal, can begin to teach us something."

A little later he was himself dead, a victim of that unloving, vengeful spirit of violence that in a single decade had cut down King and Malcolm X and a young President.

This week the family and friends who loved and needed Robert Kennedy as a human being will go out to Arlington Cemetery and stand by his grave and ask again the question he had so often asked his countrymen: "What did violence ever accomplish?"

NORTH CAROLINIANS GIVE VIEWS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago a delegation of student and faculty members from the University of North Carolina came to Washington to register their concern over the expansion of the Vietnamese war into Cambodia.

At that time, the entire North Carolina delegation was pleased to meet with these students and teachers and to hear what they had to say.

I was impressed both by their seriousness and by their willingness to work constructively within the democratic system. And while I did not agree with everything they said, or with all their reasons for opposing American involvement in Southeast Asia, I did feel that they came well prepared for the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, so often we hear only of those young people who attempt to destroy our society when it does not change to suit them. It was a pleasure to listen to the delegation from the University of North Carolina, which used persuasion rather than coercion.

I insert the text of the students' and faculty members' remarks at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY TOMMY BELLO

Let me first introduce myself. My name is Tommy Bello, president of the student body at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and have lived my entire life in Raleigh, N.C. I would like to thank the N.C. delegation for its attendance today to hear our voice of protest.

I will lead off the presentation by addressing myself to one question. Why? Gentlemen, why was the formerly peaceful Carolina campus one week ago the scene of incredible unrest, of massive striking, of over six thousand students from the campuses of Duke, Carolina, State, and Shaw Universities joining in a march ending at the State Capitol on Friday? And yet at the same time,

why, with what has happened at other universities throughout the country, why has our protest been disciplined, peaceful, patriotic, and responsible?

Why? Well, the large number of students participating in the protest is indicative of a number of things. First, it is indicative of the widespread dissatisfaction and discontentment at President Nixon's decision to send troops into Cambodia and of our moral outrage at what has happened at Kent State University. Second, the numbers represent the amount of frustration students have felt for so long in their efforts to communicate their feelings to the political leaders of this country and see tangible results from their efforts.

The American political system has not been responsible to the seventeen million students who now attend this nation's colleges and universities. So many of us do not have a vote and in this manner have not been given the chance to become a responsible, participating part of the American system. Even more than this, we do not feel that our voice is being heard. I have in my hands the Congressional report on campus unrest dated June 17, 1969. That report stated: "It is apparent that Viet Nam originally served as one of the major factors in radicalizing students. It is still a major source of alienation and dissatisfaction with our society and our national government." Gentlemen, we have been saying this for over five years now. When will you listen?

The Cambodian incident only made us further realize how far removed we were from national decision-making; and when we saw how our protests, as sincere and concerned as they were, were met by the trooper's bullets at Kent State and the caustic words of our national leaders, we could not believe our eyes.

And yet gentlemen, so, so many of us still believe in this country and the democratic process. Thus we have unified to work peacefully and politically. On this campus, we have not been as much radicalized as we have been politicalized. Last weekend over three hundred students went out into the Chapel Hill community to talk to the voters and many thousands more went home to their local communities throughout the state to talk to their parents and friends about the extension of the war into Cambodia. Efforts are already underway to organize politically in every county in this state. As far as this campus is concerned, the time for political demonstration has ended, the time for political organization is just beginning.

We still believe in this country, but feel it is headed in the wrong direction. We are tired of all the violence and killing, whether it be in Viet Nam, Cambodia, or Kent State. And we are voicing our protest of this violence in the most constructive and productive manner that we know: by coming to you, the leaders of the state.

And so gentlemen, we come today in protest, but we come in peace. We come with a sincerity of conviction and a dedication to what we believe. And we come to be heard. I would only ask your kind attention to what every speaker has to say.

Thank you.

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH B. SHEDD

My name is Joe Shedd. I'm a senior majoring in Political Science. I'm a Morehead Scholar from Leonia, New Jersey.

I suppose a Yankee's credentials as a spokesman for a group from North Carolina might be questioned. For what it's worth I've been President of the campus YMCA for the past year, my great grandparents were North Carolinians, and my father, two uncles and two cousins are all graduates of UNC. So I can say that I'm a Tar Heel bred, and I can lay some claim to being a Tar Heel born as well.

Tom has illustrated the breadth and scope of the response students on our campus have made to the events of the last few weeks. I'd like to suggest what the depth of that response has been: I'd like to indicate some of the feelings and emotions students have experienced lately. No one has looked over my comments so I'll speak in the first person about my feelings. But I think what I want to say bears some relation to what others have been thinking.

The best word to express my feelings is uncertainty—uncertainty about where my nation is headed and uncertainty about what I can or ought to do.

I sense that Americans have finally decided to have done with the war. And I sense that we are being drawn into an expanding conflict.

I sense a renewed willingness among students to use electoral politics to effect changes in leadership and policy. And I sense a despair that no measure of political activity can have a significant effect on leaders or policies.

I sense an optimism that Congress is now ready to reassert its leadership in affairs of war and peace. And I sense a pessimism that we have come to the point where our system cannot accommodate more than one leader and that come hell, Congressional resolutions or 50,000 more deaths, we are at that leader's mercy.

I feel the rejuvenation of a democratic spirit. And I hear the words of the Vice President as harbingers of a growing intolerance for political dissent.

I note that there seems to be a reemerging respect for the individual and for human life. And I note that we can callously dismiss My Lai as a necessary, if "unfortunate," consequence of war.

I sense that perhaps now people regret the bitter divisions the war has caused among us. And I sense that perhaps it will continue to drive us even further apart.

The forebodings are no more depressing than the hopes are reassuring. The optimism and faith are just as real as the pessimism and despair. There is little coherence to my feelings, little on which to predict how things will turn out.

But I think a sense of purpose is emerging. It's a sense of purpose which assumes that a person will do what he thinks is right without the naive comfort of believing he's on the winning side. It's a sense of purpose which won't diminish with disappointments and defeats. It, too, has the potential for good and bad.

It can give a man courage. And it can generate an intolerance which mirrors the intolerance of some of our leaders. Hatred and pettiness are no more foreign to me and my generation than they are to any other. But that fact alone ought to convince us that we can't afford to pursue this war further.

I consider myself a loyal American. I'm proud to claim as part of my heritage a system of government and a body of ideas which affirms the right of people to work out their own patterns of living and thought. This war is ripping the fabric of our country apart and destroying the respect men ought to have for each others' differences and each others' dreams. I don't believe our heritage can be preserved in the atmosphere of fear, intolerance and callousness for human life that this war has spawned.

And I'm not sure if any of us know where we're headed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. DIXON, JR.

I am experienced at extemporaneous speaking: It is a part of my profession. I read this for one reason only. I want very badly to inform you of some things that are very close to my experience and to persuade you of things that are very strong in my belief. My time is brief and my task is difficult. I want

to be as precise and yet as accurate as possible. It is not my purpose to try to give you information you obviously have or to compel you to listen to opinions you have already heard. I want, rather, to convey to you what I have that you cannot have unless we tell you: a sense of who we are, of why we feel as we do and especially who these students are who have come here to speak with you.

There is one word above all I want to emphasize and that word is patriotism. If there is a single word, a single principle that would unite the members of this House it is "patriotism." It is a holy word to you and it is right it should be for you have custody of the public destiny of 200 million people. No single principle has so obstructed understanding of what we in the university feel than the passionate belief that we are unpatriotic, that we attack and reject our own country. It is obvious that we attack and reject the policies of our government but our motives are precisely a passionate love for the principles of our country. It is vital to know that the students you see around you are not radicals or rebels. Radicals and rebels we do have and they longed to seize control of this movement. But, with extraordinary skill, the students themselves—not the faculty, not the administration, not the police—the students themselves controlled their own rage and the rhetoric of the radicals and have concentrated their attention on the real issue and they do so with a passionate patriotism. They do so because they passionately believe that what we are doing in Vietnam, in Cambodia, in Laos, is un-American, unpatriotic, an offense against the basic principles that should give meaning to our country.

One of them looked at me and said, "I guess I really believe what they taught me in school about the American dream."

And what is the American dream they see our government supporting? We taught them that killing is wrong but our government measures its victories by the number of Asian peasants killed. We taught them that lying is wrong but our government has lied throughout the years. More than five years ago our government solemnly promised we would be out of Vietnam by the end of that year. The victory claims are false, the casualty figures are false, the promises have always been false, the statements of purpose are false. Should, therefore, the protesting students be called unpatriotic?

My fifteen year-old daughter wept while she listened to the President try to justify actions she has always been taught were wrong. What should the young think when air raids with 150 planes are called "protective reaction strikes?" And those of us who grew up in the thirties may remember who then used such names for such acts.

With desperate helplessness we have seen already what the American dream means for Cambodia. For in these recent days our troops have totally destroyed another lovely village. It is, presumably, a consolation to our patriotism to hear the government announce that the families of the villagers we killed have been paid \$43 each.

Can we really expect them to believe that the honor of the mightiest nation in history is preserved by smashing—Vietnam? Can we really expect them meekly to kill and be killed because presidents are afraid their pride will be hurt? Other nations may fear our destructive fury but they will not honor a "firmness of purpose" that simply kills more peasants, destroys more villages, exhausts our substance, and tears us apart as a people.

The students protested against this in every way they knew. Then they saw in the torn and bloody bodies of their comrades in Ohio what the answer of their country might be. Their response has been one of the most extraordinary political phenomena of our time. They are afraid as they rightly should be but they have come forward in

astonishing numbers. The most surprising thing of all is that they have done exactly what we have told them all along to do, we of the previous generation: they have come forward once more within the system. They are now the moral conscience of the nation. Do not mistake who they are. They are my children—two of my daughters are in this room. They are your children and the children of your neighbors. Do not mistake their purpose. It is a deeply patriotic love of their nation and its principles. For perhaps the last time in this generation they are back in the system. God grant that the system will be worthy of them.

STATEMENT MADE BY HETWOOD RANKIN

I am going to speak to you about the reaction of the law students at the University of North Carolina to the recent events—the invasion of Cambodia and the deaths of four students at Kent State University. First, I wish to say that it is very significant that I or any other law student could represent a majority of the law students of any law school on any given issue. Law students, almost by definition, whether by predilection or training, are very cautious people. Law students are steeped in tradition and they are inclined to work through the existing polity. They tend to have a high respect for leaders of their state and country. They are often displeased by those who speak out against the system in angry tones, displeased by the emotionalism and the apparent irrational fury. For these reasons, what I have to tell you is quite extraordinary:

For the first time in the history of our law school, our law students, as a body, have become outwardly and actively aroused about a crucial issue. No one in the law school that I have talked to has been untouched; every law student I know has searched his soul as he never has before. And many, many are going beyond a rethinking process and are committing themselves to an active involvement in a way they would never have dreamed of just one week ago.

I am not exactly sure why this has happened so suddenly. Most law students, just as most people across the country, supported this war in the early years; many volunteered to fight, and they fought hard, and believed they were fighting for a good reason. The war has gone on and on, one promise of immediate victory and immediate peace has succeeded another. Meanwhile in this country the problems in the cities, in the environment, and of conflicts between various socio-economic groups have multiplied, and people have become increasingly aware of the magnitude of the national commitment of resources that is going to be required to meet these domestic problems. Any enthusiasm people felt for the war dissipated; people began to talk not of support of the war, but of nonopposition to the President. And the President seemed to comply: he withdrew some troops and promised the withdrawal of many. The entry into Cambodia could hardly appear other than an about-face; the frantic response, the fear of a deeper and longer involvement in Southeast Asia, was only to be expected—even among law students, who more than anyone yearn to venerate their leaders and uphold national political policy.

I spoke of the "active involvement" of law students a moment ago. Having come to a decision about this war and having decided to do something, law students, as to be expected, have searched for constructive means within the framework of our republican system to act to implement their stand. Several alternatives have quickly come to mind: working within the local political parties, leaving classes in the weeks before the November elections to canvass voters throughout the state. Speaking to groups at the community level about the position

of the law students toward the war. Writing letters to the President and to our Congressional delegation. Signing petitions. And today, coming to Washington to discuss the war with you. Some cynicism has been heard—"How can we, powerless as we are, have any effect on persons in positions of political power?"—but yet, a faith that the political system remains responsive to its concerned and thoughtful citizens has far overbalanced the unhealthy cynicism.

May I suggest why I think this response in the law school has relevance and importance. First of all, these law students will not long from now be men of influence in communities throughout North Carolina. The cathartic experience they have undergone in this week will not be forgotten; it has had a lasting molding influence on the minds and character of these men. Second, I suggest this response has importance because law students in many respects more resemble people outside the university than they do those inside. Many law students enter the law school after serving in the military, many after working in the business community. Moreover, the legal discipline is not generalistic, as are the social sciences and humanities; just as the harried businessman or millhand or secretary has little time and energy to be concerned with and to reflect upon the burning issues of the day, so it is with the law student learning the hundreds of thousands of technical rules that structure society. If my evaluation of the law students is correct, I submit that their opposition to the war in Vietnam portends a similar antiwar reaction throughout the nation.

STATEMENT OF VIRGINIA ANNE EDENFIELD

I am speaking to you today in an attempt to communicate some of the sense of urgency and frustration that I and many of my fellow students are feeling at this time. The recent tragedies at Kent State and President Nixon's decision to send troops into Cambodia have served to unite the college population as never before to work towards bringing an immediate end to this war in Indochina.

I find it extremely difficult to verbalize many of the emotions and thoughts prevalent among the students at the University of North Carolina in the past week. I have seen many of my closest friends so very upset, disillusioned, frustrated, and scared—wanting to help but not knowing where to go or what to do. What has struck me as perhaps the most significant is the involvement of so many here-to-fore apolitical people. I have been a student at Chapel Hill for four years, and never before have I seen the student body so united and so committed as they are now in working to end our involvement in this war.

Students are actively organizing in the communities across the state in order to bring about changes through our existing political channels. And the very fact that we are here today is proof of the deep commitment and involvement felt by UNC students.

Many people have said that a student strike is merely a symbolic gesture, and that it is if it stops at that. But we at Chapel Hill have shown by our activities that it won't. We are aware of many of the things that are needed to be done, and we are willing to do them. There are numerous students at UNC truly dedicated to academic pursuits who have become actively involved in this strike because they and I feel that business as usual cannot continue so long as lives are daily being lost in an unnecessary war. We have gone on strike because we feel that by uniting our efforts we might be able to bring about the needed changes.

For years we have been given promises that the United States is withdrawing from Southeast Asia, and repeatedly we have seen

little or no results. The optimistic promises of our national leaders have lost their credibility, and perhaps this is one major reason why so many people at this time are so vigorously opposing our government's actions in Southeast Asia. We can no longer sit idly by while people are unnecessarily dying daily.

We are not "campus bums" attempting to disrupt but deeply concerned Americans who are exercising our rights to assemble and dissent. We college students of this country deserve to be heard. Today we, as members of your constituency, are asking you to represent and not merely listen to us. We are asking you, our elected officials, to do all in your power to bring about an immediate end to this unjust and immoral war in Indochina. For it is only then that we can get down to solving the much more urgent problems that are rapidly tearing our own country apart.

STATEMENT BY VIRGINIA CARSON

I've been asked to speak primarily because I'm a woman, I think. On this issue, however, there is no clear woman's side to present. We students are united as never before. I have been active in campus and national political issues for the past three years, and I have never seen so many students willing to speak out in protest, many of them for the first time. I can report to you that most of these students still have faith in the democratic system of government. We can't conceive of few other systems of government to replace ours with. We are canvassing, petitioning, lobbying as we are in Washington today, and campaigning in the fall. I have spoken with Joe Peckerman, a law student from Yale University, who is setting up an election service so that student volunteers can be of help in the fall elections. I can promise many student volunteers who will be working next fall in support of those candidates who are opposed to the war in Indochina and who have demonstrated that opposition in the past. Through the coordination set-up at Yale, we hope to have a vigorous national effort on the part of peace candidates. Our campus protests, then, are only the most verbal sign of a deep commitment to change our country's war policy, as all of us, I believe, are trying to indicate. We are working now, we will continue to work in our home communities this summer, and in the elections next fall. I think we will succeed.

STATEMENT MADE BY CHARLES A. PATRIZIA

I feel slightly foolish in making this speech, since I have been asked to talk about politics to a group of professional politicians. Lest I feel even more foolish than I do right now, I will talk only about what has been done, or is already planned.

I am a Morehead scholar from Winston-Salem, majoring in Political Science and Psychology. I am only one of several people who have organized this campaign to canvass the State. Another Morehead scholar, the daughter of one of the Vice-Chancellors, and an instructor in the Math Department have all worked to make this campaign a success.

Our Campaign began last week, when we realized that political action was necessary to bring about the aims of the strike. We began the following:

1. A campus letter writing campaign, which should begin filling your mail bags, and continue to fill them for the next three weeks. These letters have been from people all across the state and nation, all of them urging that the war be ended now.

2. Approximately 150 people began to canvass all over Chapel Hill-Carrboro areas last Thursday, finding out the opinions of the community on the war. This group has grown larger every day. Results indicated that most of the people favored getting out of Cambodia and Vietnam now. Here again,

letters are being sent to the President and members of Congress, expressing this conviction.

3. There are now 400 people, organized statewide, setting up groups to canvass in every county of the State. This canvass will work out of the campuses of colleges, out of churches, and out of Chamber of Commerce offices, and will be conducted throughout the summer. The goal will be to bring certain issues before the public, and to encourage them to express their views.

4. We are also working in coordination with a national movement to encourage students to join in the campaign of the elections this summer and fall. Our goal is the election of a Congress which will end this war. Our criteria for encouraging students to join a particular campaign will be the candidate's record and his views on the war. This will not be just a summertime campaign. It will carry on through the fall, right on into November.

Other students will be working on local campaigns for county commissioners, state senate and legislature.

All these are to be carried out with the goal of getting us out of Southeast Asia. That is why we have come here today, to ask you to get us out, please, get us out now.

We, as students, have been urged for a long time to work within the system. This is what we are doing: asking the system to end a war which we consider unjust and immoral.

We tried in 1968. We are now in Cambodia.

Lest we all lose our faith in the system and the beliefs which we grew up in, we hope, with a singlemindedness born of the fear that we will be proved wrong again, that the system will respond this time.

STATEMENT BY ANNE STUBBS

I am Anne Stubbs, a graduate student in political science, from Montreat, North Carolina, Congressman Taylor's district. This past week has been my first involvement as an active citizen, as it has been for many of the students here today and those who have been aroused by the events at Kent State and in Cambodia. I feel a part of this movement of Middle America that is bestirring on campuses. At the University of North Carolina, there is a sense of aliveness—of a community in tension—which is the reason why many of us are here meeting with you today.

Many of us are motivated by concern; a concern for Cambodia and Vietnam. There is a fear that the action in Cambodia is not a "decisive action" but the beginning of yet another escalation. Students may accept the military justification of the Cambodian invasion but increasingly reject the validity of military means to maintain United States' honor and commitments.

We are concerned for a "Kent State". The deaths at Kent State hit close to home for many of us, for it was Middle America that was killed there. The sense of morality instilled in us by our parents and our schools has been disturbed by the brutality within Cambodia, by the unilateral American decision to invade Cambodia; and it has reached the breaking point by the rapid escalation of violence at Kent State.

We begin to feel a sense of alienation from our present Administration and its silent majority of unquestioning support. We are caught up in a polarization which is growing within this country between students and the Government, between students and parents, and, within the academic community, between students and students.

Our reactions and our feelings are often confused and unstructured. Not all of us demand that this nation end the war today, but we do demand that the country accept the validity and the credibility of a "strategic minority" of its citizens—the future leaders of this nation.

May I close with a request—a challenge: that this nation and this Congress have the courage to seek a meaningful alternative to the policy and the quagmire in Vietnam.

Thank you.

STATEMENT MADE BY LEE MEYROWITZ

My name is Lee Meyrowitz and I served for one year as a point man with 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division in Viet Nam. I now go to UNC under the Disabled Veterans Retraining Program.

As I begin to speak here today I remember a day in August, 1966 in Viet Nam when a man of 19 named Tommy Morales, who nobody knows here except me, got shot in my place. Since that time I have been asking myself two questions—Why? and Was it worth it? You would ask yourself also these same two questions if somewhere in your life experiences something such as this had happened to you.

Did he die for the corruption that exists within the U.S. military in Viet Nam? Did he die for the corruption that exists within the South Vietnamese government and military? Did he die for the corruption that exists within the American industrial system? Did he die for the unresponsiveness of the American democratic system? What did he die for?

Did he die to protect the democratic nations of the world from the onslaught of the Communist monolith of the Eurasian plan which has its definitional origins in 1945? I answer "No" to all these questions for he died because he thought that he as a Mexican-American was helping to protect the people of Viet Nam from supposed aggression from their countrymen in the North. He went to war like I did thinking that we were going 11,000 miles to help the people of Viet Nam save their country from aggression. Well, I think that we were both wrong. And I will use these terms right or wrong even though they have moral connotations. So often we as Americans talk about morality within our domestic political structure, but never do we apply the same standards to international relations—in this realm we use the pragmatic approach to foreign policy.

It is about time that Senators, Representatives and other officials across the U.S. listen to a large body of people who are tired, frustrated, and disgusted with our commitments to fight anywhere in the world whenever the President deems it necessary for the protection of democracy.

You can take as many fact-finding trips as you want to Viet Nam, but will never be able to feel or express the sensations of leeches sucking at your blood, the acrid smoke from artillery bombardments as it stings the membranes of your nose, nor the nausea that eats at your conscience as you kill another human. If you can go to Viet Nam and stay there one year and get away from your hallowed halls of affluence and monumental power you will see Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Polish-Americans, Jews, etc., all fighting to secure the vested interests of the U.S. and South Vietnamese governments. No matter what sociological terminology you use, this cross section of American society is what our democratic theory is supposedly all about. Or is it?

Before I finish I have one final question to ask of you. If the U.S. government supports governments such as the Thieu regime, do they not do this because the U.S. defines these governments as responsive to the needs of the people? If this is the case, is it not possible that the government of North Viet Nam which represents a large cross section of people is more responsive to the needs of its people than is the corrupt, repressive, and oligarchal regime of Premier Thieu which we have to support militarily, financially, and morally?

STATEMENT OF FREDERIC N. CLEAVELAND, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

As a student of contemporary American politics, I want to speak briefly about the impact of America's continued involvement in the war in Indo China upon the domestic political scene—and here I am talking about what you members of the Senate and the House of Representatives know much better than we, for it is very much your essential business to know.

We are in the midst of a political crisis—certainly the most severe of this century, and probably exceeded in our history only by the Civil War. It is a crisis which threatens the very capacity of the nation to govern effectively.

First, the American people are becoming increasingly polarized: (1) The Administration's policies in pursuing the war aggressively while allowing peace negotiations to remain on dead center are flatly opposed by a significant segment of the American people. (2) The President and a substantial part of the Congress are at odds over important issues about the conduct of war and the pursuit of peace. (3) Administration leaders and the university world—students, large numbers of faculty, and many distinguished university presidents—are in conflict over the propriety of dissent and how to insure that it is peaceful. (4) Black people are everywhere straining against the system, challenging and testing the forces representing order, an order which in the past has consigned them to inferior status.

These divisions sap our strength, cloud our vision, and confuse the alternatives before us.

Second, as a direct consequence of this war the American economy is in a strait-jacket, hobbled by inflation: (1) Unemployment approaches five million, and falls most heavily upon racial minorities and young people—the two groups already seriously at odds with the system. (2) High interest rates, essential to check inflation, are seriously crippling the construction industry and forcing postponement once again of long over-due efforts to alleviate housing shortages—this, too, falls disproportionately upon blacks and the urban poor, those least able to cope. (3) Severe labor tensions are inevitable as unions press for wage increases to maintain standards of living only to meet an immovable object in the form of Administration hold-the-line policies to guard against further inflation. (4) The rate of real economic growth has been slowed, and there is ever present danger that measures strong enough to stem inflation fed by the forced draft of military spending, may precipitate the economy into recession. (5) The business pulse reflected in Wall Street's current behavior is anything but encouraging. Can anyone believe that business confidence will be restored by any actions short of ending the war in Viet Nam?

Third, continued involvement in this war is depriving us of the resources in men and money necessary to tackle the major priority problems facing the nation at home. We know what these problems are, and they are legion: (1) Restoring man's environment. (2) Rebuilding the cities. (3) Eliminating hunger and poverty in the most affluent society on earth. (4) Providing all our youth the quality education which modern life requires. (5) Bringing health and adequate medical care within the reach of all people. (6) Developing a productive economy with jobs and hope for people in such areas as Appalachia and the Coastal Plains. (7) Affording the elderly real security. (8) Eradicating the causes of crime and delinquency. (9) Bringing into the economic and social system as full partners blacks, Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans.

In summary, this Government's continued involvement in war in Southeast Asia threatens the fundamental consensus upon which our vitality as a free people rests. It threatens our economic security. It undermines our capacity to pursue national goals which have commanded wide public support over four national Administrations as the highest priorities before us.

It is the very essence of the American democratic tradition of representative government for us to express our vigorous dissent to the present policies of this Administration, and to seek your help to change these policies. We pledge to work within the system, and with your assistance, we expect the system to respond.

(Professor Cleaveland is currently on leave from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill serving on the senior research staff of the National Academy of Public Administration in Washington, D.C.)

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO THE NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—MAY 4, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, as I make the rounds of the 16 counties in the Ninth District I am often impressed with the contribution made by the small businessman.

His welfare is important to the American economy. There are an estimated 5.4 million independent businesses in the United States, 97 percent of which employ fewer than 100 workers. Small businessmen employ more than 40 percent of the U.S. work force, and they contribute about 37 percent of the Nation's gross national product, the total of goods and services produced.

However, in an economy dominated by large corporations, there are special risks for small businessmen. Operating many times on the edge of solvency, he is the first to feel the effects of the slightest tremor in the Nation's economy.

Today, he faces the highest interest rates on record, dwindling credit supplies, increasing property taxes, a spiraling wage-price index, and increasing inflation.

Government has expressed its concern for the plight of the small businessman, but has done little to alleviate his burdens—sometimes adding to his burden in fact. Many actions have had the effect of creating new requirements, additional paperwork, and more redtape to be managed by already-burdened staffs of the small businessman.

The best way Government can help the small businessman is to stimulate the entire private sector by creating a favorable business climate. Direct Government programs to assist and protect small businesses have not had real impact. The main needs of small business are for trained people and more capital, and Government efforts ought to concentrate in this area with—

Incentives to make loans to small business;

Assistance on interest payments;
Tax reforms to make it easier to start a small business like a partnership, stock options, and an extended tax loss carry-forward period;

Guarantee for surety bonds for small qualified contractors; and

Assistance for job training.

A recent report from the President's Task Force on Improving the Prospects for Small Business also makes several suggestions which deserve consideration. The task force recommendations concentrate on protecting the opportunities for small business rather than assistance programs which often have the effect of sheltering and fostering ill-conceived or incompetent enterprises.

The 12-member study group recommends that the Small Business Administration—SBA—lead in identifying and analyzing the problems of small business, be the advocate and voice of small business, foster and coordinate research, and widen the opportunities for small businesses to compete on an equitable basis. Additional recommendations included—

First, that Federal agencies or departments affecting small business designate a high-level executive to work in close liaison with SBA;

Second, that the SBA and the Department of Labor develop improved programs to attract trained people into small business and provide incentives to small businessmen to employ and train people from the local work force;

Third, that consideration be given to motivating private credit sources to take the risks of lending to small business in addition to Government participation in this area;

Fourth, that Government study present and proposes income tax legislation to be sure that present and future changes do not harm small businesses; and

Fifth, that Government agencies develop contract guidelines to motivate contractors to subcontract to more small businesses.

TRIBUTE TO HON. LESLIE C.
ARENDS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as the newest Member of the House of Representatives, it is my great pleasure to join my distinguished colleagues in congratulating the dean of the Illinois delegation, the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, on the 27th anniversary of his election as Republican whip.

My colleagues and friends who have served with LES for many years probably know him better than I, but it is particularly noteworthy that he has been a wise counselor and mentor to those of us who have only recently come to this body. I have had the privilege of sharing several speakers' platforms with the distinguished minority whip in the last several years, and I have come to

know and value his advice and ideas on many areas of national concern. From traveling with LES in our home State, I know the high regard in which he is held by his own constituents in the 17th Congressional District, and I congratulate them for their good judgment in repeatedly sending LES ARENDS back to the House of Representatives.

LES, I look forward to working with you for many years in the future and wish you the best of everything.

LETTERS FROM GI'S IN VIETNAM

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Freedomia, Kans., Daily Herald of May 11, 1970, published a letter written by Lt. Steven Shields to his mother and dad, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Shields.

I called Mrs. Shields and asked her permission to place Steve's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and her reply was:

Congressman Skubitz, please do, we think the Congress and President Nixon should have some idea how some of our men in the Armed Services feel about Cambodia.

Lieutenant Shields is stationed in Bien Hoa with the Air Force. He has been a pilot, flying HC-47's and has been in Vietnam since September 1969.

I am sure that Steve is just as anxious to end this war and get home as any other American—his life is on the line. With full knowledge of what could happen, he writes as follows:

Hi all. My land, I got 3 letters from you all yesterday. Thank you so much. I love letters so much.

Well, I've got a feeling that the questions are going to be asked about Cambodia so I may as well answer them now. First—"Am I flying into Cambodia?"—"yes." But only at 7,000 feet or higher.

Okay now for the big one you are going to ask. "Do I think we should be going into Cambodia?" Definitely yes! Reason the whole time I've spent here at Bien Hoa, they have known where the VC were and where the supplies were coming from all this time. Somehow it was like your next door neighbor giving your other neighbor a gun and ammo and rockets to shoot at you. When we fly at night, along the border around the Parrot Beak and the Fishhook you can see the trucks come right up to the border with their lights on and then turn them off and from here, the stuff is loaded onto people to bring on in. What makes you so mad is that whatever they bring in, you could be seeing it in the future. Ammo, guns or a rocket that could wake me up at 6:00 some morning. Somehow, that doesn't and never has made sense that we should let it happen. Do I think we ought to be in Cambodia—"Hell yes."—it's about time we did something across that border. Now you know I'm not a "war monger" but the situation that was here before we went in was the dumbest thing in the world. I hope you understand what I'm trying to say. At least this is one consolation. You won't talk to five guys out of 100 that will disagree to what I've said—that's of the guys over here that are doing it. The ones back home seem to be having a different view of the situation though, don't they? I don't understand that. They

aren't here—let those of us that are here worry about what we are doing. I don't understand the riots at all, I'm not that much older than those people either.

Well, good-night you all, hope my philosophy of what the U.S. is doing has helped you as to how I think. Love an miss you all so much. See you soon.

Love, STEVE.

Another soldier in Vietnam, Cpl. John K. Poole of El Dorado wrote me:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SKUBITZ: I am now serving in Vietnam. I would like you to know that I support President Nixon's Cambodian campaign 100%. I think that is the right way to end the war.

I also hope you will do all you can to stop the campus disorders across our nation. I had 2½ years of college before I joined the Marine Corps and I hope there are colleges left where I can finish my degree when I finish my job over here.

I am from El Dorado, Kansas and was a member of the Young Republicans at Butler County Junior College when you spoke there once.

Sincerely,

Cpl. JOHN K. POOLE.

And I received another letter from Mrs. Lee Goodin, a grandmother who lost a son in World War II and has a grandson in Vietnam. She writes:

DEAR MR. SKUBITZ: I am a widow 68 years old, living 10 miles south of Wichita. I lost a son in World War II. One grandson was in Vietnam one year and another grandson will soon take his physical, so I know something of the heartaches of war.

Concerning President Nixon's decision to go into Cambodia, I have faith in him and believe he knows what he is doing.

While most of my neighbors probably won't write and say so but many I have talked with, feel as I do.

And, all of us, are so sick and tired of the protestors, that have done no good, only harm.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEE R. GOODIN.

In addition, I would like to submit an article from the May 27 Pittsburg Headlight-Sun concerning the answer given by ex-1st Lt. Michael Judah of Pittsburg, who is fighting in Vietnam, in reply to a telegram by Dr. George Budd, Kansas State College president to President Nixon:

On a mountain top in Cambodia, things look a lot different than they do from a plush office in a college, or even under leafing trees that accent green lawns of a school campus.

This comparison was penned from the Cambodian locale by 1st Lt. Michael D. Judah, Co. C, 1st Bn. 8th Cav., 1st Cav. Div. in reply to a published telegram apparently dictated in his more serene site by Dr. George F. Budd, Kansas State College president, to President Richard M. Nixon. The Cambodian-linked wordage far more than indicated the lieutenant was in complete disagreement with the thinking expressed by the KSC president.

Lieutenant Judah is a 1968 graduate of KSC. His home address is 202 S. Pine, where, if all goes well, he anticipates returning by late August.

The army officer put aside his lethal weapons on the Cambodian hillside and reached for a ballpoint to make known not only his own views on the war situation but to, he says, echo sentiments of the fighting men in his platoon, and others.

In a letter technically designated for the "Letters to the Editor" department of the Headlight-Sun, Judah wrote:

"I recently received in the mail a clipping from your newspaper sent to me by my par-

ents. It was entitled: 'Budd to Nixon: Withdraw U.S. Troops Now.'

"I am a 1968 graduate of Kansas State College and am presently serving a tour in Vietnam with the U.S. Army as a platoon leader. In view of my present position and the experiences I've had in this part of the world in the last 10 months, I'd like to comment on Dr. Budd's advice to President Nixon and at the same time present the views of some of us who are actually involved in the Cambodian campaign. Dr. Budd's remarks both shocked and appalled me and it is for this reason I am writing this letter.

"At the same time I received the above-mentioned newspaper clipping, I also received another clipping from your paper. It was a letter to the editor, written by Allen Engles and, if I am not mistaken, relegated to one of the inner pages of the paper. Engle's remarks embody the thoughts and feelings of myself, the men of my platoon and the men of my company. In other words, we who are actually involved in the Cambodian campaign (this letter is being written on a mountaintop in Cambodia) totally and wholeheartedly agree with President Nixon's views and with his policy of sending troops into Cambodia. On the same note, we totally disagree with the views of such people as Dr. Budd and the thousands of college students who are demonstrating against President Nixon's policies.

"Now, one may ask why we support the President. In the past three weeks, in fighting in Vietnam which this company has been involved in, I have seen three men killed and five times that many wounded by North Vietnamese army soldiers who had been trained, resupplied and given sanctuary in the very Cambodian bases which we are now destroying. Until this time, we have been denied the right to attack these sanctuaries which have caused the deaths of so many American soldiers a short distance away in Vietnam. When we received the order to move into Cambodia, we were overjoyed, not because we support expansion of the ground war, but because we knew that it would hasten the pullout of U.S. troops from Vietnam and speed up all home to our families. One needs only to look only at the manner in which these Cambodian bases and supply roads are constructed to realize that it was never anticipated by the enemy that we would ever come here.

"One may criticize this letter by saying that it contains nothing but the mutterings of a brainwashed army lieutenant. But I will meet that criticism by saying that these views are held by the men in my platoon and in my company. We have discussed this matter thoroughly and have jointly reached the conclusion expounded in this letter.

"We who are presently fighting in Cambodia believe that what we are doing is the correct policy to follow and therefore, are devoting all our energies to it. I cannot conceive how someone like Dr. Budd, or other lower members of the college community, can presume to pass judgment on President Nixon's policies, when we who are actually receiving the bullets, climbing the mountains and sitting in the rain, wholeheartedly endorse them. After all, does Dr. Budd really know what is happening here? I challenge and invite him to travel with my platoon in Vietnam and watch American soldiers killed by NVA who can run back across the border and find sanctuary in Cambodia. Perhaps, then, and only then, could he presume to pass judgment on the President's policies, because then, and only then, would he know what he is talking about.

"I respectfully request that this letter receive equal position in your newspaper as that received by the article about Dr. Budd. This is an opposing viewpoint, and after all, is this not a democracy whose opposing points of view receive equal space? I don't believe the U.S. has changed that much in the 10 months I've been away.

"We receive newspapers in the field, and it seems to me all I've seen in the headlines lately is opposition to administration policies on Southeast Asia. We find this very disheartening. I feel that the time has come for people who are really involved in this situation and who really know what is going on, to have their say. This is the second reason for the writing of this letter.

"I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with Dr. Budd or any other individual or group holding his viewpoint, either by letter or in person as I will be returning to Pittsburgh the latter part of August.

1st Lt. MICHAEL JUDAH.

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN SPEAKS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the national Democratic chairman, Lawrence F. O'Brien, in the highest traditions of his official responsibilities has expressed eloquently questions logically on the minds of all thoughtful Americans with regard to American military involvement in Southeast Asia.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN ON NIXON INTERIM CAMBODIAN REPORT

Tomorrow evening President Nixon will once again address the nation on television. We are told to expect an interim report on the American invasion of Cambodia. We are also told not to expect any dramatic new announcement.

But Mr. Nixon must now recognize that he has a firm obligation to the American people to address himself in detail to several issues that urgently require clarification, in addition to recounting the mountain of weapons, clothing, and rice that have been found in Cambodia.

First, Mr. Nixon told us on April 30 that "the heart of the trouble" in securing peace in Indochina was cleaning out the Cambodian sanctuaries of enemy troops. If we withdraw all allied forces from Cambodia by July 1, what then happens when enemy troops return to the border sanctuaries? Will there be future invasions? If not, how do we plan to protect American troops as they withdraw from South Vietnam over the next year? Indeed, can the President promise us again that all U.S. involvement in Cambodia—including air support—will terminate by July 1?

Second, Mr. Nixon and his spokesmen have repeatedly told the American people that South Vietnamese military units would withdraw from Cambodia at "approximately the same time" as U.S. forces. South Vietnamese spokesmen—Vice President Ky, in particular—have repeatedly stressed their intention to stay in Cambodia for the indefinite future. How does the United States intend to resolve this obvious contradiction in policy between the United States and South Vietnam? What does this country intend to do if South Vietnamese troops refuse to withdraw on schedule?

Third, we now learn that Thai forces have also crossed into Cambodia. What is the nature and extent of the U.S. military commitment to Thailand? Will the Thai forces withdraw by July 1? What will the United States do if the Thais remain beyond that date?

Fourth, Administration spokesmen have told us that the success of the Cambodian

invasion will make it possible to accelerate the rate of U.S. troop withdrawals from South Vietnam. If the operation is as successful as Administration spokesmen have already claimed, is Mr. Nixon prepared to announce a specific monthly timetable for U.S. troop withdrawals, just as he announced a specific date for our withdrawal from Cambodia? In this regard, I urge Mr. Nixon to consider at a minimum, a withdrawal rate of 50,000 troops every two months for the next year. This would still leave approximately 150,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam by June, 1971.

Fifth, Mr. Nixon told us on April 30 that the major purpose of the invasion was to attack the "key control center" of North Vietnam "COSVN," as it is called. What happened to this objective? How did this key enemy control center escape the American and South Vietnamese units sent into Cambodia? And what does this mean for future allied military operations in Indochina?

Sixth, Mr. Nixon told us on April 30 that enemy forces were concentrating in the border areas of Cambodia, building up to a massive attack on American and South Vietnamese forces. On May 14, however, Secretary Laird told newsmen that the enemy forces were, in fact, moving away from the Cambodian borders on April 30. The American people have a right to know which version is correct. Where were these massive enemy forces at the time of the allied invasion? Were they about to attack South Vietnam? And where did they go when the allied forces moved across the Cambodian boundaries?

Seventh, the recent enemy attack on Dalat in South Vietnam raises another critical consideration. How will the dwindling number of U.S. combat troops and the constant level of South Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam retain the military initiative against the enemy? In the absence of a negotiated political settlement, can we expect anything but military disaster when U.S. combat troops are withdrawn?

Finally, Mr. Nixon told us on April 30 that the United States stands ready for negotiations to end the war peacefully. Why, then, does the President persist in refusing to send a high level personal ambassador to the Paris peace talks? What is there to be gained by this deliberate downgrading of these critical negotiations?

These questions are not asked in a partisan sense. They are asked only because the American people are asking them and because the American people have a right to some answers. Considering the terrible human price this country has paid for its military involvement in Indochina and the terrible human price we have paid here at home, we implore the President of the United States to answer them tomorrow night.

RESIGNATION OF ANTHONY MOFFETT, JR.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend George E. Schnabel, pastor emeritus of St. Mark's United Methodist Church in my northern Virginia district, reacted with some disgust, as did many of us, at the silly resignation statement of Mr. Anthony Moffett, Jr., on leaving his position in the Office of Students and Youth, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In view of the wide publicity given

Mr. Moffett's statement, I believe Mr. Schnabel's very well-written reply should likewise receive public attention. I include the text of his letter in full at this point in the RECORD:

MAY 10, 1970.

MR. ANTHONY MOFFETT, JR.,
Office of Students and Youth, Department
of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: He called them "bums", so I am quitting. Well, aren't they "bums", Mr. Moffett? Bums is putting it mildly. How childish can you get? "Mama, the bad man slapped my wrist, I'll not play with him anymore".

Mr. Moffett, these bums have left a trail of devastation across the campuses of this country. They have burned, wrecked, harassed, obstructed, bricked, stoned and used physical force on faculty, administration and students, as well as those called in to keep order. They have made the acquiring of an education a hazard on scores of campuses. Who but "bums", Mr. Moffet, would go to these extremes?

Orderly dissent—yes, and every day, if necessary, to attain worthy objectives, but violence—never; and those who resort to violence in any form and those who abet them are "bums", bums in the most meaningful and explicit sense of the word.

As they bring destruction to our campuses, with mindless fury, it ill becomes men of intelligence to stoop to their level and thus become part of the problem rather than a solution to the problem. Now, Mr. Moffett, what part of the problem have you solved by resigning and by giving as your main reason "he called them 'bums'"? What would you call these campus-burners, these disrupters, these obscene, mindless agitators? If they aren't "bums", then what are they? Could they be the real "pigs"? Like any pig, put the pig in the parlor and what changes, the "pig or the parlor"?

Where weak, vacillating, confused leadership has raised the white flag of surrender on our campuses, the "bums" have taken over and now administrators, faculty and student bodies have become the pawns of revolutionaries, who, with mindless abandon, are ready to destroy our universities, our social institutions, our political system and the moral quality of our nation.

Reform—yes! Change—yes, but orderly constitutional and legal change; by violence—never!

Your pious, holler-than-thou posture is a bit silly when stacked up against the great opportunity you had to keep your engagement with destiny and help bring order to these troubled times.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. SCHNABEL.

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE WAR—A MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there are 28 Veterans of Foreign Wars districts in Texas. The 20th District includes Bexar County, and is one of the fastest growing and one of the most alert and active VFW districts in the Nation. Right now it is rated No. 1 in the country in membership quota. Its membership—as is true of all VFW posts—is composed of active, dedicated, patriotic veterans. It is preeminent in terms of community

service and in the promotion of Americanism.

The 20th district is commanded by Mr. Martin H. Lambrecht of San Antonio. Other officers include Orva Longley, Col. (Ret.), senior vice commander, Woody Willis, junior vice commander; Spencer Mitcham and Jack Smalley, chiefs of staff; and Nick Carter, adjutant.

On last May 30 this great organization sponsored one of the most colorful and impressive Memorial Day services I have ever witnessed. A score of wreaths were laid by auxiliary posts. The celebrated Fort Sam Houston band furnished the music. Surrounded by waving flags, the ceremony was attended by many distinguished veterans and their families who joined in the solemnity of the occasion.

It was my honor and privilege to address that gathering of dedicated and patriotic Americans. I include a copy of my remarks, which follow:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN O. CLARK FISHER, SUNSET MEMORIAL PARK, SAN ANTONIO, MAY 30, 1970

It is indeed an honor to participate in this Memorial Day service, sponsored by the 20th district of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We are gathered here today in remembrance of those who have fought and died in defense of freedom.

On this day we not only pay tribute to fallen heroes whose sacrifices account for our heritage and the liberty we cherish, but we contemplate our own capacity to maintain and preserve them. For us, the living, the obligation is three-fold—to the past, to the present, and to the future.

We face in this country today a new dimension—new in terms of our ability to convince people that the right to enjoy freedom is not a license to abuse freedom.

This struggle for freedom seems to be an endless thing. Aside from the holocaust of armed conflict, even now we are fighting a battle right here at home—against dissidents and against those identified with an alien, totalitarian philosophy who are seeking to subvert both our heritage of God and of Country.

In the emotionalism of these times, when people clash without reason and riot without cause, when verbal brickbats fly over how to fight a war, let us not for a moment lose sight of the all-important fact that world Communism is still a very real threat to the very concept of what we call human freedom. On this day let us not forget that the war of aggression against freedom in Vietnam is being financed almost entirely by the Soviet Union, and Moscow has repeatedly spurned our appeals that she join in finding a peaceful solution. In assessing our potential perils, let us not forget Hungary, and let us not forget Czechoslovakia.

We know that today the Soviet Union is engaged in a massive military build-up, unsurpassed in modern times, and we know this threat is directed primarily at the United States of America. Because it happens that this country is the only real roadblock in the way of Communist designs for world domination—an objective which Communist leaders have themselves made crystal clear on many occasions, which today they would have us discount and overlook.

Strange things are happening right here in our own country today. We are witnessing serious attacks upon our military posture. Much of what we see and read is not thoughtful and considered comment on the size of the military budget, or even expressions of doubts about what should be done in Vietnam—much of what we are hearing

and reading is an out and out attack upon this country's defense structure itself. And this must not be treated lightly.

Today, in this land of the free and home of the brave, we see, for example, scores and scores of ROTC offices being burned and destroyed on college campuses by mobs of hoodlums. Some say they are not Communists who do this. Well, I wouldn't know about that. What I do know is that because of their strike at America's preparedness, these hoodlums are being toasted in Moscow, Peking, Hanoi, and Havana.

And we are appalled by attacks upon American industry engaged in the manufacture of weapons of war—without which America would soon become a second rate has-been power and a pushover for Communist aggressors. Personally, I am proud to support this military-industrial complex we read about. Without it this nation would be doomed.

WAR IN VIETNAM

Now, let me refer very briefly to the war in Vietnam, because any memorial service today must be related to the American lives that are being lost in those rice paddies and steaming jungles—every day and every night.

Many will agree with the late General MacArthur who warned the nation about involvement in a land war in Asia—where human lives are so cheap. But be that as it may, we *did* become involved—our Nation became involved in pursuance of a treaty commitment and the move to contain Communist aggression. Today we mourn our losses and pause to pay tribute to the great courage and gallantry that has been displayed there, and the supreme sacrifices that have been made, and to American prisoners of war being held and mistreated by a despotic enemy. In that struggle enemy losses have approximated 600,000. It is tragic that the military was not permitted to call the shots and win that war long ago.

As you know, the President has announced a gradual withdrawal of our combat forces from Vietnam, to be synchronized with trained and equipped indigenous troops to assume the burdens of defending that country. This is called the Vietnamization program. In pursuance of that purpose already 115,000 Americans have been withdrawn, and an additional 150,000 are scheduled to be brought home during the next year.

The degree of success of that withdrawal plan is dependent in no small measure upon the degree of national unity which it receives here in our own country.

It is well known among the military that a disengagement of this magnitude cannot be accomplished overnight—notwithstanding the expertise in foreign and military policy as enunciated by such experts as the Dr. Spocks and the Jane Fondas. We are told, and the history of warfare confirms, that a successful withdrawal is indeed a difficult and dangerous military maneuver—if catastrophe is to be avoided and if heavy casualties are to be prevented.

As a part of the strategy to achieve orderly withdrawal, the President, acting upon the best military judgment and intelligence in our land, ordered U.S. troops into the Communist sanctuary of Cambodia—only 30 short miles from Saigon—where vast stockpiles of military equipment had been stored by the enemy, to be used to kill Americans during the coming monsoon season.

I applaud the President for his courage and for his good judgment.

The results have exceeded expectations. Already enough guns, ammunition, rockets, mortar rounds, land mines, rice, and vehicles have been captured to maintain a fairly good sized army for up to six months. And by head-count up to last Thursday 8,171 Communists had been killed in that operation.

The Cambodian action was in no sense an escalation. It was *not* an invasion. The move was made with the approval of the Cam-

bodian government. The strike was designed to save American lives, enhance the Vietnamization program, and expedite our withdrawal plans.

You would think that arrangement would have been acclaimed by all Americans. I firmly believe that 90% of the criticism has come from those who were emotionally affected and did not fully understand what was involved. Our own withdrawal from Cambodia will be complete by June 30.

To avoid serious interference with the success of the Vietnamization plan and our withdrawal goals, it would, as I see it, be foolhardy indeed for the Congress to take any action which would tie the President's hands in any way, or restrict his options as Commander-in-Chief, in planning strategy and pursuing the disengagement objectives. Too many American lives are involved.

For myself, I shall have no part in such ill-conceived legislative maneuvers.

We hear and see a lot these days of demonstrations—both peaceful and violent. On this Memorial Day, as we pay tribute to our heroes and contemplate our perils, let us think in terms of patriotic devotion to a great Nation. What is needed today, as I see it, is a massive unprecedented demonstration of American flags—and we are seeing much of that; a demonstration of American unity; and an outpouring demonstration of genuine American patriotism.

Wouldn't it be wonderful to see, not thousands but millions and millions who are proud they are Americans, demonstrate pride in their heritage, close ranks and march proudly while all sing in voices loud and clear—in a united voice that would reverberate throughout the land: "God Bless America—Land that I Love!"

INCREASED TERRORIST ACTIVITY AGAINST RHODESIA?

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, while receiving very little attention in the American press, just recently the Finance Minister of Zambia announced that Rumanian and Yugoslav concerns would be allowed to prospect for copper in that nation.

I am fearful that the offshoot of this announcement is going to be increased Communist-backed terrorist activity against the Government of Rhodesia, which has already reached alarming proportions. In fact, there are numerous training camps already located in Zambia for thousands of Soviet- and Peking-trained terrorists.

As I pointed out in a speech on the House floor in October 1967, Communist instructors in the technique of guerrilla warfare were swarming into Zambia for the avowed intention of destroying its neighbor, the peaceful nation of Rhodesia.

For the past several years Zambian terrorists have crossed the border of Rhodesia and without provocation burned villages, destroyed crops and livestock, and tortured—even killed—black Rhodesians. It should be obvious that Zambia is for all intents and purposes nothing more than a Communist satellite bent upon eliminating all Western influence in Africa, and this latest

example of cooperation with two Communist-bloc nations should be greeted with real concern by the U.S. Government.

Zambia is one of the world's leading producers of copper, a valuable defense-related industry. While enemies of the United States benefit from this copper supply, American companies are not allowed to purchase chromium ore, which is also a vital defense metal, from Rhodesia because of the U.N.-imposed trade sanctions.

It is solely for the consideration of the United Nations that the United States participates in the trade sanctions against Rhodesia—sanctions, by the way, which have absolutely no legal basis under international law. It seems to me that, unless we begin showing visible signs of friendship toward the people of Rhodesia, the time may arrive when the Communists, through their African puppets, will hold the balance of power in southern Africa. This would surely be a disaster for the free world.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I would like to include an editorial from the Columbia Record, which points out in a very perceptive manner the growing concern in this Nation over these ridiculous sanctions. I commend this excellent editorial to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, May 18, 1970]

TRADE GETS PREFERENCE

After Rhodesia became a republic this year, several countries, including the United States, closed their consulates in the capital at Salisbury.

On the eve of the closings, a representative of "a certain government" called on Prime Minister Ian Smith. The foreign official, Smith said, "stated that he had been asked to convey a message to me that his government was being pressurized by Britain to withdraw from Salisbury."

"They were reluctant to do this," the PM added, "but as they saw the position, two courses were open.

"Firstly, if they were to remain, they believed this would attract so much attention and antagonism that they could be compelled to reduce their plans for increased trade with Rhodesia.

"Secondly, if they closed their office—and this I was assured would be a temporary measure—then they believed they would be free to continue with the thing that mattered, namely, their plans to increase trade with Rhodesia.

"His government believed that the second course was more realistic and practical and would be to the advantage of both our countries.

"He asked me for my thoughts. My reply was immediate and positive: I agreed with him and said, 'Close your office.'"

It is doubtful that the representative was from the United States. He would not have referred to "increased trade" because the U.S. exercises an ironclad boycott, which is backed by federal court action by the government against one company suspected of receiving goods from Rhodesia in the beginning of sanctions.

Also the closing of the U.S. consulate came as a shock to Rhodesians, who believed that they would be taken off the State Department's hate list by the Nixon Administration.

But there is strong sentiment among the American people, the Congress and several departments of the federal government for the U.S. to take a realistic attitude toward

the friendly new country and cease bowing to the British-U.N. arrogant stupidity.

Britain is also divided in its attitude toward the former crown colony. Edward Heath, leader of the Conservative Party, the "loyal opposition," recently told the Conservative Council in reference to Rhodesia: "We cannot guarantee success—no one can do so—but we shall be genuine in the attempt we make, and let us hope that this ghastly breach between the two peoples and two countries can at last be brought honorably to an end."

The United States could be the agent for an honorable end to the "ghastly breach" if it dared to defy the pressures of Britain and the U.N. and to put honest practicality before political popularity.

CONSUMER REPORTS REPORTS ON AUTO INSURANCE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the June 1970 Consumer Reports magazine contains two very informative articles on automobile insurance. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this subject since American highways are being used by more than 100 million automobiles. Consumer Reports has approached the subject with their usual thoroughness and objectivity. Their articles are based on questionnaires received from 230,800 car owners assessing the problems faced by the driving public. The articles are practical and worthy of serious consideration. They follow:

AUTO INSURANCE: THE QUALITY FACTOR

Automobile insurance companies make their living by selling financial security against accident losses. Yet this industry has managed to instill a sense of financial insecurity in the motoring public.

Millions of policyholders are hard-pressed to pay ever-rising premiums. Car insurance rates have just about doubled in the past 20 years and continue to increase at an accelerating pace. Some people—especially young men—are being priced out of the market. Countless others risk having their car insurance priced out of reach with every claim filed against their policy.

Millions of policyholders stand in peril of having their protection discontinued because their insurance company no longer wants to cover them. Car insurers have canceled or refused to renew the policies of 14 per cent of all policyholders at some time in their lives, according to a survey just published by the U.S. Department of Transportation. According to the same survey, 55 per cent of policyholders have heard of other people whose policies were canceled or not renewed. Thus does anxiety in the motoring public spread like ripples around those directly involved.

The problem is most acute in racial ghettos and racially changing neighborhoods of the cities, where insurance companies are loath to deal voluntarily with car owners no matter how good their driving records. Unable to buy insurance, they drive without it, sometimes illegally. Or they pay exorbitant rates to substandard insurance companies. Or they buy the minimal liability insurance protection available through assigned-risk plans.

Of the thousands of car owners in New York City who apply each month for assigned-risk coverage, 70 per cent are blacks or Puerto Ricans living in ghetto neighbor-

hoods. Throughout New York State, where car insurance is compulsory, 510,000 private passenger cars—about 10 per cent of all those registered—were insured as assigned risks in 1968. Two-thirds of the owners of those cars had good enough driving records to qualify for insurance at the standard price, and almost one-half qualified for a safe-driver discount; yet they could find no insurance company that would accept them voluntarily. The same sort of apparent discrimination is reported in other cities.

People living in places more acceptable to auto insurers run into a strange mixture of salesmanship and diffidence. Some companies still advertise for new customers on television or radio. Some companies invite new business through mail-order advertisements in the newspapers. But two major companies told CU they were losing money on car insurance and were doing nothing to attract new customers.

REPORT FROM THE COUNTRY CLUB

Whatever the promotional practices, as David O. Maxwell, former Pennsylvania insurance commissioner, told a Senate committee, "we must begin with the proposition that 'competition' in the insurance business is *sui generis*. When you go to buy a car, the salesman will sell you one if you have the money. Buying insurance for the car is more like joining a country club."

This is a report from the country club. CU's 1969 Annual Questionnaire, mailed to more than 1.4 million subscribers, included a long list of questions delving into their experiences in the previous five years with auto insurance. The typical CU Questionnaire respondent should be an ideal candidate for the car-insurance country club. He is a family man or woman (median age, 40) in the upper middle income bracket (median family income, \$13,000), who has attended college and very likely graduate school (87 per cent). The Questionnaire returns bore out his highly insurable status. Only 1.4 per cent of the respondents were assigned risks. From 1964 to 1969, only 4 per cent had experienced cancellations or nonrenewals of their policies.

The preferred-risk motorist can still pick and choose his insurance company. He can still shop for the best price. He can still benefit from some rather vigorous price competition. And the results of this survey can help him select a company offering high-quality service.

For this survey, we asked questions designed to find out which companies are most likely to pay claims promptly, courteously and in full. We asked questions designed to discover which companies are least likely to cancel a policy, which companies are least likely to refuse to renew a policy, and which companies are least likely to demand sudden large boosts in premiums.

The Questionnaire response was large: 230,871 people answered the car insurance section, and 133,121 of those people reported on their experiences with claims.

The response provided data on:

Some 81,000 experiences with "first-party" claims, the kind of claims you make against your own insurance company for such things as collision damage, fire losses, theft, vandalism, broken windshields and medical costs. Assuming your insurance policy covers the type of loss, your claim is valid no matter whose faulty driving caused the damage or injuries.

Some 56,000 "third-party" claims by CU members against other car owners, the kind of claims you file when you consider the other driver to blame for an accident doing damage to your own car or injuring people in it. There is no limit to how much you may claim. How much you can actually collect depends on, among other things, your provable loss and the amount of liability insurance carried by the owner of the other car.

Some 20,000 "third-party" claims against CU members, the kind of claims other drivers make when they hold you responsible for an accident.

Some 19,500 reports of single-year increases in premiums considered by the respondent as grossly unfair.

Some 9000 reports of policies canceled or renewals refused by insurance companies.

With so rich a lode of actual experience data to work with, we have been able to rate the overall quality of service provided by 25 companies or groups of companies doing 60 per cent of all car insurance business. And we think that the survey sheds some light on the performance of the industry as a whole.

Analysis by CU's statistical consultants identified two companies that stood head and shoulders above the rest, *State Farm Mutual* and *United Services Automobile Association*. As luck or good management would have it, both companies sell at relatively low premium rates in most localities. *State Farm Mutual*, the nation's largest car insurer, deals with any car owner able to meet its fairly stiff underwriting standards. *United Services*, a mail-order company ranking 16th in size, limits its clientele mainly to active retired and former military officers.

At the other end of the Ratings are two companies judged distinctly inferior to the rest: *Sears, Roebuck's Allstate Insurance Co.*, second largest in the country, and the *Home Insurance Co.*, the 14th largest company.

BUREAU COMPANIES VERSUS INDEPENDENTS

The quality of a company's service, as measured by the survey, bore no relationship to the type of company. Traditionally, auto insurers divide up into two loosely defined categories, bureau and independent, although there are many variations.

Bureau companies follow the pattern of prices and policy wording established by national insurance rating boards. The boards' prime function is to establish premium rates—literally hundreds of thousands of possible rates from state to state and from place to place within a state—based on claims experiences and other information submitted by the member companies. Until recent years, virtually all bureau companies (and many nonbureau companies) used identical rates. Many bureau companies these days charge less than the bureau rates, and some make minor improvements in policy forms.

The really distinguishing feature of a typical present-day bureau company is its practice of selling through independent local agents. Those agents are in business for themselves and handle several different companies' policies rather than one company's exclusively. Their job is to produce business. As part of their service, they usually fill out a new policy for each customer each year, collect premiums and sometimes settle small claims. The insurance companies also expect them to screen out poor risks. If too many of an agent's policyholders put in claims, some insurance companies may withdraw their business from the agent and his customers, canceling the policies when the law allows, or refusing to renew them.

Three national bureau-members or bureau-type companies in our survey—the *Federal Insurance Co.*, the *United States Fidelity and Guaranty Co.*, and the *Insurance Co. of North America (INA)*—were judged to have given above-average service.

Independent companies, such as *State Farm Mutual*, *Nationwide Mutual* and *Allstate*, long ago challenged the bureau companies to a price war. They did so by building organizations of exclusive agents, substituting high volume for high commissions as their agents' incentive, creating a reputation for low price, doing away with the ritual of replacing policies every year, and billing

customers directly (often on a budget-easing semiannual basis).

The premium rates of some of the independents are lower than most bureau-company rates, but not universally so. Through strategic rate-setting, some independents try to attract only the least accident-prone customers. In the city of Chicago, for instance, a 30-year-old man with a clean driving record can buy the minimum automobile liability coverages (as established by the Illinois financial responsibility law) from *State Farm Mutual* for 25 per cent under bureau rates. An 18-year-old Chicago youth driving his own car, however, would have to pay *State Farm Mutual* 4 per cent above bureau rates, even though he, too, had a clean record.

Today, you rarely hear the old bureau-agents' charge that the independent companies save money by holding back claims payments or ruthlessly canceling policies. Indeed, such a generalized charge wouldn't stand up against the results of our company-by-company survey. *State Farm Mutual* satisfied a very high percentage of claimants, including not only its own policyholders but also those who collected liability claims against its policyholders. It was also one of the companies least prone to cancel or refuse to renew its policies. Another independent company with an above-average service record was *Government Employees Insurance Co. (GEICO)*. Also judged above average was the *Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.*, a bureau-member company that sells through its own exclusive agencies. But the low rating of *Allstate* is a reminder that there are not-so-good independent companies, too.

THE MOTOR CLUB COMPANIES

A third type of insurance company of interest deals exclusively with dues-paying members of motor clubs affiliated with the American Automobile Association. The biggest of them are big by any standard. The *Interinsurance Exchange of the Automobile Club of Southern California* ranks 15th in size nationally. In central and northern California, the somewhat smaller *California State Automobile Association Inter-Insurance Bureau* covers 14 per cent of all private passenger cars registered in its membership area. Those two companies ranked third and fourth in CU's Ratings and were judged to have given much better than average service.

Similar companies are attached by the Automobile Clubs of Missouri, Michigan and Iowa, the Chicago Motor Club, the Keystone Automobile Club (Pennsylvania) and the Cornhusker Motor Club (Nebraska). Unfortunately, our survey did not gather enough experiences to permit a rating of any of them. As a group, they fell short of the service record of the California clubs, but were as good as the average company in this report. Individually—we just can't say.

THE BETTER SIDE OF CLAIMS

Consumer-business relationships usually work out best when the consumer deals directly with the seller. Relations with car-insurance companies are no exception to the rule. They are in business to handle claims, and it makes all kinds of economic sense for an insurer to pay a legitimate claim promptly and in full when the claimant is its own policyholder. Otherwise, it may lose a customer.

You as a customer are in this relatively favorable first-party position when you make claims under the collision, comprehensive, medical payments, uninsured motorist, and towing-cost provisions of your policy—claims payable by your company regardless of who, if anyone, was at fault. When you make a liability claim against someone else's insurance company, or he makes one against yours, you become or he becomes the third-party in the transaction. In those situations,

the claimant is not a customer. He is an adversary who must be able to prove to someone else's insurance company that its policyholder was at fault, or who must convince a jury of it.

The biggest objection raised against the liability insurance system flows from the adversary relationship, which breeds disputes, court cases, excessive and, frequently, dissatisfaction with the outcome. One good argument for doing away with the liability system of paying auto accident losses would be to put auto insurance predominantly on a less controversial first-party basis.

Theory is borne out by practice. In CU's survey, first-party claims generally caused the least dissatisfaction. Our questions

probed into the size of claims, the types of claims, and the speed and courtesy with which they were settled. Only a few first-party claims had been rejected (1.8 per cent). Of those whose claims were paid, 89.5 per cent said they received about the right amount or exactly the right amount, and only 7 per cent said they received too little. Almost all respondents were pleased with the way claims were handled: 94 per cent thought the company took no more than a reasonable time to settle, and 92 per cent felt they were treated courteously.

By no means all companies did equally well. Honors went to *State Farm Mutual*, *United Services*, and the two California auto-club insurance companies for first-party

claims handling that was well above average. If one had to choose among them, we would single out *United Services*. It stood well above the average company no matter whether it was a simple claim for a broken windshield or a trickier one for medical payments or injuries caused by an uninsured motorist.

Just how well satisfied the claimants were with the settlement hinged, however, on the size and type of the claim (see the table). As the size of the claim increased, fewer people reported themselves satisfied with the size of the payment. When the payment exceeded \$1000, it was considered too small by 13 per cent of those people who responded to that question.

1ST-PARTY CLAIMS—HOW SATISFIED WERE CAR OWNERS WITH THE CLAIMS THEY COLLECTED FROM THEIR OWN INSURANCE COMPANIES?

[In percent]

	The payment was considered—					Total		The payment was considered—					Total
	Too little	About right	Exactly right	Overly generous	Don't know			Too little	About right	Exactly right	Overly generous	Don't know	
For all claims collected.....	7.0	32.0	57.5	2.0	1.5								
For claims amounting to—							For claims based on—						
Less than \$200.....	6.0	27.0	64.0	2.0	1.0	1.51	Comprehensive.....	5.5	25.5	66.0	2.0	1.0	1.40
\$200 to \$999.....	7.5	37.0	51.5	2.5	1.5	1.38	Collision.....	8.0	37.5	51.0	2.0	1.5	1.55
More than \$1,000.....	13.0	43.0	39.5	3.0	1.5	1.11	Medical payments.....	11.0	39.0	45.5	2.0	2.5	1.10
Total.....						100	Injuries caused by uninsured motorists.....	16.5	37.0	41.5	2.5	2.5	1.06
							Other.....	7.0	26.5	60.0	4.0	2.5	1.01
							Total.....						112

¹ Received this amount.

² Of all claims.

Note: Total exceeds 100 percent because some people filed more than 1 type of claim. The data in this table are based on 69,302 claims actually paid, out of 80,951 claims reported. Of the rest, 1.8 percent of the respondents said their claim was rejected, 3.1 percent said it had not yet been settled, and 9.5 percent didn't know or didn't say how much they collected.

First-party insurance was quite clearly protecting well against property-damage claims. More than 90 per cent of those reporting felt they had been paid at least enough for losses due to fire, theft, vandalism, rocks kicked up by passing cars, and other accidents covered under the general heading of "comprehensive, fire and theft." There was also quite a high level of satisfaction with collision claims.

HOW THE INJURED FARED

First-party medical claims were paid with some reliability, too, although not as satisfactorily as car-damage claims. First-party medical coverage, remember, is payable to anyone in the policyholder's car regardless of who caused the accident. With most policies, medical payments are limited to somewhere between \$500 and \$5000. Even so, a far higher percentage of people were satisfied with those limited payments from their own insurance companies than with medical compensation paid to them as the result of liability claims.

The most troublesome first-party claims were made under the provisions of uninsured-motorist coverage. This hybrid of first-party and liability insurance obliges your own company to pay you for injury costs—medical and hospital bills, lost wages, compensation for pain and suffering—usually up to a limit of at least \$10,000 (depending on state laws and policy differences), but only if a faculty driver in an uninsured or a hit-and-run car caused the accident.

The fact that 16.5 per cent of claimants against uninsured-motorist coverage felt they had been underpaid may be attributable partly to compromised settlements of disputes over the size of a bodily injury claim and the question of who was at fault—commonplace disputes in liability situations. Or the claimant may have thought he was entitled to compensation for damage to his car. Under the uninsured-motorist laws of most states he is not.

Thousands of car owners who pay for insurance protection do not get it because the insurance company has become insolvent, and for the same reason, accident victims lose millions of dollars of compensation each year. Company failures may wipe out only a tiny fraction of all claims, but the losses are real

enough. They certainly were real to this participant in our survey:

"I was the driver of a car involved in a . . . collision in July 1961. . . . The two occupants of the other car brought suit against me individually. [My insurance company], Commonwealth Mutual Insurance Co., went into bankruptcy. The cases came up for trial in September 1967. I settled with both plaintiffs out of my own pocket, and I submitted claims to the Pennsylvania insurance commissioner against the insurance company. As of May 1969, the commissioner's office is still trying to untangle and dissolve [the defunct company]. If I sound somewhat bitter, I am."

Most states now require uninsured motorist provisions to cover at least the injury liability claims owed by bankrupt liability insurance companies, but that doesn't help you collect when your own company fails. Thus, uninsured-motorist coverage serves only as stopgap protection for some motorists and their potential victims in some situations in some states. Other states have an insolvency fund to help in some cases. What is needed is a Federal law creating a system that will safeguard all policyholders in all states, the way the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. safeguards the savings of bank depositors. Such a bill, the Federal Insurance Guaranty Corp. Act (S. 2236), is said to be gathering increased support in Congress.

THE LIABILITY SYSTEM

Despite the flaws in uninsured-motorist coverage, even this form of first-party insurance proved more reliable than the liability coverage of properly insured drivers. Liability protection is at the heart of present-day combination auto insurance policies. It is there to protect the financial interests of the car owner against the legal consequences of faulty driving by anyone who operates his car. State law usually says faulty drivers must pay for all the losses sustained by their victims, not only those losses directly measurable in dollars but also any subjective or "psychic" losses such as pain, suffering or disfigurement. Liability insurance saves the car owner and others who drive his car from those financial consequences by spreading the costs among all insured car owners. The insurance company pays the claims against

you; it also supplies you with legal counsel and pays any court costs.

The least amount of liability protection found in automobile policies in most states is "10/20/5" coverage. That pays a maximum of \$10,000 to any one person for bodily injuries, up to \$20,000 for all persons injured in the same accident, and up to \$5000 damage to cars and other property. Financial responsibility laws in each state set minimum limits, and quite a few states set them higher than 10/20/5. Maine requires the highest limits, 20/40/10, and many people everywhere wisely carry even more than that.

In short, there is usually enough liability insurance in any policy to pay for all except very severe injuries. Yet those who reported to us on successful liability claims against other drivers expressed a high degree of dissatisfaction at the amount they received.

The table on this page tells the story: 31.5 per cent felt their medical payments were too small (compared with 11 per cent who thought medical payments from their own insurer were too small); 38 per cent were dissatisfied with payments for pain and suffering; 40.5 per cent were not fully paid for wages lost because of injuries serious enough to prevent them from working. Even though 13 per cent of those reporting liability claims had received \$1000 or more from the other driver's insurance company, one third of those claimants felt they had received too little.

Liability insurance functioned fairly well in the large majority of claims involving compensation for property damage only. In those instances, 82 per cent of the claimants received at least enough to pay for repairs. The real problem is not with repairs to cars. Many would be covered by their own collision insurance in any case.

Our findings hint at the hardships endured by some accident victims while insurance adjusters tried to knock down the size of the claim. The wait was too long for 19 per cent of the claimants reporting, and far too long for an additional 18 per cent of them. One in seven liability claimants retained lawyers. Nearly half the settlements won through a lawyer were considered too small, and most of those claims took too long to settle, the claimants reported. The lawyer's fee typically took 25 per cent or more out of the settlement.

LIABILITY CLAIMS—HOW SATISFIED WERE ACCIDENT VICTIMS WITH THE CLAIMS THEY COLLECTED FROM THE INSURANCE COMPANY OF ANOTHER DRIVER WHEN HE CAUSED THE ACCIDENT?

(In percent)

	The payment was considered—					Total
	Too little	About right	Exactly right	Overly generous	Don't know	
For all claims collected.....	17.5	40.5	38.0	2.0	2.0	
For claims amounting to:						
Less than \$200.....	14.0	36.5	45.5	2.0	1.0	151
\$200 to \$999.....	18.0	43.5	35.0	2.5	1.0	136
\$1,000 to \$9,999.....	36.0	47.0	12.0	2.0	3.0	112
\$10,000 or more.....	37.0	37.5	19.0	2.0	4.5	11
Total.....						100

	The payment was considered—					Total
	Too little	About right	Exactly right	Overly generous	Don't know	
For claims based on:						
Damage to auto.....	16.5	40.5	39.5	2.0	1.5	94
Medical expenses.....	31.5	48.5	13.0	3.0	4.0	16
Pain and suffering.....	38.0	46.5	6.5	4.0	5.0	11
Loss of wages.....	40.5	45.5	7.0	3.0	4.0	17
Collision deductibles.....	37.0	36.0	19.5	2.0	5.5	5
Total.....						133

† Received this amount.
‡ Of all claims.

Note: Total exceeds 100 percent because some people filed more than one type of claim. The data in this table are based on 44,662 claims actually paid, out of 56,393 claims reported. Of the rest, 7.6 percent of the respondents said their claim was rejected, 8 percent said it had not yet been settled, and 5.2 percent didn't answer the question pertaining to the amount they had received.

When people have been injured, who pays the costs meantime? How many people will delay getting physical therapy and rehabilitation treatments? A Transportation Department study of seriously injured highway victims in 1967 found that those whose losses exceeded \$10,000 recovered an average of only one-third of their losses and those whose losses exceeded \$25,000 recovered only one-fourth. According to other studies, few get the money when they need it most.

SOMEONE ELSE'S CLAIM

One exceptional Questionnaire respondent wrote: "We were hit while . . . virtually standing still. The police report definitely assigned all blame to the other driver. My husband offered to accept \$800, the exact cost of the car repairs and my small medical costs. We had to get a lawyer, who [collected] \$1200 for us (exaggerating my injuries, etc.) so he would receive one-third. This seems to be common procedure and we deplore it. No wonder insurance is so costly."

Only 2 per cent of those reporting on claims against other drivers thought they had been paid too much. People saw things quite differently, however, when it was someone else's claim against them. A great many Questionnaire respondents did not know how much their company paid someone else or couldn't judge the fairness of the payment. Quite a few who did know thought the payment was overly generous. Here's how people judged the adequacy of liability payments when their company was paying, contrasted with how they judged payments when someone else's company was paying them (not counting those answering "don't know" or "can't judge"):

(In percent)

	Too small	About right	Exactly right	Overly generous
When the claim was against those reporting..	2.0	36	43	19.0
When it was their claim against someone else....	17.5	41	39	2.5

Clearly, the liability system of paying highway injury claims tends to becloud the objectivity of some of those involved. Nevertheless, some insurance companies did a better job than others of satisfying third parties. *State Farm Mutual's* handling of third-party claims was judged outstanding. The *Auto Club of Southern California*, *GEICO* and *United Services* did nearly as well. The least satisfaction was reported with third-party claims against the *Aetna Casualty and Surety Co.* and *Allstate*.

CANCELLATION PROBLEMS

The standard family automobile policy says as follows:

"This policy may be cancelled by the company by mailing to the insured . . . written notice stating when not less than ten days thereafter such cancellation shall be effective. The mailing of notice as aforesaid shall be sufficient proof of notice."

It goes on to say that after the policy has been in effect for 60 days the company "shall not exercise its right to cancel" the liability portion of the policy except for failure to pay the premium or suspension or revocation of the driver's license of anyone who customarily drives the car. In other words, an insurance company wants 60 days to decide whether to do business with a new policyholder for the full term of his policy, usually one year, or to drop him unceremoniously. Moreover, the typical policy puts no restriction at all on the right of a company to refuse to renew an expiring policy.

State laws further restrict cancellations and nonrenewals. Most states require insurance companies to give 20 days' notice, not 10, of cancellation or nonrenewal. Some states require the company to give a reason. A few states grant policyholders a hearing if they think the cancellation is unfair or illegal. And several states prohibit auto insurers from determining whom they will or will not insure solely on the basis of age, race, color, creed, national origin, ancestry or occupation.

A new law this year in Ohio requires companies to guarantee renewal of a policy for two years. The law, however, gives insurers 90 days to cancel a new policy for any reason at all, instead of the usual 60 days.

Some few insurance companies promise to continue your coverage longer than any law requires. Of the companies rated in this report, *Allstate* guarantees renewals for five years after the first 60 days. As a result, *Allstate's* incidence of nonrenewals as reported in our survey was much lower than average. Its incidence of cancellations, presumably within the first 60 days, was much higher than average, however, and a much higher than average percentage of policyholders said their premiums had been increased by a grossly unfair amount in a single year.

Without making any guarantee to renew, *State Farm Mutual*, *United Services*, *Liberty Mutual* and *GEICO* also had a much lower than average incidence of nonrenewals. In contrast to *Allstate*, their incidence of cancellations was much lower than average, too, and relatively few policyholders answering the Questionnaire complained of unfair step-ups of premiums.

One of the most disturbing findings in our survey is that thousands of people felt so intimidated by the threat of cancellation, nonrenewal or excessive premiums that they were willing to sacrifice benefits rather than risk a claim against them. We asked this question: "Did you pay anyone for some damage or injury done by your car without involving your insurance company, so as to

avoid the chance of having your rates raised or your insurance cancelled?" More than 14,000 respondents—6 per cent of all those reporting—answered "yes." At that rate, it is plain that millions of other motorists, too, hesitate to use the protection they are paying for.

How much does this feeling of intimidation save the insurance companies? As you might expect, most of the private settlements reported to us for the years 1964 to 1969 involved less than \$100 and 98 per cent involved less than \$500. But 142 people said they paid amounts between \$500 and \$1000, and 129 people said they paid more than \$1000.

It is a violation of your insurance policy not to report an accident to the company. CU's insurance consultants warn against the private settlement of damages, at least in accidents involving other cars with people in them. Even if everyone says he is unhurt, you may find yourself served later with notice of a personal injury suit. That nearly happened to a participant in our survey. He wrote:

"The accident took place . . . with a police officer in full view. . . . I hit the car in front of me, which had stopped suddenly in traffic. The officer came over, looked over both cars, asked how each of us felt, told us there would be no ticket, and asked us to quickly move out of the scene so that traffic would not be held up. Much to my dismay, about 30 days later my company was taken aback by a letter from an attorney . . . requesting payment for whiplash injuries suffered by his client. . . . My company paid the claim, \$1100, which was all medical charges, not for auto damage."

Luckily, the insurance company paid that claim. But if you attempted to settle automobile damages yourself and were later sued for someone's real or alleged injury, your insurance company might not pay the claim and it might not defend you in court.

CHOOSING A COMPANY

The Ratings give weight to the way each company handled first-party claims and third-party claims and to its record on cancellations, nonrenewals and big premium boosts. If you are seriously worried about losing your coverage, you may want to consider *GEICO* or *Liberty Mutual*, for their low incidence of cancellations and nonrenewals, in preference to some of the other above-average companies with better records on first-party claims. Any above-average or below-average characteristic of a company is mentioned in the Ratings.

Also noted, but given no weight in the Ratings, are the companies' own comparisons of their rates with those published by the national rating organizations—the bureau rates. That information is given as a first step in price shopping. It should hardly be the last step, though. The car-insurance

rate structure is immensely complicated and rapidly changing. As the insurance commissioner of Georgia has pointed out, the industry's system of classifying drivers, localities, car usages, and types of cars can produce more than 100,000 rates for a single company in a single state. Next month we will tackle the difficult problem of finding a practical method of making valid price comparisons.

The Ratings also indicate which companies offer the family automobile policy, and which ones offer the special automobile policy. Next month's issue will explain the differences between the two policies in greater detail. For now, the important thing to note is that some bureau companies sell the special policy at rates around 15 percent lower than for a family policy with equivalent coverages, but you may have to prod an agent into offering it.

If you are pleased with your present car insurance or with your present agent, perhaps you should leave well enough alone. Even a company rated below average in this report may be giving you better-than-average service because of a good agent or a good district claims manager. And an independent agent may really go to bat for you with a balky car-insurance company if you have placed a lot of other insurance with him, too.

DON'T SWITCH IF . . .

Some people should probably hang onto their present policy under any circumstances. A safe rule of thumb is: Don't switch companies now if your company has paid a liability claim against you of \$100 or more in the past three years. Don't switch if you have had a number of smaller liability claims. Don't switch if you have made a large claim or a number of smaller claims recently under the collision, comprehensive or medical provisions of your own policy. A new company may accept you at first but cancel you within a couple of months on the basis of further investigation. In no instance should you discontinue your present policy until you have been notified that a new one is in effect. The best time to apply to a new company is about 60 days before your old policy is due to expire.

HOW RELIABLE IS THIS SURVEY?

Ordinarily, people who answer questionnaires tend to be motivated by some sort of bias. If an automobile insurance questionnaire were mailed at random, the people most inclined to answer it might be those who felt strongly about the subject—especially people with gripes.

That kind of bias did not play a significant part in this survey. The automobile insurance questions took up less than half of a questionnaire that was five pages and 77 questions long. Other questions ranged over a variety of subjects. A full additional page, the front page, consisted of the ballot for the election of seven CU directors. Valid ballots were cast by 231,377 members. The automobile insurance questions were answered by 230,871. If the respondents had any particular bias, it must have been a devotion to Consumers Union and to the cause of more and better consumer information. It was certainly not an ax-grinding bias against insurance companies.

But the experiences gathered are indeed those of a select group in American society, as noted elsewhere in this report. Possibly, a scientific sampling of all driving-age Americans would have painted a different picture of how well automobile insurance functions. A concurrent survey for the U.S. Department of Transportation, for example indicates a higher incidence of cancellations and nonrenewals of policies among the general public than among CU's sample of that public.

For another thing, the people in our sample are prone to be price-conscious insurance shoppers. A larger percentage of them were insured by low-priced companies such as *Allstate*, *State Farm*, *GEICO*, and *United Services Automobile Association* than would have been predicted on the basis of the position of those companies in the national market.

What counted in the statistical evaluations behind the Ratings were, first, the percentages of people reporting this or that experience with each company, and, second, the total number of responses for each company. Companies with comparatively few returns, such as *Federal* (322) and *Ohio Casualty* (312) were less likely to be judged above or below average than companies with many returns, such as *State Farm* (13,515), *Allstate* (9538) and *Geico* (6059).

In CU's judgment and that of its consultants, the Ratings constitute a highly reliable reflection of the way 25 insurance companies treated CU-members as policyholders or liability claimants in the years 1964 through mid-1969. And given the fact that the managements of automobile insurance companies are slow to change, the Ratings should hold true for a number of years into the future. Inevitably, in a national study of service organizations some of you who are persuaded to insure with one of the top-rated companies will be disappointed. Some insurance authorities tell us company management can vary from state to state or even from city to city. And of course an occasional company too small or too local to be picked up by this kind of survey may be outstanding.

Those qualifications having been dutifully noted, your prospects of choosing well on the basis of CU's Ratings far exceed the prospects of choosing well on the basis of any other information we know about.

AUTO INSURANCE: THE PROSPECTS FOR REFORM

In May 1968, Congress directed the Secretary of Transportation to study the present automobile liability insurance system. Now, two years later, Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe is about to present his report and recommendations. Mr. Volpe is expected to propose some changes in the law that gives rise to automobile liability insurance.

The law, handed down from the horse-and-buggy age, says anyone who suffers injury to body or property through another's carelessness has a right to full compensation from the wrongdoer. On today's highways, though, the word "wrongdoer" may not properly describe the situation. There were an estimated 20.4 million highway accidents in 1969—one for every five motor vehicles. Truly, as one of our readers has observed, "The ubiquitous automobile is a hazard which must be accepted in the same category as fire, earthquake and disease."

Everyone who drives a car runs a heavy risk that he will someday be a wrongdoer in the eyes of the law. That's why car liability insurance was invented. Moreover, every state in the union, in order to give highway victims a fair chance to collect from wrongdoers, seeks to compel all motor vehicle owners to buy liability insurance.

Here is a rare instance in which the police power of the state is used to force consumers to buy something from private business. In CU's opinion, the state thereby takes on a special obligation to see that consumers receive good value for their money—some \$7.2 billion in 1968. But in that the state fails miserably.

A BILL OF PARTICULARS

First, liability insurance does a poor job of paying for highway injuries. Out of every dollar of premiums spent for bodily-injury liability, nearly 25¢ pays for legal expenses—more, probably, than pays for medical costs.

A second extravagance takes the form of insurance benefits paid twice, three times or even five times for the same loss. The rule of liability law says every loss must be paid as though no insurance existed. So along with liability insurance, many people also get first-party medical payments from their own car insurance and from other accident and health insurance; some also are paid life insurance, workmen's compensation insurance, social security, Blue Cross, sick pay or unemployment insurance. By recent estimates, nearly 20 per cent of benefits from liability insurance are duplicate payments. That doesn't mean all victims are generously paid. As noted elsewhere in this report, many people hurt in accidents are underpaid—especially those whose losses are heaviest.

Liability insurance has also been blamed for a distaste on the part of insurance companies for certain kinds of customers. According to T. Lawrence Jones, president of the American Insurance Association, insurance companies look at each applicant for a policy as a potential defendant in court. Mr. Jones recently told the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, "It is easy to see how this . . . unfortunately leads to the reluctance of some insurers to make auto insurance available to young people, minority groups and people with occupations that are judged to be in less favorable light."

INSURANCE WITHOUT FAULT

For all those reasons and others, Consumers Union has endorsed a plan to change most automobile-accident bodily injury claims from third-party liability claims, payable only to victims of faulty drivers, to first-party claims, payable without regard to fault (Consumer Reports, January 1968). The Basic Protection plan, as it is called, was developed by two law professors, Robert E. Keeton and Jeffrey O'Connell, and is better known as the Keeton-O'Connell Plan. Before it can be put into effect, Congress or state legislatures would have to pass a new car-insurance law. So far that hasn't happened.

Under the Keeton-O'Connell plan, the liability law would be preserved primarily for people whose injuries were so severe and so costly that their first-party coverage limit of \$10,000 per person wasn't enough, or who, because of the loss of a limb or mutilation of mind or body, could convince a jury to award them more than \$5000 in compensation for their suffering or for being crippled.

While the Keeton-O'Connell plan remains only a plan, it has spurred other proposals to swing more of the emphasis of car insurance toward payment without regard to faulty driving. Various industry trade associations have come out for reforms of one sort or another, and one of them, the American Insurance Association (AIA), has proposed a plan to eliminate liability claims entirely.

THE NEW YORK STATE PLAN

Progress towards insurance reform took a major step forward last February, when Richard E. Stewart, New York State superintendent of insurance, submitted a report to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller extensively reviewing and documenting the failures of the present liability insurance system in language the layman can understand. (Free copies of the report, "Automobile Insurance . . . For Whose Benefit," are available from the Governor's office, Albany, N.Y. 12224). Mr. Stewart proposed, and Governor Rockefeller endorsed, legislation to achieve major reforms.

Under the New York State plan, the insurance on the car in which you were hurt would pay all injury costs, including wage losses, as they were incurred. You would not have to go in debt or postpone treatment while waiting for a claim to be paid. Liability claims would be possible only if someone were killed. If a drunk or a drugged driver

caused the accident, your insurance company could recover what it paid you by making a claim against his company. Your company could also recover from the insurer of a commercial vehicle, if you were involved in an accident with it, on the theory that businesses can exert some control over the way their vehicles are driven.

The New York plan, like other proposed no-fault plans, would be compulsory. But unlike compulsory liability insurance, this plan gives car insurance a back seat to more economical insurance policies. The compulsory coverage would be used only to pay expenses not covered by more efficient insurance. At present, even the nonliability coverages in car insurance policies are relatively costly, taking 30c to 40c of the premium dollar for company expenses. By contrast, social security takes 3c, Blue Cross 7c, and health and accident insurance 17c. Premium rates under the New York plan have been estimated at 33 per cent below the rates for today's package policies with equivalent coverage.

One minor weakness of the New York plan, as we see it, is its treatment of automobile damages. The compulsory policy would pay for damage to clothing, buildings and other property but not for car damage. No one could collect for car repairs unless he had bought an optional collision policy. The trouble here is that many older cars aren't worth insuring against collisions, and quite a few owners of new cars are willing to take the risk of paying for their own mistakes, so long as liability insurance will pay for damages caused by someone else. Under the present liability system, our studies show, most claimants do manage to collect car-damage costs from other driver's insurers when the other driver causes the accident, probably because claims can go no higher than replacement value of the car and are usually much smaller than that. The New York plan would induce many more people to buy collision insurance unnecessarily, while the present property-damage liability system could probably be made to work well at a lower price.

There is one much more serious complaint against the New York plan. Its basic compulsory coverage leaves no way for grievously injured victims to win compensation for losses not directly measurable in terms of money—losses claimable in present liability cases under the heading of "pain and suffering." The truth is that, today, most payments for pain and suffering are bribes used to settle relatively small, so-called nuisance claims, and that people with severely disabling injuries are lucky to recover even their out-of-pocket losses. All the proposed no-fault plans are designed to eliminate nuisance claims, and rightly so. Under the New York plan, you can collect for pain and suffering only if you have bought your own optional extra coverage for it. But when the other driver's negligence was flagrant and when your injuries leave you with endless pain or terrible disfigurement, optional coverage hardly seems fair or adequate—especially if you don't have it.

In those cases, either the victim should be able to sue, as he can now, or he should have a claim against his own compulsory insurance. A no-fault insurance bill in Minnesota, for instance, proposes to fix compensation for permanent injury at amounts ranging from \$1050 for loss of a big toe to \$25,000 for total disability.

The New York plan is also somewhat fuzzy about how it will pay for future wage losses of children, students and workers who have not yet realized their full economic potential. Critics of this and other no-fault plans often exaggerate the weak points instead of suggesting ways to strengthen them. A favorite horror story has a drunken driver run

over a little girl, mutilating her horribly. The drunk's no-fault insurance policy pays the little girl nothing. Her family's no-fault policy pays, at most, her medical expenses.

That horror story might be appropriate if today's drunks and other negligent drivers really paid claims and if they were the only ones responsible for maiming innocent children. But it's the drunken driver's insurance company that pays—with money from other policyholders. And not all injuries are caused by drunks or other negligent drivers. Some children dart into the street from behind parked cars. A tragic few are run over by parents backing out of driveways. If the victims of drunks deserve money for a lifetime of pain or disability, so do the victims of innocent drivers.

FEDERAL ACTION?

The New York plan, the Keeton-O'Connell plan, the AIA plan and others all provide a good basis for the kind of reforms Transportation Secretary Volpe is considering for his imminent report to Congress. The swiftest, most effective reform could come through Federal legislation establishing one unified no-fault auto insurance plan for the entire country. Whether through Federal or state action, though, change is needed. Those in the insurance industry who oppose it might well heed Mr. Stewart of New York, a staunch supporter of private enterprise:

"If fundamental change in the fault insurance system does not come very soon, we predict that the entire apparatus will be swept away and replaced by a social insurance system run by government."

The consumer's main concern is not whether government or industry will do the job. One way or the other, he wants insurance designed for the realities of the road. He wants protection from serious financial losses in all highway accidents. He wants insurance that returns the largest possible slice of his dollars in benefits. He wants his claims settled fairly and promptly without legal travail. And he wants to be treated as a customer, not as a supplicant.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of June 2, 1970. With the voting rights bill currently before the Committee on Rules and due on the House floor soon, this editorial is most timely.

The editorial follows:

VOTING RIGHTS IN DANGER

The House Rules Committee is expected to take action today on extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965, one of the most effective civil rights laws ever passed. If the committee reports out the expected resolution, allowing the chamber simply to vote for or against the bill as amended by the Senate, there is a good chance that this crucially needed legislation will quickly be passed and sent on to the White House.

If the committee allows further changes, however, or the House rejects a rule for a simple yes-or-no vote, then a vital protection for Negro voters in the South will almost surely disappear in August, when the present law expires.

What points ominously to this possibility that any further amendments now would require that the bill be sent to a conference committee, which, because of its probable Senate membership, would provide the perfect setting for a quiet entombment.

The greatest threat to the bill, ironically, is not that the House will seek to undo Senate provisions that strengthened the original House measure. Republican House leaders and the Administration itself have made clear their acceptance of those changes.

The danger is in the proposal to lower the voting age to eighteen, introduced and pressed by Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts. Even some Representatives who favor such action believe the purpose should be achieved by constitutional amendment rather than Congressional statute. We hope that those who take this view will nevertheless forgo their preference rather than endanger the entire measure. If their reservations are solely on legal grounds, they need have no qualms, since the bill provides that a court decision ruling the method unconstitutional would affect only that provision, leaving the rest of the measure intact.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has made far too great a contribution to American democracy to be sacrificed before its purpose is fully served. In those Southern states affected by it, Negro registration has jumped from 29 per cent to 52 per cent, and the number of blacks elected to office has gone from 78 to nearly 500. Yet in terms of getting a majority of voting-age Negroes registered, the job is far from done. To allow the act to expire now would be the worst setback to civil rights since the martyrdom of Martin Luther King.

MR. SPEAKER—JOHN McCORMACK

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, I am tempted to offer my remarks as a personal privilege speech—because it has been my privilege to serve in this great body under the direction of the best there is, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK.

When I was first sworn in as a Member of Congress, I was awed by the quiet power of this man JOHN McCORMACK. Over the years, that respect has not diminished; rather it has grown. In my time here, I have witnessed personally the skill, the compassion and the mettle of the Speaker, and I have learned from that experience.

To my thinking, this man richly deserves the outpouring of affection as witnessed by the appearance of former President Johnson and President Nixon who came to Capitol Hill to offer their thanks for the service he has rendered.

Of all the truly great men in government, I know of few who can match JOHN McCORMACK's minute-by-minute awareness of responsibility to his Government, his country, and his people. Many is the time I have rushed to the Speaker's office with a hot request of crisis proportions to my district, and always I have found a receptive audience. The Speaker would always listen; he would not always agree and I respect him for this, but he would always listen.

JOHN McCORMACK earned the respect of his colleagues by his fair treatment of all Members, regardless of party or philosophy.

His tenure at the helm is direct testimony of his worth. A lesser man could not have commanded the job for one-half the years that Speaker McCORMACK has lead the House of Representatives. In times of both crisis and calm, the Speaker has been a steadying influence for the House. Because of my close personal association with President Johnson, I know how much he depended upon the Speaker during those initial months after that paralyzing moment at the assassination of President Kennedy. I know how much President Johnson depended on him through all these years, and I know, and even predict, that history will prove my convictions about the Speaker. He has indeed been a giant in his time. History will bear that out.

But, instead of waiting for the kindness that will come from history, I want the Speaker and the Nation to know of my high regard—my "maximum high regard" as President Johnson puts it—for Speaker JOHN McCORMACK. I like him as a man, as a colleague, and as a leader. Speaker McCORMACK was Speaker when I came to the House. He is my Speaker now. He will always be my Speaker.

To the Speaker and to his beloved wife Harriet, I offer the special thanks for having shared with the Nation their lives, their energies, and their direction. I wish them every happiness.

MY GOD, HOW CAN IT BE?

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned over the events of the times, particularly those related to the war in Southeast Asia, and the high level of violence and crime here at home. Mr. Joseph R. Holmes, of California, has written some eloquent questions on these subjects. I include Mr. Holmes' words in the RECORD:

MY GOD, HOW CAN IT BE?

That one boy lies rotting from malnutrition and torture in a jungle prison camp in North Vietnam—and another boy spits and tramples on the flag of this country on the steps of a university.

That one boy lies sightless in a hospital room from communist inflicted face wounds—and another boy uses a communist flag to drape himself in defiance of the laws of this country.

That one man of medicine begins his thirtieth straight hour standing over an operating table in pursuit of life for men serving this nation—and another man of medicine implores crowds of young men to refuse to serve their country.

That one negro holds the face of his dead white comrade in his hands and cries pitifully in a dirty mud hole in Vietnam—and another negro screams with hate against his

white brother on the streets of countless American cities.

That one young woman sobs with grief over the death of her soldier husband in a far off jungle—and another young woman sobs with hysteria as her body pulsates with drugs.

That one man's heart fills with pride as he stands before his President to be honored for valor—and another man stands in a gutter carrying a sign smeared with venom and vulgarity directed at his President.

That one boy lies in a coffin beneath the ground because he believed in duty to country—and another boy lies on a dingy cot giving blood to the enemies of his country.

That one man of God shields a wounded boy from an enemy bayonet with his body and dies—and another man of God uses his cloth as a shield to preach hate, dissension and lawlessness.

That in the name of liberty for Southeast Asia, Americans walk the streets, the jungle paths of South Vietnam with courage and conviction—and in the name of civil liberty for those who wallow in a life of crime, other Americans walk the streets of their own cities with fear and trepidation.

My God, how can it be?

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN
O'HARA AT MICHIGAN PRISONER
OF WAR WEEK RALLY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, the people of the Detroit area under the leadership of the Prisoner of War Committee, Mrs. Shirley Odell of Mount Clemens, president, held a rally to mark the beginning of Michigan Prisoner of War Week. The rally, held in John F. Kennedy Square, in downtown Detroit, included remarks by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

I include Mr. O'HARA's comments on this occasion at this point in the RECORD:

It's an honor to be here to speak a very few, inadequate words with regard to the brave Americans who are being held prisoner in North Vietnam and with regard to their equally brave families who have organized this event today.

In a time of increasing, and ever more bitter division among the American people on a great many questions, and on the over-riding question of the war itself, there are few subjects on which we can with any accuracy claim unanimity.

But if there is one such subject, it is the question of the treatment of prisoners held in North Vietnam.

There are those here today who favor an expansion of the war. There are those here today who favor rapid liquidation of our involvement in the war.

There are those here today who believe firmly and without question that the President's decisions are correct. There are those here today who think he has made a serious mistake and that present policies will not shorten the war by a day or shorten the casualty lists by a single name.

But there are few indeed who would not subscribe to the proposition that the Americans who are being held in North Vietnam are entitled at the very least to treatment as

good as that which their fathers may have received in German prison camps in World War II.

Those who are gathered here today—those who have fathers or brothers or sons or husbands in prison camps—pray hourly for their release and their return home. But all that these wives and children and mothers and fathers have demanded as a right is that North Vietnam tell us who they are holding, let them send and receive mail on a regular basis and treat them in accord with the minimal requirements of the Geneva Convention.

The Geneva Convention on Treatment of Prisoners of War is a document of some age and considerable moral values. It stands as a symbol of hope to those who feel that a treaty can mean something. In World War II when the contending powers were fighting for their life and for their way of life—in a war which ideological considerations made particularly bitter—in a war in which at least one combatant demonstrated a willingness to eradicate millions of people as a matter of national policy—even in that war, that combatant and the others observed the Geneva Convention. Even in that bitter war, the International Red Cross was able to exercise its normal functions as a neutral intermediary between Germany and the Western Allies, frequently between Germany and the Soviets, and to a limited extent between Japan—which had never signed the Convention—and its enemies.

There were, God knows, horrible exceptions in World War II to the principle of decent treatment of enemy prisoners of war—and few combatants were wholly innocent of such exceptions. But, by and large, a prisoner in World War II was treated as a prisoner.

He was given the kind of diet and medical care which was available to the soldiers of the nation holding him prisoner. In Japanese and German prison camps toward the end of World War II, this wasn't very much. But it was for the most part as good as the German and Japanese soldiers were getting at that time.

He was, for the most part, able to count on the intervention of the International Red Cross.

And, for the most part, his family knew he was a prisoner!

None of these things are true with respect to the prisoners in North Vietnam today.

There are nearly 1500 Americans missing in this war. Of these, only about 400 are, in fact, known to be prisoners.

Their treatment leaves much to be desired. The pitifully tiny handful who have been released have told tales of brutality and starvation that would turn any stomach. For a while, the North Vietnamese government noisily talked of trying them as "war criminals." But under the pressure of world public opinion, this threat, at least, has waned.

The ability of these prisoners to write to their families and the ability of their families to write to them or to send them relief packages is severely limited.

A self-styled Liaison Committee with families of servicemen detained in Vietnam has claimed to have expedited the mail situation. And whether this Hanoi approved group deserves any credit or not, there has been some improvement. But in fact, the situation is still very difficult with regard to mail.

But above all, the worst and cruelest fact of all is that the North Vietnamese have continually and consistently refused to release lists of the names of those held in their camps.

The pain of knowing that your husband or your father or your son is in battle and in peril of his life is difficult enough to bear. The knowledge that he has been wounded

and is fighting to hold on to the life that for most of these young men has just really begun, is harder to bear. Almost as painful is the knowledge that he is a prisoner held in a distant land with his future dependent largely on the efforts of others and on the outcome of battles in which he cannot participate.

But the worst fate of all is not to know if he is a prisoner or indeed even if he is alive. Those who bear the cross of uncertainty bear the most difficult burden this long and bloody war can impose. They are entitled to, and they have our sympathy and our help whatever we may believe about the war itself.

On the question of expressing this nation's determination that its prisoners shall be treated according to the Geneva Convention and by minimal standards of human decency, there is no division—in the nation, or in the Congress—and indeed congressional resolutions endorsed by the families of prisoners have been approved by the House of Representatives without a dissenting vote.

In a recent letter to a Washington newspaper, the wife of an American prisoner of war has gone to the heart of the matter. She says, "Only world opinion will persuade Hanoi to change its policy on prisoners. It is known that the North Vietnamese cannot believe that the American public really cares about 'just 1500 men.'" As this brave American woman suggests, however, it is the genius of a free society that it does not reckon the mortality of a question in terms of the number of people involved.

The gas chamber of Auschwitz and Belsen were immoral when the first man died in them, long before their terrible toll mounted. The refusal of Hanoi to communicate the names of prisoners to the Red Cross became immoral the first time it happened, not when the figure reached 400 or 700 or 1,000 or 1,500 or whatever figure it has actually reached now.

The families of these prisoners have demanded that Hanoi abide by the obligations the civilized community of nations has set for the treatment of war prisoners. They are entitled to nothing less.

SILENT MAJORITY SPEAKS OUT

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, more and more of the so-called silent majority are contacting our office to express their support for President Nixon. Such a vote of confidence arrived today from a student at Indiana University who wanted to assure me that the vocal minority does not speak for her. Her comments, which I would like to share with my colleagues, are typical of the comments I am hearing throughout my congressional district:

TUESDAY, MAY 19.

HON. JOHN MYERS,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I realize you'll probably never see this; but hopefully, someone will.

I just want to thank you for trying and doing a good job as my Congressman. I know how difficult being in office must be—especially during such a pathetic period.

I wish the war was over but it makes me sick to think my generation acts so resentful.

Someone has to fight the war. If my parents could fight in World War II so that I could live in a free country then the least I can do is fight for my children. Oh yes, I'm a girl but when I get my degree in 2½ years I'm going to either join the Peace Corps or work for the Red Cross even if it's just serving donuts to the soldiers.

This country has given me too much to just sit back and watch it rot away with the corruption of many of my generation.

Thank you again, Congressman Myers. Run in '72 and by then I'll be able to vote for you.

Yours truly,

ANNACAROL LAMPE,
Indiana University.

QUESTIONS ON CAMBODIA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in light of antagonism and disturbances perpetrated by the Lon Nol regime against the NLF and North Vietnamese Embassies—March 11, 1970—and actions taken against Vietnamese living in Cambodia it is easier to understand the difficulty Lon Nol is now having in negotiating with Hanoi. The United States as well has jeopardized any prospects for peaceful negotiations.

These two points are discussed by the director of the Southeast Asia program at Cornell University, Prof. George Mc T. Kahin, in his analysis of a set of questions and answers the Nixon administration has issued:

ANALYSIS

9. THE ADMINISTRATION'S QUESTION

If Lon Nol cannot beat the communists, why does he not negotiate with them or compromise with them as Sihanouk did?

The administration's answer

We understand that he has made several offers to open negotiations.

We also understand that talks were held immediately after the new government came into power and that the North Vietnamese broke off those talks when they pulled almost all their staff out of Phnom Penh.

Since that time, the North Vietnamese have refused to deal with Lon Nol and have called for the overthrow of his government. He has made several efforts to deal with them, we understand, but they have refused. It seems clear from their tactics that they either want to gain control of Cambodia or to intimidate the government to let them have free use of large portions of the country.

Our answer

It is incredible that in the above answer no mention is made of the fact that before Lon Nol's alleged indication of a desire to open up negotiations, he and the Cambodian army had organized the sacking of the North Vietnamese and NLF embassies (March 11, 1970). As a consequence of these army-supported mob actions as well as other more serious violence taken against Vietnamese living in Cambodia, one can appreciate that Lon Nol was hardly setting the stage for negotiations. Moreover, the attacks of his army units in cooperation with South Vietnamese and American forces against NLF and Hanoi base areas did not increase prospects for negotiations.

10. THE ADMINISTRATION'S QUESTION

Do we not think that operations by U.S. forces inside Cambodia will jeopardize the prospects for negotiations?

The administration's answer

Recent North Vietnamese actions and statements give no indications that they are ready to negotiate. In fact, they may be postponing any serious negotiations which they might have contemplated until they can see what happens in Cambodia.

I think we should not continually act on the assumption that a de-escalation by our side will promote negotiations whereas any new action which we might undertake will jeopardize them. Over the past year we have de-escalated in a variety of ways and Hanoi has steadfastly refused to talk seriously. Under those circumstances, I do not believe that what we are doing now will jeopardize any prospects for peace which might have existed.

Our answer

It is already evident that the invasion of Cambodia has made President Thieu even more outspoken in his refusal to accept a negotiated settlement, and in his insistence upon a solution by military means. If, as the Administration has repeatedly stated, the Vietnamization program was designed to reduce American commitments in Southeast Asia and to facilitate the achievement of a negotiated settlement of the war, the Cambodian adventure is impossible to justify. By enlarging the area of conflict and the scope of American commitments and by increasing the number of disputing parties, it adds enormously to the length and complexity of any agenda for negotiations. With the U.S. and the Vietnamese now enmeshed in a Cambodian civil war a virtually insoluble Cambodian problem is added to the already intractable Vietnamese problem. It is no longer enough to settle the war in Vietnam and Laos; we are assuming a responsibility for settling a Cambodian war as well.

President Nixon's precipitate invasion of Cambodia has not only further polarized internal political forces in Cambodia; but by aligning Sihanouk (who for so long had managed to remain unaligned and genuinely neutral) with Moscow and Peking, it has increased polarization within the concerned international community. The President's action has seriously reduced the confidence of Japan and our most important European allies in America's foreign policy; and it has drastically undercut the possibilities for any Soviet offices in getting a negotiated solution of the Vietnam war underway. Thus, the long-term consequences of President Nixon's short-sighted military escalation further diminish the already faint prospects for that negotiated settlement of the war to which the Administration has repeatedly committed itself.

A STUDENT LOOKS AT AMERICAN YOUTH

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when many students are being criticized for their irresponsible actions, I was heartened by the receipt of this inspiring poem. It was written by Tony Mattasolio, a 17-year-old student at Robert E. Lee High School, in Tyler, Tex.

I commend it to my colleagues and others seriously interested in learning about both sides of the student question:

I KNOW

(By Tony Mattasolio)

A boy becomes a man when he has to.
When he is forced to face the responsibilities of manhood.
A student becomes an adult not through knowledge gained, but knowledge applied.
There are many things to know, without necessary being twenty-one.
I know, as a student, I have been made ashamed; made ashamed not of my actions, but of people's my age.
Ashamed of being a student.
Ashamed of being a teenager.
Ashamed of being referred to as the juvenile group.
I know that there are still people among us who want to do right,
But, I also know that there are masses of people, worlds large in number who are filled with the sour juices of apathy.
Indifferent persons, or equally as bad, persons who fall to realize the dangers of our own country's internal affairs.
I know that I am a man of lesser experiences than of my forefathers who fought for me,
The men who died to make it possible for me to help send my brethren to the moon.
I know that in the pitiless heart of society, there dwells the diseased mind of many.
Ones who take thousands of shapes, forms and colors.
Ones who have queer flags, kill guards and riot.
And I know that in the nucleus of these sick minds lives a desire to destroy what America has always stood for.
The valor, effort and pride that endless amounts of people sacrificed for,
Died for.
To endanger such a precious thing as the American people's liberty,
To confiscate our tremendous honor,
To endure our high standards to be infested with such heresy,
To allow this type of atrocious behavior to continue under the American flag, would be total appeasement into the hearts of our sick minorities.

AN OPPOSITION TO THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1971. In a year when the budget is right, when labor, health, and education programs are woefully underfinanced, when the key criteria for funding programs are supposedly cost-effectiveness and performance, and most of all when the need for reordering our national priorities is more urgent than ever, I find it impossible to vote for such desirable but deferrable facilities as theaters, expensive commissary quarters, and men's clubs for the military.

Some glaring specific shortcomings have also induced me to object to this

legislation. The Safeguard missile program I am convinced is ineptly planned, unnecessary and counterproductive as it is a dangerous provocation in our international relations. If we grant the \$325.2 million this bill requests, these funds will simply disappear into the insatiable maw of the omnivorous military-industrial complex which has been so unreliable, and what is worse, unaccountable in the past decade.

PITTSBURGH PHYSICIANS EXPRESS CONCERN OVER WAR, CAMPUS UNREST

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, physicians as a group do not ordinarily mobilize to publish statements of concern over foreign policy; for one thing, they are usually too busy caring for all of our health needs.

So, it is particularly significant when statements, such as that sent to me recently by one of my constituents, Dr. Jack Paradise of Pittsburgh, appear in print.

It seems to me that an administration that cuts the health budget while talking about a "national medical crisis"; reduces funds for medical manpower training, while complaining about the shortage of medical personnel; slashes funds for health research that could save future lives—and at the same time escalates our very human involvement in Southeast Asia, which I believe has contributed to divisiveness on the campus, and nearly everywhere else—could well heed this plea on behalf of those whose profession is dedicated to saving lives.

I am pleased to include the statement of concern by 82 Pittsburgh doctors at this point in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

THE INDOCHINA WAR AND THE RIGHTS OF STUDENTS: A STATEMENT OF CONCERN BY 82 PHYSICIANS

We write this statement as citizens and as Pittsburgh area physicians concerned with human life. We decry violence of all types.

We believe that American military actions in Vietnam and Cambodia are resulting in needless death, injury, and destruction.

We do not agree that retaliation—lethal or otherwise—is an expected result of student participation in anti-war demonstrations. Students who express their horror and indignation at this war through peaceful demonstrations are not merely within their rights; they are exercising their moral and civic obligation to speak out against what they perceive as wrong. As Secretary Hickel pointed out, our leaders have not appeared to be listening to students or trying to understand their position. Instead, they have created an atmosphere of hatred and divisiveness by implying that student opposition to the war is unpatriotic. This atmosphere, we believe, helped make possible the killing of students at Kent State.

We urge a prompt end to the war in Vietnam and Cambodia, so that our nation may turn to the improvement rather than the destruction of life.

Siamak A. Adibi, M.D., Sheldon Adler, M.D., Thomas E. Allen, M.D., Max A. Antis, M.D., David Bachman, M.D., Lawrence C. Bachmann, M.D., Lee W. Bass, M.D., John Baron, M.D., Marvin L. Bellin, M.D., John Berardinelli, M.D.

Milton Bilder, M.D., Eugene Blank, M.D., Charles D. Bluestone, M.D., Jane Breck, M.D., Philip Brostoff, M.D., Sidney N. Busis, M.D., C. Glenn Cambor, M.D., Maurice S. Cerul, M.D., Robert Chanovitz, M.D., E. Joseph Charny, M.D.

Robert M. Coyle, M.D., Sophie J. Coyle, M.D., Catherine DeAngelis, M.D., Carmen A. DeChesaro, M.D., Frances L. Drew, M.D., Sheldon M. Epstein, M.D., Richard A. Finegold, M.D., Stanley Fisher, M.D., Warfield Garson, M.D., Kenneth L. Garver, M.D.

Milton W. Golomb, M.D., Samuel P. Harbison, M.D., Christa-Marie Homann, M.D., Juergen Homann, M.D., Donald N. Hutchinson, M.D., Gilbert H. Isaacs, M.D., Stanford Isaacson, M.D., John B. Josimovich, M.D., Richard L. Kalla, M.D., Irwin Kash, M.D., Sidney S. Kaufman, M.D.

Laibe A. Kessler, M.D., Yale D. Koskoff, M.D., Norman N. Kresh, M.D., Stephen Landay, M.D., Joseph Leighton, M.D., Cora C. Lenox, M.D., Macy I. Levine, M.D., Kathryn H. Lewis, M.D., Samuel Lewis, M.D., Benito Lombardi, M.D.

Ned G. Maxwell, M.D., Richard H. Michaels, M.D., Richard W. Moriarty, M.D., Jack L. Paradise, M.D., Leo R. Patton, M.D., Richard Paul, M.D., Mark M. Ravitch, M.D., David E. Reed, M.D., John B. Reinhart, M.D., Gerald P. Rodnan, M.D.

Joan B. Rodnan, M.D., Kenneth D. Rogers, M.D., Lore Rubin, M.D., Diane Sachs, M.D., Joseph Schachter, M.D., David P. Segel, M.D., Richard P. Shapera, M.D., Frank E. Sherman, M.D., Herschel Sidransky, M.D., Earl B. Smith, M.D.

Abraam Steinberg, M.D., Milton G. Tall, M.D., Douglass S. Thompson, M.D., Robert G. Tyson, M.D., Alan Winkelstein, M.D., Jerome H. Wolfson, M.D., Michael R. Wollman, M.D., David N. Yatzkan, M.D., Eugene L. Youngue, M.D., George Zitner, M.D., Janis Zvargulis, M.D.

Committee for Physicians' Statement: Kenneth L. Garver, M.D., Jack L. Paradise, M.D., Richard H. Michaels, M.D., Robert G. Tyson, M.D., Co-chairman.

PRAYERS FOR NIXON URGED

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite correspondents is Mrs. Gertrude Andrus Record, of Mechanicville, N.Y., a young woman of 93 years of age. Many times in the past she has written me and always has a knack of coming up with the proper suggestion. Recently I saw a letter from Mrs. Record to the editor of the Saratogian, our hometown newspaper. I thought her sentiments were so profound that I include her editorial in the RECORD at this point. I only wish that some of our younger generation had the wisdom of Mrs. Record.

PRAYERS FOR NIXON URGED

This is a plea to the people of our nation to go down on their knees praying that our harassed President be given wisdom, courage and strength to meet the tragic challenges which he has inherited.

Far too long the conditions which exist in this country have been building up.

Too long we have been indifferent to the ruin of our lakes and forests. Far too long we have been blind to scheming gangsters who control our economy.

We have been asleep while traitors infiltrated our schools, our colleges, our unions, our social and political organizations.

We have been grasping in our gratification of "good times," in our love of pleasure. We have danced when we should have been at work. Suddenly we are aware that we have become a tragically sick nation.

It did not all come to pass in the 16 months since Mr. Nixon became President. He inherited it. He is not responsible for the Asian conflict, for the frightening influence of huge families of gangsters, for the pollution, for race hatred, for the wave of rebellion. It has all been years in building up.

And now we weep for ourselves and demand that our President, with little help from us, correct that which downgrades our poor, sick nation.

Let us help him, first in winning the war. Then, there will be released billions of funds to be used to control all of these other ruinous evils.

Mr. Nixon needs and deserves our dedicated concern and our help.

May God hold him close and give to him wisdom, courage and strength to accomplish what I firmly believe he so desperately is trying to do.

With God's help, he will succeed.

GERTRUDE LONG ANDRUS RECORD.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the list of our needs and priorities in many areas is growing by leaps and bounds. We must bring our country and its services to the people up to the levels of need in this space-jet age, and particularly in the 1970's. The money is in our record gross national product and it must be brought forward as painlessly as possible to meet crying needs. This is a must that cannot be ignored or compromised. It must be fulfilled now. And it must be done without unfair, excessive tax levies on any individual, class, or group.

Frankly, if we could establish universal peace we would be in a much better position to meet some of these great problems in the homes, schools, hospitals, and lives of the American people—young and old.

If we could, for example, have world peace tomorrow, in the not too distant future, this would make billions of dollars available for many urgent social and economic programs (to which I have referred)—although, admittedly, this huge sum would hardly be enough in the light of all the deferred demands of many kinds pending that have very high priority.

We must remember two things about such comments and proposals.

First, we are living in a very dangerous world, and further the Soviet Union and its allies are keeping the pressure upon us practically everywhere and have not even been willing up to this time to discuss seriously with us the peace options, which if agreed upon, could so easily lead to total world peace and a virtual

millennium on this earth. As one of our most illustrious diplomats observed to me just today. "We never got to the negotiation stage. We were bogged down by frustration and refusal to bargain."

The Soviet Union makes all the gains because they have developed and are supporting loyal, ferocious allies in other countries, who are waging their fight to subvert and take over other nations and incorporate them into the Communist world.

They are willing to spend the money to furnish huge supplies of arms, aircraft, missiles, and other deadly weapons to enable these smaller nations to fight, as North Vietnam is doing, in wars of aggression but they are not willing to talk peace, or at least they have not been willing up to this time.

It is a matter of note that less than 48 hours after Congress voted to implement the ABM system last year, the Soviet Union agreed to enter the SALT talks that are now talking place.

Now I do not know what that illustrates, but we know very definitely that the Soviet Union is very strong in total military power and destructive capability and is spreading this potential to other nations that may be intent upon aggression in numerous areas.

It possesses great strength in every important defense category on land, sea, and in the air that this Nation cannot afford to minimize or ignore.

So long as this raw power lies in the hands of nations that will not even negotiate sincerely to effectuate the peace, this Nation will be required, if it hopes to exist and survive, to maintain armed forces adequate to defend this country as best it can in a nuclear age against all who seek conquest or destruction of the monuments and institutions of freedom.

If we were to do otherwise at this crucial time in history, when communism is making gains inside, as well as outside, the United States, we would be guilty of gross, criminal neglect of our national security, and we would greatly endanger our survival as a free Nation—indeed, we would be leaving ourselves open to deadly attack. But I do not want to belabor these points further at this time.

I am pointing to the fact that if we could afford to dispense with a substantial part of our huge Defense Establishment and still retain an adequate defense, we might be able to transfer some of the money saved to some of the constructive purposes that I have mentioned in my foregoing remarks.

At the same time, we must realize that even such a large sum would not be nearly large enough to meet all of the extreme, and oftentimes urgent, needs that the American people are seeking in terms of social security, medicare, medicare services and health and welfare, not to speak of education, welfare and other humane needs.

But at least at this time, before the situation grows worse, let us tackle and try to dispel, and eliminate the hideous specter of uncontrolled pollution in our midst that has threatened to turn this country into a foul and nasty place—an

unfit habitat for human beings and animal life.

Also, let us move fast and with determination to provide for our education, health, and hospital needs without cavil or delay.

Above all, let us be reminded that unless we keep strong, able to defend ourselves, protect our shores and free heritage, everything else we do will be in vain, for we shall perhaps have lost our birthright and committed ourselves to Communist domination, slavery, or destruction.

It is clear to me that this adds up to maintaining our defense and striking power at adequate levels to protect our security in a world where we face not only enmity and hatred, but are threatened as never before from both at home and abroad. Let us not miscalculate these dangers, and let us not underestimate the power, strength, and intentions of our possible adversaries in the world.

RHODESIA DESERVES BETTER TREATMENT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent newsletter in which I discussed the subject of Rhodesia. The report follows:

NEWSLETTER

How much longer will the United States arbitrarily refuse to recognize and do business with the small Republic of Rhodesia? That African nation has done us no harm. It even offered at one time to send some aid to South Vietnam if we asked for it. It is a friendly country, rich in resources, and strongly committed to the western struggle against the relentless forces of communism.

But the United Nations decided several years ago that it did not like the way internal affairs were being handled inside Rhodesia, and so a boycott of trade was decreed—joined by the U.S.A. That occurred during the Johnson administration. More recently, during the present administration, at Britain's urging we pursued the boycott and sanctions, and then closed down our consulate in Salisbury. The British had asked for it.

To be sure, there is much evidence that Rhodesia is controlled by a minority. So what? So are most of the other Nations of the world, for that matter. But who are we to probe the internal affairs of other countries? Are we not committed to the concept of self-determination?

While our British friends were pleading with us to shut down our consulate in Salisbury, the Union Jack continued to fly over the British consulate in Hanoi! While we refuse to allow any U.S. trade with Rhodesia, our government makes overtures to open trade relations with Red China.

And, aside from the principle of the thing, we cut our nose off to spite our face. For example, it happens that Rhodesia and the Soviet Union are the world's two principal producers of chromium, an essential ingredient in the manufacture of stainless and chrome steels. We must import it. But from where?

Union Carbide Corp. is one of the leading suppliers of this mineral. It had 150,000 tons

from its mines in Rhodesia paid for and ready for shipment when the sanctions were clamped on three years ago. In the meantime, the price has jumped from \$35 a ton to \$55 a ton.

Despite Union Carbide's pleas, the U.S. has steadfastly refused to allow a ton of that chromium to be imported from Rhodesia. And so Union Carbide has been buying its chrome from the Soviet Union—a Nation controlled by the tightly managed Communist party, which constitutes less than 10% of the Russian people.

Let us hope this unrealistic, indefensible policy will not be continued. Let's cut out this nonsense!

WYOMING RURAL ELECTRIC NEWS
REPORT ON WYOMING'S ELECTRIC POWER CONFERENCE

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, the May 1970 issue of Wyoming Rural Electric News was entitled "Special Wyoming Power Edition" and devoted to the electric power conference sponsored by Wyoming's progressive Governor, Stan Hathaway.

The publication, edited by Stu Crawshaw, noted editorially that "our society today cannot exist nor function without an adequate supply of electricity" and called for an enlightened attitude toward power generation and conservation/antipollution measures.

Mr. Speaker, I include the central article and editorial concerning the power conference:

HAVE YOUR CAKE AND EAT IT

This issue of the Wyoming Rural Electric News is a departure from previous policy as far as content is concerned. Heretofore, we have avoided overloading with REA news, electricity, etc. First, because to most people it is a dry subject. Secondly, being the largest rural magazine published in Wyoming places upon us an obligation to satisfy some of the communication needs and desires of rural people . . . which include agriculture, history, politics, and many other subjects.

But we have devoted most of this May edition to the Wyoming Electric Power Conference sponsored by Governor Hathaway for a very good reason. We think that every Wyomingite should be aware of the problems facing the industry, and how they will be solved. Power users should have ideas about how their electricity reaches them, and they should know more about who supplies it.

It is a fact that our society today cannot exist nor function without an adequate supply of electricity, which makes the problem of maintaining this supply more than just the power company's concern. It is a subject for every citizen. Your awareness is important to your power supplier, whether an REA cooperative or a private corporation.

The public is creating a huge demand for power all over the nation. Americans are using more and more of it everyday . . . to the extent that in less than ten years they will far exceed our present ability to produce. As the power organizations begin to make plans for the building of additional generating plants, power plants stand idle

under court injunctions brought about by environment protectors.

Demands to stop the pollution of our land, air, and water are top news everyday. Most of these demands are reasonable and vital to our future existence. Some of them are ridiculous. The anti-pollution movement is no more immune from crackpots than any other.

While the power industry has itself, with few exceptions, pioneered in meeting the demands of clean environment, the hysteria which so often accompanies highly emotional issues threatens to disrupt efforts to gear up for these huge expected demands. The situation is so critical in some parts of the country, that the shutting down of one generating plant could cause far-reaching "brown-outs" and even total blackout.

As our technology advances, the ability to more successfully control the smoke emission from power plant chimneys will grow with it. But this is expensive, and the consumers who demand pure air along with all of the electricity they can use must be prepared to pay more for both.

Someday someone will find a satisfactory way to handle the heat discharged from a power plant . . . maybe even a valuable use for it. In the meantime, the extremists may lead us into making a choice between having all the power we need and want, or stopping every last little vestige of the effects a generating unit has on its environment.

The power industry offers great promise for Wyoming's future. With the unlimited coal reserves here, this state could easily become the power capital of the United States. The benefits this development would bring, both socially and economically, need not be spelled out. With the increasing capabilities of the electric business to keep itself compatible with esthetic and health requirements, they can be attained without encroaching on the desires of those who wish to preserve the virgin qualities of our state. In this case, we can have our cake and eat it too.

This is why your understanding is important. As the air and water belongs to you, so does electrical energy and the potential of the earth to produce it. If you are not prepared to return to the kerosene lamp, the washboard, the outside toilet; and you're not willing to give up the T.V., dishwasher, automatic furnace . . . then you had better get with it. It's your problem too.

POWER CONFERENCE

(By S. J. Crawshaw)

As important as the air we breathe, and almost as fundamental today as life itself, electrical power is the hidden servant that turns wheels, heats homes, waters crops, and does a thousand other uncountable jobs in industry and on the domestic scene. Yet, like many important elements in our lives, we take it for granted . . . until it is not there.

To make sure that it will be there . . . always when demanded, . . . the nation's power suppliers are taking a hard look at their own industry. They are finding some alarming answers to difficult questions, and are beginning to see, waiting around the corner, some monumental challenges looming in the future.

Interconnection of all power companies across the country, crash programs to generate new power, developing better uses for electricity, meeting the need to protect the environment; these are just some of the problems the industry has to face. But they don't belong only to the power company. Every person who benefits from the use of modern electrical applications . . . and that's just about every American . . . shares in these problems, and it behooves him to share in their solution.

In an effort to bring all of Wyoming's electric suppliers together for a cooperative look at their common problems, Governor Stan Hathaway called an "Electric Power Conference" last month in Cheyenne for a two-day meeting. The response was overwhelming.

With attention focused on the fact that someday people in the mid-west will be using more electricity than can now be generated, over 300 representatives of all phases of the industry . . . public, private, and REA . . . joined to discuss privately and on organized panels the means of solving power supply problems, with all the ramifications that go with them.

COAL

While speaker after speaker spoke of Wyoming's huge coal reserves, regarded so fondly by the state's developers, in the eastern seaboard other power companies expressed alarm over their dwindling coal stockpiles. Consolidated Edison in New York announced that it would have to "ration" power this summer in residential areas, causing controlled blackouts to avoid shutting down vital industrial and business facilities.

As the conferees in Cheyenne discussed how Wyoming coal could be converted into electricity here, with the accompanying benefits of tax base, employment, etc.; and ship it out of state by wire to areas where it is so badly needed, the American Public Power Association in Washington, D.C. fired off a letter to President Nixon demanding steps to be taken in the next few weeks to prevent widespread "brownouts" . . . and even total blackout.

While in Cheyenne they talked of Wyoming's 900 billion tons of coal, most of which lies idle beneath the earth, power plant operators in other parts of the U.S. watched with increasing dismay their coal stockpiles shrink from the customary ninety-day reserve down to sixty days, and as low as fifty-four days.

ENVIRONMENT

During the time of the conference, students at schools and universities along with older citizens were gearing up for "Earth Day" slated to be held the week following. While the environmentalists prepared frantically for this national focusing on protection of air, water and land, the Power Conference participants in Wyoming's capitol seriously and unemotionally talked about the same thing. It was evident that they have been working for some time to eliminate any contributions they might have been making to pollution.

GETTING TOGETHER

Where conflicts . . . serious ones . . . used to exist between private and consumer-owned electric distributors, the Governor's Conference made one thing very clear. The day of the conflicts, at least in Wyoming, are over. The need for rapid solution to their problems, and with the guiding hand of the state's Public Service Commission and a progress-minded governor has tended to fuse a common bond between all . . . and it appears to be strengthening.

Interconnecting power transmission lines which carry large amounts of electricity to the load areas will someday be an accepted fact. A huge national "grid" of these lines will allow power to flow in any direction, from one system to another, providing uninterrupted energy sources for the consumers of every company and cooperative. This, it was felt, would be the basis for cooperation. Joint ventures in building and operating power generating plants will be another.

WATER

Water inevitably became a subject for talk. To use coal for power generation with conventional methods ("thermal-generating"), water is necessary for cooling purposes. Neil

Simpson, Black Hills Power & Light president from Rapid City described his company's revolutionary air cooled condenser experiment at Wyodak, east of Gillette.

Simpson, an authoritative speaker, explained long-dreamed-of benefits to both utility and consumer that this new concept will produce . . . lower cost power because it allows the generator to be placed right at the coal mine, eliminating high transportation costs. Black Hills' experiment will prove to be a boon for Wyoming utilities if it allows them to divorce themselves from huge water needs.

FARM AUTOMATION

The changing face of agriculture was the reason offered by Wyoming State Rural Electric Association president, Merl Rissler of Casper, for the huge increases in power use facing the state's fifteen rural electric associations. Farmers are demanding automation to free them from long hours ". . . to give them the same recreational benefits their city cousins have already attained," Rissler stated, adding that labor shortage for rural areas is another contributing factor. "Sprinkler irrigation, both circular and solid-set, will be a necessity on farms and ranches where good low-cost hand labor is no longer available." Rissler, with an eye on the future, looks for the day when such "far-out" devices as closed-circuit television will be regular equipment on large livestock operations. With this, he says, one man can keep his eye on hundreds of cattle or sheep at the same time.

Using past records to illustrate his point, Rissler indicated that the consumer-owned power systems in Wyoming will be needing twice as much electricity in 1977 as they are using today. In addition to irrigation, he said that oil production, the building of more summer and recreational homes, electric home heating, and the expected influx of population and industry will bring about greater demands for electricity in Wyoming's rural areas.

BACK AT THE COAL MINES

Iowa Public Service Company is preparing to ship coal from Hanna, Wyoming mines in "unit trains" to a power plant near Sioux City. This was told to conference listeners by Governor Stan Hathaway in his opening speech. "Wyoming," Hathaway added, "is in an advantageous position in the middle of a donut. All around us demands for more electricity are going up . . ."

Former Dept. of Economic Planning Development director Roy Peck, introduced as "co-publisher of the Riverton Ranger", spoke in glowing terms about Wyoming's potential as a supplier to the nation's power users. The state is, Peck said, "in the middle of the greatest and most successful search for minerals since Texas oil field days or the California Gold Rush." As far as how much coal there is in Wyoming is concerned, Peck told a luncheon gathering that, "it doesn't matter whether we set these reserves at 120 billion or 560 billion tons . . . there is enough coal to meet present energy needs of the world for two thousand years or more." Peck is known for his zeal and enthusiasm in helping to develop Wyoming economy, and is expected to be a contender for political office in the upcoming elections.

JOINT VENTURE

Consumer-owned and private power companies can work together in using these coal reserves, Bob Risch, of Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association said so . . . and so did REA administrator David Hamil.

Risch, operations manager for the Denver-based wholesale supplier of power to twelve of Wyoming's REA co-operatives, had several suggestions for joint venture. ". . . Investment sharing," he said, "where the actual

generating facility is owned by a number of utilities and the investment shared on the basis of the power to be provided each utility." He also suggested the "staggering of construction" through joint planning so that surplus power from one plant could be used to supply another's customers until a plant in that area is built.

Benefits from joint ventures, Risch said, would include more reliable service, savings in money, conservation of natural resources and protection of water supplies.

Hamil, who has long been known as an advocate of cooperation between private and public power organizations, laid it on the line with several examples of jointly operated power plants now existing in the east. He called for common efforts to solve common problems.

A former Colorado cattle rancher, Hamil held the same position with REA under the Eisenhower administration. He has frequently stated that he would make REA loans for generating plants contingent upon whether prospective borrowers were considering joint facilities with private investor-owned power companies.

EGGS HATCHED

Keynote speaker of the conference was Federal Power Commissioner Carl Bagge who topped off the conference banquet with a speech that was a mixture of pats on the back and spankings for power companies. Warning of the enormous strains that future demands will make upon the power industry, Bagge said, "Nowhere is the problem more critical than in the west which still represents the last frontier of spacious, unspoiled landscape and clear blue skies."

Wyoming coal got a boost from him too. "Nuclear power generation," Bagge commented, "was not the great panacea we had envisioned. Utility planners had placed too many of their eggs in the nuclear basket, but now the eggs have hatched and have come home to roost." He pointed out that nuclear methods of power production are proving to be too costly and have the added problems of pollution.

What is hoped will come out of the Electric Power Conference is the appointment of a Governor's Advisory Committee to help with the coordination of power planning in the future. Only in this way, it is believed by leaders in the industry, will effective use be given to new knowledge of pollution control, cooperation between power systems, and the desire to develop Wyoming as the major supplier to the nation.

JAPANESE ARE AIMING AT ECONOMIC TOP SPOT

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the threat of foreign imports to the American domestic market no longer is considered just a smudge on our economic horizon. The threat is all too real now. It looms menacingly over the entire national economy.

The House Ways and Means Committee has recognized the danger and now is holding hearings to determine what must be done to protect the American textile and shoe industries, which are teetering on the brink of economic extinction. The proceedings are being watched with interest by other indus-

tries which already have felt the squeeze of foreign competition on the home market.

The chief threat to America's economic security is Japan. She is the leading exporter to the United States and just this month she replaced this Nation as the leading exporter of goods to the Philippines. Her tremendous strides to gain dominance over the world trade market has caused justifiable alarm. She seeks to expand her exports while maintaining a strong protectionist policy on goods imported to Japan.

Japan's burning ambition to achieve superpower economic status in the world is clearly spelled out in five articles written by Sylvia Porter and appearing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. I intend to submit the articles, separately, for inclusion in the RECORD. The first appears below and I strongly urge my colleagues to read it and heed the message:

JAPANESE ARE AIMING AT ECONOMIC TOP SPOT

(By Sylvia Porter)

TOKYO.—From a nation bombed into a shambles a mere 25 years ago, Japan has surged ahead to become our Number One competitor in the trade markets of the world. Now, from an astoundingly advanced level in 1970, Japan is striving to surge further ahead to replace us as Number One of all world economies well within the next 25 years.

After an intense working trip to these crowded islands (103 million people in an area smaller than California), Japan's ambition to become an economic superpower stands out as my most vivid impression.

Whether or not she achieves her aim will depend as much on how you react to this challenge as on what Japan dreams of.

When I accepted the invitation of JETRO (Japan External Trade Organization) to visit Japan last month, I had my fists up—for I thought of Japan's competition primarily in terms of a threat to us.

I was well aware of her enormous sales of textiles to the U.S., irritated by her refusal to meet our textile industry's complaints by imposing voluntary quotas on her shipments, deeply annoyed by her maintenance of steep tariff-tax-quota walls around her own booming industries while she moved in on free markets everywhere else.

Now my fists are still up, but now I view Japan's competition primarily as a challenge which can benefit all of us if we only have the determination to seize and meet it.

Item, autos: The major reason Detroit is giving us sub-compacts at relatively attractive prices this year is: fierce competition from Japan's Toyota and Datsun on top of Germany's Volkswagen. Imported cars will account for more than 11 per cent of our new car market in 1970: Toyota alone is selling more than 200,000 cars a year to us.

But Detroit is fighting back now with the U.S. mini-models and it seems inconceivable to me that America's genius for innovation and automation can't meet the Japan-Germany challenge. As for us, the car customers, we cannot help but benefit.

Item, steel: The reason our steel industry has in recent years adopted cost-cutting, product-improving methods which are enhancing our competitiveness around the world lies in one word: Japan.

Steel is Japan's largest single export today; she is the world's leading steel exporter in tonnage; the newly merged Nippon Steel Corp. tops U.S. Steel; we are Japan's leading customer for steel. All this has finally compelled our steel companies to modernize to survive.

Now, although Shigeo Nagano, chairman of Nippon Steel, smilingly predicted to me that "Japan will rival the U.S. steel industry within a decade," other objective observers believe our updated steelmakers can and will remain in the number one spot.

Item, textiles: One basic reason our cost of clothing has risen less than most other essentials is: Japan's exports of textiles to us. So serious is her low-priced competition that the powerful House Ways & Means Committee chairman, Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, is spearheading a drive in Congress to limit her sales here.

The U.S. and Japanese textile industries are in an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation and the issue has moved out of economics and into the emotional sphere.

Before protectionism here reaches the point of new laws, though, I'm still confident the textile issue will be negotiated and compromised—with U.S.-Japan government prodding. And if this also forces modernization of our industry, you and I again will benefit.

I do not underestimate Japan's ambitions or capacities!

Although dozens of the influential men I interviewed in Japan denied her objectives, I knew they were telling me what they thought I wanted to hear. And who's kidding whom? We, of all nations, ought to agree it's only human to strive to be No. 1.

But I also know that at stake is \$7 billion of two-way trade between us, slated to reach \$15 billion by 1975. At stake too is Japan's role as an equal trade partner, a friend in a crucial world area.

And I know that if we retreat to trade walls now, we're throwing away dollars in exchange for dimes.

Japan, a threat?

No, not if we insist that she open her markets as befits a nation at her economic level now and if she lives up to the rules of the world trade game.

Japan, a challenge?

Yes, the toughest we've ever had. And if we wake up to and rise to that challenge, a blessing as well.

A MEMBER OF THE SILENT MAJORITY SPEAKS OUT

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, very deliberately the silent majority in this Nation is becoming an aroused majority, and I cannot express how pleasing this is to me.

Recently I received a letter from one of those persons of the silent majority who speaks out in crystal clear language.

The letter I received is from Rev. J. Hulet Stogner, superintendent of missions of the East Tennessee Baptist Association, 212 Broadway, in Newport.

Mr. Stogner is deeply concerned about lawlessness in this country, the disruption by some of our judicial system, abuse of constitutional authority and the attempts being made to bring about reform by force, fear, or revolution instead of through the democratic process.

He also expresses his support of President Nixon for his decision to enter Cambodia and Vice President Agnew for his vociferous criticisms of the youth radicals and all militants engaged in unethical and disorderly activities.

Reverend Stogner's conclusion is that our problems will continue to increase and enlarge until this Nation returns to a faith in God and allow Him to direct our affairs through people who are obedient to His laws and seek His wisdom.

Reverend Stogner's letter is so stirring that I wish to insert it in the RECORD for others to read, as follows:

EAST TENNESSEE BAPTIST ASSOCIATION,
Newport, Tenn.

To whom it may concern:

A member of the silent majority wishes to express himself to various members of the Congress of the United States.

The real enemy of this nation is any person who tries at any time to interfere with Constitutional authority, disrespects and disregards the laws of the land and the enforcement officials, mocks and disrupts the judicial system, or attempts to bring about reforms by force, fear, or revolution instead of the Democratic process; whether they be old or young, Black or White, American or Foreign, Politician or Educator, Senator or Representative, Governor or Mayor, Draftee or Soldier, or the man in the street.

To cut off funds for military operations is the most asinine thing possible for intelligent leaders, or to tie the administration's hands in any other way to jeopardize our ability to meet emergencies promptly.

To allow the continued riots, demonstrations that incite violence, and terror tactics used by minority groups, civil disobedience, that destroys both public and private property and lives is not to be tolerated. It is unthinkable for the two percent of our population to influence the policy making process of this country by their revolutionary tactics. How can we ignore the manifestoes and stated aims and policies of radical groups and permit their activities to go on unrestrained by any legal procedure whatsoever.

The attitude and position taken by some of our legislators is treason of the highest degree in my opinion.

The Bible says, "That a house or city divided against itself cannot stand." The same applies to a Nation. It is time our elected leaders reached some kind of agreement so that the people might hear one voice giving one direction out of the many complex problems faced by this nation.

I support the President in his decision to enter Cambodia, even if it is five years late. I support the Vice President in his position relating to the news media and the youth radicals and all militants engaged in unethical and disorderly activities. I support our military personnel and plead with those most responsible to see that civil rights of one group is not violated by another group seeking special privilege in the name of demanding their civil rights.

Finally, our problems will only increase and enlarge until this nation returns to a faith in God and allow him to direct our affairs through people who are obedient to his laws and seek his wisdom.

I pray daily to this end.

J. HULET STOGNER,
Superintendent of Missions.

CRACKING DOWN ON ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Crime continues to examine the problem of strengthening our

internal national defenses against crime. It was a privilege, therefore, to be able to testify on a major aspect of our national crime problem in the hearings being conducted by the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary on S. 30 and other bills related to the control of organized crime.

It was my purpose to indicate my general support for S. 30, based upon the information which the select committee has obtained to date. We are undertaking more intensive investigations of organized crime, but we already have learned a great deal about the dimensions of this criminal conspiracy. Therefore, in addition to indicating general support for a stronger effort against organized crime, I wished to suggest several specific areas in which the weapons against organized crime could be expanded and strengthened.

I have condensed my testimony somewhat and offer it as one of the periodic reports which I feel I should make to the House:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER,
CHAIRMAN OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON
CRIME, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
THE JUDICIARY, MAY 27, 1970

Mr. Chairman, it is always an honor and a pleasure to appear before your distinguished committee. Our Select Committee on Crime has been shocked by what we have learned since our inception about the onslaught of organized crime in our Nation. Wherever we turn and wherever we have held hearings, be it Boston, Omaha, San Francisco or Washington, we have seen the deleterious influence which organized crime has visited upon our society.

I have been deeply concerned about the ever-increasing crime rate in our country and especially alarmed by the violent antisocial behavior that has become so prevalent in our daily lives. Such behavior has conveniently been referred to under the general heading of "crime in the streets." As you well know, Mr. Chairman, these crimes are often committed by the economically underprivileged. Violence of this type is ugly at any time.

However, what alarms me as Chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime, is that there are other types of crimes of rapidly growing prevalence that not only menace our society, but which fan the flames of violent crimes by the poor and which are, to an ever increasing extent, responsible for them.

For example, we have learned that the narcotics addicts who live in every one of our major cities and who commit a substantial number of our Nation's robberies, car thefts, and burglaries are dependent upon organized crime for their daily dosage. Organized crime controls such traffic and protects itself from detection and prosecution by the immunization inherent in a sophisticated and complex corporate structure.

As our gross national product increases we have witnessed a parallel increase, not only in crimes of violence committed in our Nation's streets, but also, and more pointedly, in organized and syndicated crime. Yet, with all our prosperity and supposed affluence, we have not answered or cured our Nation's ills in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, my concern cannot be limited to street crimes of violence. Our Committee's nationwide overview hearings have brought to our attention the disturbing geometric growth of organized and white-collar crime, and have made it abundantly clear that this type of crime needs more attention.

It is my considered judgment that there is

a definite relationship between violent crimes of the poor and white-collar crimes. Judge Henry J. Friendly, one of the most scholarly and articulate members of the Court of Appeals of the 2nd Circuit, recently said, "In our complex society, the accountant's certificate and lawyer's opinion can be instruments for inflicting pecuniary loss more than the chisel and crowbar." Federal prosecutors across the Nation have long been handicapped in their pursuit against organized and syndicated criminals because they have lacked the proper prosecutory tools.

Organized and white-collar crime, and the hypocrisy which so often surrounds and protects the perpetrators of such crime, has repeatedly been cited by investigating commissions as a root cause of the attitude that leads to lawlessness and violence on the streets. How much longer can our society survive as a nation if we continue to ignore the blatant statistical fact that organized crime yearly drains from 30 to 50 billion dollars from our economy?

As you know, Mr. Chairman, Robert M. Morgenthau, formerly United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, for the past nine years conducted a relentless campaign against organized crime and continually was frustrated in his efforts because of limited immunity provisions, improper witness protection and the inability to convene lengthy grand jury sessions where intricate corporate financial workings could be discovered. Frank S. Hogan, for 25 years District Attorney in Manhattan, has also stated that his office has been similarly limited in its fight against organized crime.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to direct a few brief remarks to the provisions in Title V of S. 30; namely, the protection and housing of government witnesses. Initially, I want to offer my wholehearted support for these provisions. To my knowledge, no responsible law enforcement official dealing in the area of organized crime has ever testified that successful inroads can be made in the area of detection and prosecution of organized crime without the help of informant information. Our Committee in its investigations has become alerted to the justifiable concern inherent in such cooperation by an informant with officials of our Federal Government.

Indeed, several Attorneys General have indicated that such fear was not unjustified. The President's Crime Commission has clearly stated that this is a problem which must be dealt with if we are to obtain the cooperation of witnesses who can testify as to their inside knowledge of agreements and conspiracies perpetrated by organized and syndicated crime figures. Our investigations have revealed that several potential informants refused to cooperate with various agencies of the United States Government because they feared violent reprisals if they defected from the ranks of organized crime.

Our Committee, during the course of its investigations, has been confronted by the disturbing problem of an informant who was actively cooperating with federal agencies but stopped cooperating because he was told that the federal government did not have sufficient funds to protect him and his immediate family, nor did the government have funds available to pay for the hundreds of long distance telephone calls which this man placed at the behest of federal agents. This episode is particularly distressing in light of the fact that this man is scheduled to testify as the principal government witness in an important case pending in one of our federal district courts. We are also aware of the fact that information which he has provided to law enforcement officials led directly to the arrest of several lower echelon mob figures and the seizure of illegal contraband.

Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in Title V to compensate an informant or potential congressional witness who provides val-

uable information to a Congressional investigating committee. Obviously, all competent investigatory efforts into the organized crime field must necessarily include the gathering of information from people who would be classified as informers and/or potential congressional witnesses. During the course of an intense Congressional investigation wherein such people are used to gather source and background materials, expenses are often incurred by both the committee staff and the actual informant. I respectfully suggest that Title V be amended to cover such disbursements for Congressional investigating committees.

In addition, I respectfully submit that Title V should be expanded to include the appropriation of funds for the training and instruction of the United States Marshals and their deputies who are assigned the task of protecting informants and government witnesses. To my knowledge, no such training in protective techniques for U.S. Marshals now exists. I am aware of the fact that Title V represents a distinct effort by the United States Senate to meet society's obligations to protect informants and witnesses from the underworld's vengeance. It is my considered judgment that this legislation as presently written does not go far enough. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee include a provision for the training and instructing of U.S. Marshals so that they would be better able to perform this vital function of protecting and housing government witnesses and informants.

In addition, I would suggest that this Committee consider setting up a contingency fund for the payment of information from informants and government witnesses, where such payments, in the discretion of the Attorney General are necessary in our government's battle against organized crime. A contingency fund should be established in the office of the Attorney General to take care of disbursements of funds to cover expenses incurred by informants and witnesses pursuant to requests by federal law enforcement officials. Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that the Congress recognize the fact that for many years government agencies have relied upon informant information in order to strike at the heart of organized criminal conspiracies. If the Congress refuses to recognize this fact, we will be like ostriches with our heads in the sand. Mr. Chairman, we are living at a time when disrespect for the laws of our land seems to be commonplace and law abiding conduct often becomes the exception rather than the rule.

Information has come to me in the course of my responsibilities as Chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime that often responsible federal agents, attempting to do their jobs, must disburse their own funds to cover expenditures incurred by government witnesses and informants during the course of their investigations and prosecution. Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to encourage federal agents to violate the law by their filing false vouchers to cover necessary expenditures which must be made if they are to do their jobs properly.

Mr. Chairman, I raise only three additional points. I would like to inquire as to whether or not the Omnibus Streets bill carries adequate authority to conduct electronic surveillance and perhaps wire tap surveillance upon those who are a part of the pattern of racketeering as described in this bill.

As I understand it, the limitations in the Omnibus Crime bill on wire tapping and the electronic surveillance are fairly severe as to the showing of probable cause that must be to a court.

I suggest that the court should be authorized—upon a proper showing that an individual was a part of a pattern of racketeering as defined in this bill, or a member of an organization which was a part of or carried on a pattern of racketeering—that the courts should be authorized in that limited

category of cases to authorize the placing of electronic or wire tapping devices at such places as the officials thought that it would be effective.

I believe that that is broader than the present authority for the use of electronic wire tapping devices.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to mean that even if there is no crime involved, electronic devices and wire tapping may be used?

Mr. PEPPER. No. If one meets the definition on page 51, where a pattern of racketeering activity is defined, it requires at least two acts of racketeering activity, one of which occurred after the effective date. Where you find an individual has committed, according to this definition, at least two acts of racketeering, one which occurs after the enactment of this bill, if it is enacted, then in respect to that individual, the court should be permitted to allow, by appropriate order after appropriate hearing, electronic and wire tapping surveillance at such places and times and for such lengths of time as the court should approve and the enforcement officer should desire—because it is so hard to get to the top of these isolated figures in the field of organized crime, who insulate themselves by layers of protective personnel from ordinary contact.

Second I would like to inquire as to the effect of the language of this bill (S. 30) which makes illegal the collection of an illegal debt, defined in this bill as one that violates the usury laws of the respective states. So far as I know, in the bill there is no reference to what we call loan sharking. Loan sharking is considered to be one of the grievous offenses committed by organized crime and perpetrating fraud upon the people of the country.

I am wondering whether or not "particularly in a pattern of racketeering" as defined in this bill might well cover injurious interest collections. When our crime committee had a hearing in Miami, we wanted to hear a certain individual who was a victim of a loan shark operation by some elements of organized crime. We thought we were going to get that man to testify because he had been robbed literally by this gangster crowd. But, evidently they got wind of it. He came back and told our people trembling, "I cannot afford to testify before your committee," because, of course, they probably would have done him bodily harm.

Third one, I suggest that your competent staff look into the question of whether or not the present law relative to prohibiting using the mails or using wires or other facilities to cross state lines, are broad enough to cover various acts under the "pattern of racketeering" as defined in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, as I take it, you want us to possibly broaden the provisions concerning that subject.

Mr. PEPPER. That is it. I would suggest that your able counsel examine the present law relative to the use of the mails and to the use of the wires and other media for crossing state lines or effecting interstate commerce, as to whether or not this broadened pattern, of a pattern of racketeering as defined in this bill, whether or not the present law is appropriate to that broader definition of the offense of engaging in a pattern of racketeering.

THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL AND
WONDERFUL WORLD

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, with all the agitation and the complaints today

that the current generation has failed and produced a bad world, it was refreshing for me to read a description of the situation as viewed by my good friend, Mr. George P. Leonard, a former resident of my congressional district. I have entitled his effort "This Is a Beautiful and Wonderful World," and am pleased to submit it herewith:

THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL AND WONDERFUL WORLD

Please forgive me but I grow weary from all the complaints, particularly by the young and inexperienced, as to how bad our society is, and only militant or revolutionary action can help it. They know not whereof they speak.

At the time of my birth in 1904 my life expectancy was 47 years. Were I born today my life expectancy would be 68 years. That's an increase of 44 percent, which came about because we live in an organized society, this Establishment if you will, of the United States of America. Now at 66 years of age I can hope to live to be 79. This is a gift of life itself, where society comes closest to being godlike.

Please note that I am not talking about gross national product, or net worth, or automobiles, bathtubs, telephones or televisions per capita, but of life itself, than which there is no greater gift.

Together my wife and I have experienced premature birth, whooping cough, measles, mumps, chicken pox, smallpox, poliomyelitis, amebiasis, coronary occlusion, scarlet fever, puerperal fever, mastoiditis, ethmoditis, peritonitis, arthritis, pluerisy and dandruff. We should look like a well sliced salami for we have undergone tonsilectomy, adenoidectomy, appendectomy, bilateral vasoligation, prostatic resection, Falloplian tube ligation, tumor of the urethra and Caesarian section operations. We still live solely because we are part of an organized society.

Now at 66 we have almost all of our teeth, my good wife has practically no gray hair, and I have practically none too. I'm bald. Our only visible defect is a bunion on my left foot and since I rarely go barefoot, that doesn't show much.

All of this has happened not to the elite of our society, but to one of ten children of a laborer, and the only child of a widowed mother. What organized society has done for us, in our short lifetime, is but a token of what it can still do if we work with it, and for it, and quit throwing monkey wrenches in the machinery.

This is a grand and a beautiful and wonderful world and we were meant to make the most of it. Can you understand why we like it here?

GEORGE P. LEONARD.

QUESTIONS ON CAMBODIA: VII. THE PRESIDENT'S ACTIONS VIOLATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the legality of the President's actions in invading Cambodia can be challenged on two levels. As George Kahin, professor of government, explains in "Cambodia: The Administration's Version and the Historical Record," the President may have violated international law in acting without the consent of Cambodia, a sovereign state; and his invasion of a "neutral" country has been taken with-

out a declaration of war and without the advice and consent of Congress.

12. THE ADMINISTRATION'S QUESTION

What was the legal basis for the President's actions?

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ANSWER

The President was acting under his Constitutional authority as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces to assure the security of the troops under his command, and also under his Constitutional authority as Chief Executive for the conduct of foreign affairs.

OUR ANSWER

It is appalling for the Administration to define the legitimacy of President Nixon's act strictly in terms of American law and precedent.

Cambodia is a sovereign state. Since the U.S. acted without consulting its government, our invasion is a violation of international law.

It must be noted that Cambodia renounced the SEATO protocol providing protection for the former Indochina states. In point of fact, Sihanouk formally requested the SEATO powers in May 1965, to amend Article IV to exclude Cambodia from SEATO's perimeter of intervention. His request was ignored but he was advised that the language of the treaty provided that intervention would not be undertaken without the request and consent of the Cambodian government.

If it is argued that the President made his decision in the context of American constitutional practice, it must be noted that his invasion of what he has referred to as a "neutral" country, has been taken in the absence of a declaration of war without the advice and consent of Congress.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues in saluting the historic records achieved by our beloved Speaker.

The fact of his election and reelection to positions in the administration of the House of Representatives for the past 30 years testifies to the complete respect of his colleagues he has always enjoyed. But more than for a simple record for longevity, JOHN W. McCORMACK's tenure as majority leader, minority whip, and Speaker will be remembered for the progressive legislation enacted under his guidance.

As a Member, he helped lead the fight for the enlightened programs of Franklin Roosevelt: bank reform, securities regulation, collective bargaining, social security, and the first non-Government employee retirement plan: The Railroad Retirement Act.

As majority leader, he projected America into its role as the world leader of free nations with the passage of the Lend-Lease Act of 1941 and the postwar programs of rehabilitation of war-torn countries and assistance to emerging nations. He and his counterpart in the Senate, Lyndon Johnson, created the space program.

As our Speaker, he has put on the

books more significant progressive domestic legislation than ever before enacted by any legislative body in the world.

History books will be filled with JOHN McCORMACK's achievements. But those of us who have been fortunate enough to have served with him for a part of his distinguished career will remember him most of all as a wise and good man, fair to all.

SOME USE, SOME ABUSE IT

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James A. Fitzpatrick, long a leader in both the north country and New York State, and chairman of the New York State Power Authority, has written a letter to the editor of the Plattsburgh Press Republican offering the community of Plattsburgh some sound advice about the relationship between the generations. His remarks are particularly fitting in view of the fact that the New York State University has a college at Plattsburgh, N.Y. I am sure that my colleagues will enjoy Mr. Fitzpatrick's letter which I make part of my remarks:

SOME USE, SOME ABUSE IT

To the EDITOR:

Last week representatives of the student body at Plattsburgh State University College came to my office and left a written invitation to attend a public forum. The invitation, addressed to all members of the community, solicited opinion and advocated an exchange of views. Unfortunately, I was not in the state at that time and was unable to attend or participate. I was pleased to have the communication and pleased at the constructive request for dialogue. The views which are expressed herein are tendered in the spirit in which they were solicited.

Before stating my views, I wish to recite that I have listened to students, have read and studied many of their statements and did attend and observe the meeting on Sunday between students and Congressman McEwen. I have two children in college. My views are conditioned by twenty-four years of political life and four and one-half years of military service. I was in England when it entered World War II in 1939 and the Philippines when the war concluded in 1945. I have served in both Korea and China, have had training in counter-subversion and have conducted minor military negotiations with Chinese Communists in occupied territory. I am proud and grateful to live under the American Flag and to luxuriate in the hard-won security and freedom which it symbolizes.

I respect the views of the young, applaud much that is being said and agree with the right to dissent. However, I am surprised at the manner in which some opinion can be so fearlessly, passionately and inflexibly embraced by those whose experiences and personal exposure to history have of necessity been so limited.

As I listen, read and observe, I am deeply disturbed and very much afraid, I am disturbed as I witness the pride and accomplishments of our universities, the blossoming idealism of students, the dedication, wisdom and courage of many teachers and the overriding good in most young people, obscured nullified, debased or destroyed by apostels of discord and violence. I am afraid that un-

less respect for duly constituted authority is promptly restored, parental and academic authority reasserted, and belligerent confrontation halted, that our society will be so polarized and torn asunder that further dialogue will be impossible and a national disaster inevitable.

Citizens of this community have been asked two questions: (1) What of Cambodia? (2) What of Kent State? As all well-intentioned people, I want peace at home and abroad. I have not had and do not have the military and diplomatic intelligence available to the President and his advisors. I am thus unable to sit in judgment as to either Vietnam or Cambodia. I feel that the general public is similarly situated. I can and do have an opinion that our original entry into Vietnam was a serious mistake and that we should withdraw as soon as we can safely and honorably do so. I think that the move into Cambodia is designed to hasten that day and to safeguard our troops. As such, I support both it and the President who had the courage to make it. I firmly believe that every military move this country makes has as its sincere purposes the protection of freedom. Mistakes have been and will be made, and when made should be acknowledged as such. The price of freedom, however, has never been cheap and the land of the free must continue to be the land of the brave. It takes no courage to surrender and much won at great sacrifice can be suddenly destroyed by turmoil at home which can only prolong our agony abroad.

The death of the students at Kent State was an obvious tragedy. So, too, was the violent confrontation which provoked and caused the loss of life. If the resulting demonstrations and marches were to be directed against, rather than for, anything, I feel that they should have been directed against the climate of violence—not against the government or against the National Guard. The Guard, while unfortunately over-reacting, was charged with maintaining the law and order without which neither society nor educational opportunity can survive.

I am very much opposed to strikes against colleges or against the government or to any activity, student or otherwise, which interferes with the rights of others. Education is a privilege, not an unconditional right—a privilege which can, should and inevitably will be curtailed or terminated for those who abuse it at the expense of those who appreciate, desire, support and pay for it.

I feel that students have been used by some and abused by many. I have confidence that, given a chance, sanity will prevail, communications will improve and government will listen to voices honestly raised in support of orderly social change. If we are willing to try, we can encourage and pursue these objectives through the established democratic process, without destroying the national unity, firmness of purpose, solidarity, strength and patriotic pride which has saved us from peril before and will do so again.

The intelligence, idealism and energy of a great majority of our young people affords today's society with an unparalleled opportunity for progress and improvement. None of us can afford to idly watch this opportunity turned aside, or lost, by surrender to those from within or without who seek only to tear down and destroy us.

JAMES A. FITZPATRICK.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, you know that I share the sadness of my col-

leagues here in the House that you will not be returning in the 92d Congress to serve and to lead.

I remember well the first days of my service in 1965 and how you extended to that very large number of new Members a warm and friendly greeting and the unspoken promise that our problems and our needs would be very important to you also.

Over the years since then, I can attest to the fact that the promise was kept, and I want to take this opportunity to thank you for all of the help that you have given me in so many ways.

It always seems so inadequate, to offer only words of thanks as a response to many concrete acts of assistance and kindness. Nevertheless, the words are symbols of deep feelings. Mr. Speaker, you have an enviable way of making even the most routine matters a kind of personal experience, and your uncanny ability to multiply time so that there was always an opportunity for us to personally seek your advise and aid.

I will always be impressed with your willingness, and even more importantly, your availability, to help me with many of the special problems and projects which were really my burden, and not yours.

I shall always remember you as one of the kindest and most capable public servants I have ever known, and I wish you well.

CITIES NEED COORDINATED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I recall saying in my remarks before the Fourth International Conference on Urban Transportation held in Pittsburgh in March of 1969 that "a nation that could send a man to the moon ought to be able to get him to and from the airport."

All of us who are interested in improved urban mass transit facilities should also recognize the need for coordinated planning to not only get to and from the airport, but that will mesh with other systems of transportation to achieve a balanced approach to transportation.

I include at this point in the RECORD a recent article appearing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette citing Tokyo's response to this challenge for the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, May 14, 1970]

CITIES NEED RAPID TRANSIT TO AIRPORTS

An article appearing on the magazine page of today's Post-Gazette tells how the world's largest city—Tokyo—has linked its downtown area with its international airport 8.2 miles away. Since all major cities, including Pittsburgh, must deal with a similar problem, we commend this article to our readers.

Tokyo responded to its mass transit challenge by building the world's fastest commercial monorail at a cost of \$54.4 million and in time for the Tokyo Summer Olympic Games of 1964. The monorail has ever since

hailed large numbers of passengers quickly, punctually, safely and profitably. What more could be asked of rapid transit?

Tokyo's experience has relevance to the Pittsburgh District, which is involved just now in two significant developments: 1) the provision of rapid transit, and 2) the expansion of Greater Pittsburgh Airport at an estimated cost of \$250 million.

Thus far these developments are not related. Port Authority Transit is in its first developmental phase for rapid transit plans to build a Skybus linking downtown to the South Hills. It also plans to build PATways (buses operating on their own rights-of-way) to serve the East End and South Hills.

We have endorsed those projects and we think they should proceed as promptly as possible. But we think, too, that PAT directors should also be giving serious attention to the inevitable traffic congestion that will follow an expansion and internationalization of the airport. The Parkway West linking downtown to the airport is already inadequate. As the airport expands and attracts more industrial and residential construction, Parkway congestion will become a more urgent problem.

A way should be found to provide rapid mass transit over the same right-of-way used by the Parkway West. An elevated structure of the sort used for at least some sections of the Tokyo monorail might suggest an answer.

While we understand full well that PAT can't meet all of this district's transit needs at one time, it should keep a close watch on the need to provide an adequate link between downtown and the air terminal. That's where the action will be in the age of the jumbo jets.

WHOSE SIDE ARE BIG 5 ON?

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the major news media have often emphasized every U.S. shortcoming in Southeast Asia, while totally ignoring the staggering toll of Communist brutality in that conflict. As the tension increases in the troubled Middle East, it is interesting to consider the approach these same media will take to Russian-inspired crises there. I know my House colleagues will be interested in the following analysis by Alice Widener as published in the San Diego Union:

WHOSE SIDE ARE BIG 5 ON?

(By Alice Widener)

Now, before another day passes, it seems that someone must have courage enough, regardless of the misinterpretations it might evoke, to state the case regarding U.S. foreign relations as they are today, and to ask some extremely serious questions requiring frank answers.

Indisputably, there are two major crises now—one in Southeast Asia and the other in the Middle East. In the first, we already are engaged militarily and lives of our GIs are at stake; in the second, we are not yet involved militarily but there is the extremely dangerous possibility that we could become so involved.

In Vietnam, we are fighting against a Communist foe backed by the Soviet Union, and our natural allies in Western Europe are neutral. In the Middle East, we are in danger of becoming drawn into a bitter dispute between Israel and the Arab states backed by the Soviet Union, a dispute in which West European nations probably will not be neutral.

A big question is: What will be the attitude of the so-called "peace" forces in our communications media if the Arab-Israeli situation reaches the boiling point?

To be specific: since Dec. 14, 1961, when President John F. Kennedy declared the United States was prepared to help the Republic of South Vietnam "preserve its independence," and since December 1962, when he increased U.S. military "adviser" support to South Vietnam to 4,000 men, our major broadcasting companies—CBS, NBC, ABC, and the New York Times and Washington Post—have been openly against U.S. military policy there.

The "Big Five" in our communications media openly propagandized against President Diem of South Vietnam and have consistently highlighted everything unfavorable to that country while remaining virtually uncritical of North Vietnam and the Viet Cong.

Since December 1964, when President Johnson increased U.S. forces in Vietnam from 23,000 to 75,000, and since July 1965, when he authorized an increase of U.S. forces in Vietnam to 125,000, the Big Five in our communications media have refrained from giving moral support to our participation in the war.

It is the first war ever fought on TV, and NBC, CBS and ABC on-scene correspondents have stressed all the faults, fallings and mishaps of our side and put all propaganda pressure for "peace" on our side almost exclusively. There have been no CBS or NBC televised editorials demanding "peace" moves by Moscow and Hanoi.

Now what will be the Big Five's attitude in the Middle East?

If Israel shoots down an Egyptian plane with a Soviet pilot over Israeli territory, or if a Soviet-furnished SAM missile hits a populated area of Israel and an Arab-Israeli war breaks out with the Soviets backing the Arabs, what will be the foreign policy of our communications media Big Five?

If the independence of Israel is jeopardized, what will be the attitude of the "peace" forces in our Big Five communications media? Since they have failed to denounce the Russian Communists backing Hanoi, will they also remain silent about the Russian Communists backing Cairo?

Ever since our Navy was sent to protect the independence of Formosa with the Seventh Fleet, the "peace" forces in the Big Five communications media have been insisting it play a passive role in the Pacific, Formosa Straits and China Sea.

What will be the attitude of those "peace" forces toward the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean?

CAUSE OF KENT STATE DEATHS SENSELESS

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, all of us were shocked and appalled by the fatal shooting of four students at Kent University during recent antiwar demonstrations.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial by Lewis S. Mrkvicka which appeared in the May 10 edition of the Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News. I thought my colleagues might find his comments of interest:

CAUSE OF KENT STATE DEATHS SENSELESS

I know that you were shocked and appalled, as I was to learn about the fatal

shooting of four students of Kent State University by Ohio national guardsmen during an anti-war demonstration last Monday. The deaths of these young people were even more tragic because the disorder which triggered the shooting was so senseless and so absurd. What strange idiotic logic could prompt students to riot against a school which had no part in the decision to send American troops into Cambodia and no power to alter the situation?

We will, in the days, weeks and months which lie ahead, be hearing endless arguments over the question of whether or not the guardsmen were justified in shooting when they did. I doubt that the question will ever be settled to everyone's satisfaction. I am, however, not primarily concerned over whether or not the threats to the lives and safety of the guardsmen were sufficient to have their actions classified as self-defense. I prefer to place the blame for the Kent tragedy, as well as the disgraceful rioting on other college campuses, where it rightfully belongs.

I blame all the students who with a juvenile logic which belies the wisdom which they profess to possess, blatantly defy the forces of law and order and resort to senseless violence in an effort to enforce their demand on society.

I blame the indulgent and apathetic parents who continue to pay for the college expenses of their children even after they become aware that the young people are devoting their energies to anarchism rather than the pursuit of an education.

I blame the college officials and teachers who, with a startling display of spinelessness, do nothing to prevent these things from taking place, and especially those educators who lend support to lawlessness by joining the demonstrators in their illegal activities.

I blame the courts which have been rewriting our laws to protect the rights of those who violate the law while forgetting the rights of those to whom the law is a sacred thing which must be obeyed in order that our free society may be preserved.

The deaths of the four Kent students were not the only tragic events of the past week. Who would have thought that the American flag would be sullied and defiled on the campus of one of our great universities? Or that colleges throughout our great nation would be forced to close their doors because of the actions of a bunch of hoodlums? These closings were a hardship for serious students who sincerely want an education. As for the members of the unruly mob, however, there was no loss. What need do they have for more learning when they already know—or think they do—enough to take over the running of the world?

It's time that we restored sanity to our nation's campuses. It's time that we said to our rebellious students:

"You have a right to dissent, but not to try to force your views upon the rest of us. If you disagree with what is going on, state your views and then get back to your books. If you don't want to obey the rules of your school, get out, go to work and make room for other students who really want an education."

STUDENTS OFFER LEGISLATIVE SUGGESTIONS

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the lack of communication between the generations and that the younger members of our society do

not try to work within the framework of our present system of government but resort to other methods because they feel that the adult portion of the society pays little heed to their ideas.

My strong faith in the younger generation is constantly being reinforced by recommendations, such as I insert below, which is the work of two classes of high school seniors from Highlands High School in North Highlands, Calif. The following proposals are the result of a course of study in which the students attempt to solve significant internal problems facing the United States. Their instructor, Mr. Robert Silvis, permits his students to decide what problems will be discussed and what recommendations will be made. The result was attained only after much debate and compromise, a method with which we here in the House are very familiar.

The students elected one of their classmates, Miss Debby Ginotti, as the student "Secretary of State." Miss Ginotti's letter of transmittal precedes the recommendations themselves. I urge each of my colleagues to take the time to peruse the student's suggestions and urge them to pay heed to their recommendations:

MAY 1, 1970.

DEAR SIR: The following recommendations are the result of a combined class effort to alleviate and improve that which we believe to be the most important problems existing today within our society. One primary objective of the course "International Relations" (from which these solutions came) is to define the existing problems within the United States, and to carefully select the solutions most workable, enforceable, and logical. To fulfill the second objective upon solving and improving the International Relations with the world, the class was divided into three groups:

- (1) Anti-American.
- (2) Neutral.
- (3) Pro-American.

Each group evaluated the following problems and presented their solutions to the class. The class then voted on what they believed to be the most complete of all possibilities. The following then, are our suggestions for future Congressional Legislation to aid in the alleviation of poverty in the United States, Environmental Pollution, Racial Discrimination, the Draft, also, improvement of our National Security, and the Space Program.

As high school seniors, we are soon to face the reality and responsibility of the problems within society. We are deeply interested in these problems and have gained valuable additional information on the above mentioned problems.

We wish to thank you for the valuable time you have spent reading our solutions. It is only hoped that they may benefit you as much as they did the students who participated in their creation.

Sincerely Yours,

DEBBY GINOTTI.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION TO AID IN THE ALLEVIATION OF POVERTY IN THE U.S.A.

1. Education.

a. That substantial additional amounts of federal money be spent in poverty areas for the purpose of increasing educational opportunity.

b. That most of this money be spent at the primary-elementary level although all levels of education, including adult vocational training, be included.

c. That federal funds be used for addi-

tional sociological and psychological training of teachers who will be teaching in poverty areas. This could be done through an expansion of the VISTA program.

2. Overpopulation.

a. That the federal government establish family planning clinics in all rural and urban poverty areas and that these clinics dispense free birth control pills and devices.

b. That a positive step be taken to alleviate the population problem by having the U.S. government pay a cash bonus each year to all U.S. families that have no more than two children.

3. Additional Federal Programs in Poverty Areas.

a. That Congress change its priorities in the appropriation of money to shift more funds to promoting an equality of opportunity in America and that this shift of funds be taken from the area of "defense" spending.

b. That surplus food be more easily available to the poor but that the distribution of such food be part of a federal program of created jobs in rural and urban poverty areas so that the poor will be able to work for this food rather than be given food.

c. That jobs created by the federal government be primarily in poverty areas and that some of these work programs be directly related to improving life in these areas.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION TO AID IN THE ALLEVIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

1. Internal Combustion Engine as a Pollutant.

a. That the internal combustion engine, in its present form, be banned from new automobile construction after 1975.

b. That a federally approved smog control device be mandatory on all automobiles after 1973.

c. That the federal government subsidize mass public transport that is relatively non-polluting like electric trains.

2. Industrial Pollution.

a. That the federal government set up regulations covering industrial air and water pollution standards and enforce these standards with heavy fines.

b. That included in these standards be the specific requirement that all liquid wastes be expelled as water "fit for human consumption".

3. Personal Pollution.

a. That federal legislation be enacted to force manufacturers of beverages to produce either reusable or completely dissolvable containers.

b. That open burning be banned in all metropolitan areas of the nation.

SOLUTIONS TO HELP LESSEN RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

1. Employment Discrimination.

a. That the federal government provide tax reductions to employers who are equal opportunity employers.

(1) An "equal opportunity employer" will be any private business where the size of the working force has as a minimum, ten employees in addition to members of the owner's family.

(2) The per cent of ethnic distribution to qualify as an equal opportunity employer shall be equal to the ethnic and racial distribution of the COUNTY wherein the business is located. A variance in the ethnic distribution of no greater than 20% will be allowed.

2. Housing Discrimination.

a. That the current Federal Housing Act be strengthened by authorizing the Justice Department to provide free legal assistance to members of minorities who have claims against landlords and owners who refuse to rent or sell solely on racial or ethnic grounds.

b. That all such claims be settled within 30 calendar days.

3. Discrimination in Education.

a. That the federal government provide significant additional funds to promote "quality" education in poverty areas.

b. That the federal government encourage, through subsidies, large centralized elementary schools that draw their enrollment from both ghetto and middle class neighborhoods thus ending one of the reasons for "busing."

c. That the federal government provide additional subsidies to school districts that show that they lessen racial discrimination by changing school attendance boundaries for this purpose.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MILITARY SERVICE—NATIONAL SERVICE

1. That, except for War declared by Congress or the National Emergency declared by the President, the present draft law is not to be extended past June 30, 1971.

2. That, with the exceptions listed above, a United States public law be enacted limiting the size of the active military forces to not more than 2,000,000 personnel.

a. Under such a law, all personnel will be volunteers.

b. Volunteering will be encouraged by: (1) more than doubling the pay of the lower enlisted ranks and lesser raises for the higher enlisted ranks and the officers. (2) Increasing the present "G.I. Bill" privilege by 50%.

3. That, in the event a "draft" is necessary, volunteers rather than "delinquents", be called first.

4. That, as an alternative to military service (in peacetime), a "National Service" be created.

a. This "National Service" will combine the present organizations of Peace Corps, Vista, Job Corps, etc.

b. It will be completely voluntary and the upper limits of the numbers in each of its branches be set by Congress.

c. Enlistments in the National Service will be for periods of two years.

d. The pay structure will be similar to the military with the exceptions that the pay for each pay grade be approximately 20% less and that those who complete at least two years of "National Service" be awarded benefits similar to those contained in the "G.I. Bill" but of a lesser dollar value.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

1. That Congress do all in its power to avoid future "Vietnam type conflicts" by using the following guidelines:

a. In the future, armed intervention be limited to those situations where the national security of the USA is definitely threatened.

b. That the majority of the people, not just the leaders, want us to help them defend the country.

c. In the event of armed conflict, Congress should use recommendations from soldiers and civilians who have been involved in battle along with the testimony of "expert" witnesses to help determine the amounts and types of future appropriations related to that of "armed conflict."

2. That Congress should place more emphasis on Military Advisory Assistance Groups (M.A.A.G.) as the type of Military Aid most desirable to render to those countries faced with possible Communist takeover.

3. That Congress change concepts of the Army Special Forces (Green Berets) away from being an elite fighting force toward being an elite organization of advisors who would train and possibly lead indigenous "special forces."

4. That in matters related to internal security (subversion), Congress legislate definite guidelines about what organizations would provide under-cover agents. It is suggested that no Army Counter-Intelligence

agents be used to infiltrate civilian organizations and that C.I.A. agents be used only when the organization draws financial support from a foreign power. It is recommended that the F.B.I. provide the bulk of the under-cover agents and that the National Security Council provide direct supervision over all activities of this type.

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE SPACE PROGRAM

1. That the budget for fiscal year 1971 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration be reduced by 30-35 percent under the 1970 figure.

2. That the savings in money, due to this recommendation, be spent equally in the areas of aid to poverty and alleviation of environmental pollution.

OLIVER BRUCK—MR. POSTMASTER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in Austin, Tex., we will honor a man this Friday who has served his country and his Government continuously for 50 years—he is the postmaster's postmaster. In fact, he has been selected by the Dallas regional office of the post office to train new postmasters.

I rise today to join the many friends of Oliver Bruck, Austin's postmaster who first agreed that the mails would go through back in 1920. On June 7 of that year at the age of 18, Oliver Bruck took the oath and signed on as a substitute clerk in the Austin office.

And he was a man whose talents and initiative would not be denied. Oliver rose through the ranks in what must be a living textbook for anyone wanting to make a career in the post office—he worked his way through school at the post office—he was married and raised two children while at the post office. And he is there today, to our everlasting gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, this man's list of accomplishments—both professionally and in community involvement—runs seven pages. I will not attempt to itemize the many accomplishments of this man, but I would briefly headline some of the highlights of his life to date.

First, let me sketch his career with the Government. In 1935, Oliver was promoted to foreman of mails; in 1943, he was promoted to superintendent of mails; in 1949, he was elevated to assistant postmaster; then in 1959, Oliver was named to acting postmaster and on June 19, 1962, Oliver Bruck was confirmed as postmaster in the Austin office.

Mr. Speaker, that is a model career accomplished by an extraordinary man. Oliver was born in Austin, and although his interests are national, he has never left central Texas. In 1929, he married Sibyl, the daughter of Judge Walter Wray of Waco. The Brucks now have two grown children—a daughter named Sibyl, but known affectionately as "Susie" and a son, Oliver, who is a career clerk in the Austin Post Office.

Oliver has made many contributions to his community that go beyond the mail

service. His list of civic accomplishments and offices runs as long as your arm. His active, working membership is a reflection of his concern for his neighbor. I have served with him in the Lions Club for over 30 years.

Oliver is carrying on a tradition started by his father. Today, he serves his church in the same office once held by his father for many years—chairman of the communion committee at University Methodist Church. Also, he is a member of the board of stewards.

After the investment of a lifetime, Oliver Bruck can make his work at the post office look easy. For example, the Austin Post Office was the first installation in the Nation to win the award of merit for working a full year without a single disabling injury. And, for the last 7 years in a row, the Austin Post Office has won the safety contest in their division. Mr. Speaker, this is ample evidence of an efficient operation. If there is trouble in the mails—I submit, it begins somewhere else and not in Austin.

Obviously, Oliver Bruck has done the job we asked him to do—and more. I am proud to call him my friend and honor him in this way. Oliver Bruck is the highest type of public servant in America.

LT. GOV. RAYMOND J. BRODERICK
RECOMMENDS FEDERAL AND
STATE ACTION FOR AIR POLLU-
TION CONTROL

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my fellow Members of Congress and the American people the excellent letter dated May 31, 1970, of Lt. Gov. Raymond J. Broderick, of Pennsylvania, to enlist help for air pollution control legislation. Lieutenant Governor Broderick favors an amendment to the Federal Air Quality Act of 1967 which would give all States the power to legislate further air pollution controls than are now required by Federal law.

Congratulations for the protection of the natural heritage of our environment are in order for Lt. Gov. Ray Broderick for his leadership in acting to clean up Pennsylvania skies. I have advised my friend Ray Broderick that I will cooperate and work with him to legislate for additional State authority for air pollution control standards.

We citizens of Pennsylvania certainly believe that Ray Broderick deserves our cheers in his leadership for clean air and air pollution control.

The materials follow:

LIEUTENANT GOVERNORS OFFICE,
Harrisburg, Pa., May 31, 1970.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
Congress of the United States,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I would like to enlist your help in cleaning up Pennsylvania's polluted skies. Tomorrow, I intend to announce to the press

my intention of seeking an amendment to the Federal Air Quality Act of 1967. Such an amendment would give all states, and especially the Commonwealth, the power to legislate for a more stringent automobile air pollution control mechanism than is now required by Federal Law. To date, California is the only state in the nation with such authority. I want like status for Pennsylvania.

Can I count on you to press for an amendment to Section 208(b) of the Air Quality Act of 1967? A glance skyward will tell you that we are running out of time.

Enclosed please find a copy of my most recent position paper on Air Pollution. The matter I am most concerned with, that is amending the Federal Law, is detailed on Pages 3 and 4.

I send my personal regards.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND J. BRODERICK,
Lieutenant Governor.

AIR POLLUTION

(By Lt. Gov. Raymond J. Broderick)

AUTOMOTIVE EMISSIONS

By weight of emissions, the automobile is the largest contributor to air pollution in Pennsylvania. A recent study of air pollution in the Delaware Valley area showed that transportation and industrial operations accounted respectively for 58% and 30% of the daily weight of 2,265 tons of organic compounds vented into the atmosphere. The greatest contributors to the 8,663 tons of carbon monoxide emitted daily were transportation (70%) and industrial operations (28%). It should be pointed out, however, that the total quantity of pollutant emissions does not tell the whole story—some pollutants (for example, sulphur dioxide) are chemically more active than others and hence more harmful at lower atmospheric concentrations.

Tests have already demonstrated that for each 1,000 gallons of gasoline consumed, there is emitted: 3,200 pounds of carbon monoxide, 200-400 pounds of organic vapors, 20-75 pounds of oxides of nitrogen, 18 pounds of aldehydes, 17 pounds of sulphur compounds, along with lesser amounts of organic acids, ammonia, and solids.

In addition, automotive emissions have been proven to cause photo-chemical smog. This smog irritates the eyes, reduces visibility, irritates the respiratory tract and affects materials. The incidents of photo-chemical smog in the Philadelphia area have increased as the automobile population of the area has increased. Oxidant concentrations (which is a measure of photo-chemical smog) in the Philadelphia area have exceeded the standards established by the Pennsylvania Air Pollution Commission. For the health, safety and welfare of our citizens, automobile emissions must be controlled.

Under Federal regulations, since 1968 all new automobiles have been equipped with emission control devices. These devices have added approximately \$50 to the cost of a new car. Approximately 400,000 new cars are sold each year in Pennsylvania. Thus, the citizens of this State are now spending \$20 million a year for the control of this problem. Increasing the Federal standards would result in more effective control.

It has been proven that without proper maintenance, these devices (which are installed under Federal regulation at the factory) are significantly reduced in effectiveness after approximately 12,000 miles of operation. Therefore, in order to insure that our citizens are obtaining their money's worth from these devices and that these devices are properly maintained so as to control automotive emissions, a program of periodic maintenance inspection is necessary.

A number of bills have been introduced in the General Assembly which would provide for inclusion of automotive emission

control devices on the list of items to be checked under the semi-annual vehicle inspection program. It is the responsibility of the State to see that these devices are properly maintained. The semi-annual motor vehicle inspection program is the proper means of performing these checks.

Pennsylvania must move into a partnership with the Federal Government in combating this serious air pollution problem. The Federal Government, pursuant to the Air Quality Act of 1967, has assumed the responsibility for establishing standards for emissions from new automobiles. It is the responsibility of our Commonwealth to see that the effectiveness of the control devices installed on new cars is maintained. It is also our responsibility to insure that Federal standards are responsive to the needs and problems of Pennsylvania. To do this we must continually monitor (sample) the air in urban areas and check emission control devices on automobiles operated in Pennsylvania.

It has come to my attention that the State of California is the only state in this nation which has the authority under present Federal law to issue automobile emission regulations more stringent than those of the Federal Government. I want like status for Pennsylvania. I will not accept second-class citizenship for Pennsylvanians in any matters, but most particularly in an issue involving their health.

I therefore favor a law requiring all new cars sold in Pennsylvania to have an air pollution control mechanism that reflects the needs of our state, not the needs of those states which have little industry and less concentrated motor vehicle traffic. This is not possible, however, until we amend the present Federal law.

I have requested Senators Scott and Schweiker and our Republican delegation in the United States House of Representatives to give immediate consideration to the preparation of an amendment to Section 208(b) of the Air Quality Act of 1967 which would permit Pennsylvania to have the same options as California; that is, the freedom to adopt more stringent standards than are now provided by the Federal Government.

Upon passage of this amendment by the United States Congress, I shall request our General Assembly to enact a statute requiring all new cars sold in Pennsylvania to have an air pollution control mechanism which will be more effective in eliminating emissions.

AIR MONITORING SYSTEM

In 1948 we had a smog disaster in Donora, Pennsylvania. During a four-day period of stagnant weather conditions, the build-up of air pollutants in this small western Pennsylvania community caused 20 people to die and many to become ill. These stagnant weather conditions still occur in certain areas of the State. No matter how well sources of air pollution are controlled, there is still the possibility that adverse levels of pollutants may be reached.

The Pennsylvania Air Pollution Commission has developed a regulation which will provide for special controls to be instituted during such periods. In order to enforce this regulation and to properly measure levels of atmospheric contamination throughout the State, it is necessary that we develop a more sophisticated automatic air monitoring system. We must know the nature and extent of air pollution in various areas of the State in order to develop control procedures and measure the effectiveness of these controls. We must have immediate information to determine when emergency steps must be taken.

The Pennsylvania Legislature has appropriated \$490,000 for such a system. With this appropriation, we will be receiving approximately \$1 million in Federal matching funds. We must move ahead rapidly in the estab-

ishment of this system. We must insure that the air sampling stations (which will be part of the system) are located in areas having significant air pollution problems. We must place a high priority on cleaning up these areas. The air quality information which is developed from this system must be made available to the public so they themselves can determine progress in controlling air pollution. Air pollution directly and intimately affects the public and the State must respond to the public's right to clean air.

IMPROVED AND INTENSIFIED ENFORCEMENT

The Pennsylvania Air Pollution Commission has located 11 "air basins" in this State in which air pollution problems are intensified because of high industrial and population densities. Additional air basins are being designated. (The five counties in southeast Pennsylvania have been designated as an air basin.) We must step up the number of inspections to insure that enforcement procedures are carried out. We must provide adequate legal assistance to our air pollution control program to insure effective enforcement through the courts of the Commonwealth.

In Philadelphia, which operates under an exemption from Pennsylvania law, enforcement of the new Air Management Code must be more vigorous than it has been in the past. For the four-year period ending December 31, 1969, a total of \$3,125 in fines were levied against the 15 top polluters in what is the third worst polluted city in the nation. This amounts to only \$50 per polluting firm per year—or what each of us now pays for a control device on a new car.

Pennsylvania has been running its air pollution control program on a relatively modest budget. We are one of only three states which has qualified for federal maintenance grants, and at present our program is supported on a 1:1 basis with federal funds. Clean air is an economic asset to the Commonwealth, and it is worth the investment.

There are a number of areas in the present air pollution control act in which improvement can be made in streamlining administrative and enforcement procedures. Once the existence of an air pollution problem has been established, control should be required and achieved in a deliberate and expeditious manner. The rights of all must be protected but the public should not be required to put up with these problems while long and involved legal and administrative procedures are followed. The time for rhetoric has passed. The time for action is now.

We must strengthen our law with respect to preventing air pollution. It is well known that effective air pollution control devices can be installed on new installations at less cost than on existing installations. The Pennsylvania Air Pollution Control Act should be amended to specifically provide for approval prior to the construction and operation of all new potential sources of pollution in the Commonwealth.

COMPLIANCE

It is not enough to put strong laws in the statute books. We must intensify our efforts to insure compliance.

Faced with an order to install a pollution control device, particularly if the device is costly, the industry or governmental unit faces two choices: stop operations, or install the needed equipment. The first choice is untenable. It implies the closing of a business and the resulting loss of employment. I reject this choice.

It is the responsibility of government to aid business and industry to comply with the new rigid standards. In this connection, I strongly recommend that the Congress of the United States consider expansion of the present provisions for tax credits now provided in Federal income tax structure in

order that immediate, effective incentives are provided for business and industry. By the adoption of this approach, we would finally be able to put all the pieces together—a tough basic law, vigorous enforcement, and the means to comply—so that we might truly have the clean air we all are entitled to.

STREAMLINING GOVERNMENT

In order to insure effective control of pollution, we must reorganize the state government. Toward that end, I recommend prompt creation of a single Department of Environmental Protection which would bring together all agencies of State Government now concerned with the myriad problems of pollution of land, water and air into a single unit charged with strict enforcement of existing and future law.

I propose that this new department not be based on expansion of our existing Department of Forests and Waters, as some have suggested, but rather that it bring together under one cabinet-level officer all agencies now concerned with the technical aspects of environmental pollution and control.

Such a department would have as its base the existing Department of Mines and Mineral Industries which, over the past 8 years, has grown into one of the most effective arms now existing in State Government to fight environmental pollution.

To it would be added technicians from the Department of Health's Bureau of Environmental Protection . . . including the Sanitary Water Board, the Air Pollution Commission and the Solid Waste Management Section.

From the Department of Forests and Waters would come the Water Power Resources Board; from the Department of Agriculture, the Soil Conservation Commission; from the Department of Labor and Industry, the Division of Mines and Quarries; and from the State Planning Board, the Geological Survey.

I have advocated the reorganization and streamlining of State Government so that we eliminate duplication and deliver the essential services at less cost and save tax dollars.

The creation of such a department is a major step in streamlining State Government and is a necessary step if we in Pennsylvania are to win our battle to improve the quality of the air we breathe. It is a matter of survival!

BISHOP LAURISTON L. SCAIFE RETIRES AS EPISCOPAL HEAD

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Episcopal Diocese of Buffalo bade official farewell this week to the Right Reverend Lauriston L. Scaife, who retired after serving as bishop since 1948. He was the diocese's seventh bishop.

During his 22 years as leader of his western New York flock, Bishop Scaife came to be known and loved by peoples of all faiths, all nationalities.

During the commencement exercises last Friday at the State University of New York at Buffalo, the coveted chancellor's medal was bestowed upon the bishop.

The citation credited Bishop Scaife with displaying those ideals which are the very bases of a university. The citation continued:

Buffalo could have had no greater leader in its midst during this ecumenical period.

In this age of diversity, when the affliction of Babel has compounded itself and separated men from men, it is a rare individual who, by his character, can show men of all backgrounds that they are indeed united by a common humanity.

Unusual is the man whose warmth can melt the barriers which impede understanding and goodwill. The man we honor today has demonstrated these attributes in his church, his community, his nation and his world.

His outstanding qualities have distinguished him as a leader not only in his church, but also among all religious communities.

Bishop Scaife is and has been a great spiritual leader, a great community spirit whose activities regrettable have been sharply reduced recently because of ill health, forcing his retirement at this time.

In a feature story on May 29, the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News headlined Ellen Taussig's article: "Lauriston L. Scaife—'Every Inch a Bishop.'" That's a four-word description that tells the story of this man.

Following is the newspaper feature:

LAURISTON L. SCAIFE—"EVERY INCH A BISHOP"

(By Ellen Taussig)

"I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

"Defend, O Lord, this thy child with thy heavenly grace; that he may continue thine forever; and daily increase in thy Holy Spirit more and more, until he come into thy everlasting kingdom."

"Jesus said, 'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: If it were not so, I would have told you.'"

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America meets the three cycles of man's days—birth, life and death—in part, with the above words.

Over two decades throughout her Western New York Diocese, they have been prayed and declaimed by the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, a large, majestic-appearing man, with eyes both loving and keen, who—with raised chin and proud bearing—has thus declared his allegiance to Jesus Christ, of whom he has said:

"He (Christ) lived a life deliberately balanced between the new and the old. He was and is the center of a new society in which power is subordinated to love."

Now regretfully, the Episcopal Diocese will bid her seventh bishop farewell, as he retires June 1.

A diocese where he has established nine new congregations and opened many new church buildings, and whose community outreach is reflected in the founding, during his term, of:

The Rendezvous, a teen-age coffee house in South Buffalo; The Southwestern Area Migrant Committee, Fredonia; St. Augustine's Center, an urban mission on Humboldt Pkwy., and St. Phillip's Community Center, for young and old, on Goodell St.

GAINS IN DIOCESE

A diocese where Sunday school teachers have increased from 600 to 1000 during his office, and their pupils by more than 1300.

A diocese which recently established its own charities fund.

Regret at Bishop Scaife's departure however, crosses local denominational lines, and reverberates through scores of churches around the world.

For during his bishopric, he has looked over the tops of miters, croziers and creeds to the origin and root of the Christian faith.

Recognized as perhaps the greatest diplo-

mat in the U.S. in dealing with the Orthodox Church, Bishop Scaife recently was asked what thought he has borne in mind in dealing with so many denominations:

"I have remembered," he replied, "that God has no particular love for denominations, but an inflite love for people."

GOD HAS LOVE FOR PEOPLE

"I have remembered that all of us, Christian or Jew, Moslem or Hindu share a common goal: To open ourselves to His love. And I have tried to remember that a necessary first step is for us to open ourselves to one another."

In presenting the Distinguished Citizen's Achievement Award of Canisus College to Bishop Scaife in 1966, the Very Rev. James J. McGinley, S.J., said:

"The spirit of ecumenism has been his possession for long years . . . (he) is a combination of patriotism and intelligence, laced with patience and Christian charity—a good combination for the youth of our land to behold in their day of trial and doubt."

Born in Milton, Mass., in 1907, of Pilgrim stock, Lauriston Livingston Scaife was drawn to the ministry while a choirboy of 12, at St. Michael's Church there. The inspiration of the rector, Rev. H. Boyd Edwards, helped seal his decision.

Even earlier, he had begun study of the piano and organ, an interest he has continued throughout his life.

STUDIED PIANO, ORGAN

He was assistant organist at both Milton Academy, his preparatory school, and at Trinity College, Class '31.

Afterward, he taught classical language at St. Paul's School, Concord, N.H., and studied at Gottingen University, Germany, and at Harvard Graduate School.

General Theological Seminary conferred the degree of doctor of sacred theology upon him in 1937; while there he taught New Testament Greek.

He was ordained to the priesthood a year later, and began his ministry as curate at St. Thomas Episcopal Church, New York, after which he served successively as rector of Trinity Episcopal Church, Newport, and Calvary Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh, from where he was called here.

SERVED IN WORLD WAR II

During World War II, he was first, a prison chaplain, and later was assigned aboard ship in the South Pacific.

The Episcopal diocese of Western New York unanimously elected him bishop on the first ballot, Jan. 20, 1948, to succeed the Rt. Rev. Cameron J. Davis and he was consecrated May 13 of that year.

"He came to the Diocese at a critical time," says one observer. "Following a depression and war. It was badly fractured—financially, socially and from the viewpoint of churchmanship."

Two weeks after he arrived, he met the clergy at luncheon and told them: "I am your bishop, and I want to be so in more than name."

Then he circled the tables, and called each man there by name—there were about 70—and mentioned the name of his wife and children.

"It was a tribute to his memory," says a minister who was present, "but an even greater one to his warmth and concern for people. To tell you the truth," he confessed, "Bishop Scaife knows my people better than I do today."

Another priest says: "He was every inch a bishop, but he was very tender-hearted; he was wrong by people's troubles. If he heard someone was sick, he might appear personally at the hospital, or call the patient's rector."

HE WAS A QUICK STUDY

"He was a quick study; he grasped the salient points and didn't get bogged down

with details. He thought in large terms, in the grand design.

"Bishop Scaife had a high regard for the old, in the best sense of the word, yet he was not afraid to venture into new territory.

"He had good balance in every area—social, theological and ecclesiastical."

Dramatic and traumatic events and changes have taken place in the field of religion since Bishop Scaife came to Buffalo.

The vision of Christian unity has raised its head higher than it has for centuries. Across it, like a beneficent shadow, lies the memory of Pope John XXIII, who called the Second Vatican Council, which emphasized the unity of all Christian groups, in hope of a closer relationship.

Of this Bishop Scaife says:

"The most significant thing about the ecumenical councils lies in their providing a place for Christians to get together and talk. No problem is ever solved by silence, least of all a theological difference."

TRIBUTE TO POPE JOHN

"Pope John, more than any individual in the 20th Century, showed the rest of us how to love our neighbor, while respecting his uniqueness."

Bishop Scaife expressed his own views on the full meaning of Christian unity in an address before the First Friday Club of the Knights of Columbus in 1965.

"Pope John is largely responsible for my being here today," he told his listeners.

His remarks sum up his current thoughts on interdenominational reunion:

The bishop interpreted the ultimate objectives of Christian reunion as "the healing of the divisions which now separate Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Anglican and Protestant Christians, and the reuniting of all Christians in that visible unity of the church which consists in full and complete communion in faith, in discipline and in the sacramental life."

He defined the more proximate objective of the Christian reunion movement, the Ecumenical Movement, as:

ECUMENICAL OBJECTIVE

"The removal of the obstacles of unity—not only the differences in matters of doctrine, discipline and liturgy, but the mutual lack of knowledge among the Christian bodies, and the fears and suspicions which have sprung up between them as a result of centuries of division and hostility."

Finally, he encouraged his listeners to regard the entire work of Christian reunion as "the work of God, and therefore, a work to be carried forward principally by the power of prayer."

"Study we must and talk we may," declared Bishop Scaife, "but this is one house the Lord must build, or the builders will labor in vain."

The invitation extended by Bishop James A. McNulty to the Episcopal Diocese to hold the ceremony for Bishop Scaife's successor, the Very Rev. Harold B. Robinson, in St. Joseph's New Cathedral in 1967, and Bishop Scaife's acceptance, set a Roman Catholic-Protestant Episcopal precedent in this country.

ON INTERFAITH ADVANCES

On advances in interfaith—Roman Catholic relationships, specifically during his term of office, Bishop Scaife comments:

"The dealings of Roman Catholics with their Christian brethren over the past years, have been no less than exemplary. Currently, they are engaged in more discussions with more separate denominations than any other Christian body."

Bishop Scaife, who has represented the Episcopal Church as a delegate to and mediator with the Orthodox Church throughout the world, was asked what he felt was the value of the closer relationship he has effected between the two churches.

"I pray," he replied, "that the work that

has been done in Anglican-Orthodox relations has resulted in an increase of love between brothers. There is too little of that in this world, and the more we have the better for all of us."

PARISHONER'S PROBLEM TODAY

What, in Bishop Scaife's opinion, is the greatest stumbling block to the average parishoner today, in the development of his religious life?

"Doubt is, and always has been, the greatest stumbling block," he replies. "Doubts about whether the Church is moving too fast; doubts as to whether the Church is moving at all; doubts about the future and about the meaning of the past."

"And doubt," he says, "is merely a lack of trust in whether God really works in His world."

"He does."

A wide spectrum of sociological and civic issues have appeared, particularly during the last decade of Bishop Scaife's service.

They ranged from race relations to military service, from a challenging of long-established ethical and moral precepts to interpretation and usage of scientific advancements.

In 1965, invited to deliver a major address before the Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Improvement hearing on housing and blight, Bishop Scaife declared:

VIEWS ON HOUSING

"There can be no East Side, West Side, North or South Side, in dealing with this city-wide problem."

"We are to work man to man, face to face, shoulder to shoulder—Negro and White, Christian and Jew, as brothers sharing not only a common cause, but also a common Father."

Does the bishop feel such an attitude is present in the city today?

"While I believe race relations here have improved to a degree," he reports, "they have not come as far as I had hoped. We must guard against losing the ground we have taken and face the fact that our common life is far more important than our private predilections."

"If we once relax and allow this city to split into racial factions, each with its own special interests, we shall cease to have a community and find ourselves in the midst of a battleground."

To questions on other leading issues of the day the bishop had this to say:

MATTER OF MORALITY

Q—In your opinion, are we in the midst of a drastic change in the morality of sex, or is it a reformation or a tangent?

A—Regrettably, every generation believes that it invented sex and sets out to market it to the rest of the world. We are witnessing less of a sexual revolution, than a new, and rather boring, willingness to talk about what has been going on for eons.

Q—What of the current "rebellion" of youth? Where in your judgment have parents of today's unruly youth failed?

A—"Failure" is a relative term and not one I necessarily would apply to the parents of today's so-called "unruly youth."

These young people have taken most seriously, the values of their elders: Equality and dignity for all men, the necessity of peace among nations, the joys of the good life and the importance of the care and repair of the environment which sustains us.

However, a lesson we seem to have neglected is that passionate ideals do not replace hard work; that rhetoric is a poor substitute for reason, and that self-sacrificing love brings more results than random, capricious violence.

BIRTH CONTROL, DIVORCE

Q—What is the Episcopal Church's attitude toward birth control, abortion, divorce and remarriage?

A—The Episcopal Church's attitudes toward birth control, abortion, divorce and remarriage are premised on the primacy of Charity.

While we believe that children are a blessing to a marriage, we also feel that the marriage partners should, in the wisdom of their own consciences, determine for themselves, how many children will contribute to the health and growth of the marriage relationship.

Abortion is a far more complex matter and one which, in most situations, we view with alarm. However, certain rare and unusual circumstances demand special pastoral considerations.

The Episcopal Church does not condone divorce. On the other hand, in the case of marriages which have been entered into contrary to the laws of the Church, we have provisions for providing ecclesiastical annulments.

Those who divorce and remarry are subject to individual discipline. In all these cases, our desire is not to punish or condemn, but to restore those whose lives are troubled and disordered to the full life of the Church.

Christ commissioned us to love and forgive sinners, and that is our first job.

ON THE HUMAN SIDE

On the human side, Bishop Scaife has brought to the diocese a naturalness of manner and conviviality of spirit that, of themselves, have won him many followers, including youthful communicants.

At the annual ball in his honor, the highlight of the evening was when he went to the piano to play popular tunes to the delight of the guests.

Despite the burden of his office, he continued to exercise scholarship, reserving the right to personally examine young ministers ordained here in Greek. Recently, he taught a course in philosophy and religion at Canisius College.

The Episcopal Diocese's seventh bishop took his religion home to the large white-brick, green-shuttered house at 36 Lincoln Parkway, where he received religious personages from throughout the world.

CHAPEL IN HIS HOME

He had a chapel built there. It was designed so he might worship as master of his household with his family, while still retaining the traditional liturgical place of a bishop.

What is the message of Bishop Scaife, as he leaves office? What encouragement would he give and what pitfalls would he point out to the members of his 75 churches, and to Buffalo, as a city?

"I would like to remind both the people of the church and the people of the city," he says, "that they must settle for nothing less than perfection in their own lives and the life of their community.

"There is no such thing as 'half a saint,' anymore than there is a 'partially starving' child.

"We must pray constantly that God will strip us of our pride and sin, while we labor to strip our city of its slums, its polluted air, and its racial injustice."

Bishop Scaife and his wife, the former Eleanor M. Carnochan, will remain in Buffalo for the present.

SUPPORTING THE PASSAGE OF H.R. 15424

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 21 of this year, this body took a

decisive step toward the revitalization of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet when it voted nearly unanimously in favor of amendments to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

I am proud that I was one of the 307 Members of this body who voted in favor of this legislation, because by our action we have expressed our commitment to helping our merchant marine move back into contention for the ever-increasing cargo which moves to and from our shores.

The 307 to 1 vote by this House demonstrates that there is overwhelming support for positive action that will reverse the downward trend which has marked American maritime affairs for the nearly quarter of a century since the end of World War II. I think none of us labors under the delusion that this legislation will correct all of the ills of our merchant fleet. These ills have been developing for more than two decades, and it would be unrealistic to believe that they can be remedied overnight. We have a long uphill climb in front of us—one which will stretch over a period of many years—before we can be assured that we have become, once again, a major maritime power. But the important thing is that we have finally made a beginning—we are, at long last, headed on the proper course.

The significance of this bill lies more in the concepts which it embodies, than in the actual first steps toward regaining our position among the seafaring nations of the world. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because, for the first time, we have approved maritime legislation that seeks to assist all segments of the merchant marine to share in the benefits of our national maritime program.

I do not wish to belabor the subject of the inequities which existed under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as originally written—although the fact of the matter is that, whatever the intention of the Congress 34 years ago, that legislation has, over the years, worked to the benefit of only one-third of the American merchant marine, and has left the remaining two-thirds virtually without protection against the predatory competition of foreign merchant vessels, built by cheap labor and manned by cheap labor.

There have been some justifications advanced for the fact that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 restricted its benefits so narrowly. At the time of the bill's enactment, our foreign trade was primarily centered on the liner trade; bulk-cargo carriage constituted only a minute fraction of the Nation's waterborne imports and exports. Perhaps the drafters of the 1936 act were unable to foresee what actually occurred—the decline of the liner trade and the enormous expansion of the bulk trade. Certainly I do not impugn the motives of the legislators who drafted that act 34 years ago. But many of us have long regretted both the inflexibility of the 1936 act, and the even greater inflexibility of those who, over the years, have had the responsibility for its administration.

So the greatest significance in the bill which this House adopted on May 21—

the day before Maritime Day—lies in the fact that its provisions are less restrictive, and its goal is to operate in assistance of all elements of the merchant marine, whatever relative role each segment might currently play in terms of our total waterborne foreign commerce.

This legislation is not perfect, by any means. It still denies some forms of assistance to major segments of the maritime industry. It does not offer help, for example, in either building or operating ships on the Great Lakes, in service to the offshore areas of Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or Guam, or in the fishing industry. But it does extend the beginning of some forms of help to all of these segments, as well as to all of our deep-sea vessels engaged in international trade.

But the fact that the bill is less than perfect scarcely detracts from the principles which it embodies, and from the first steps that it proposes to begin to remedy the years of neglect of this important industry.

I am pleased that the bill received such overwhelming and bipartisan support in this House, that it represents the joint efforts both of the legislative branch and the executive branch, and that it enjoys virtually the unanimous endorsement of all segments of the maritime industry, and the overwhelming support of maritime management and labor, alike.

This legislation has been a long time in coming. It is my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will witness its quick approval in the other body of the Congress, its prompt signing by the President, and its speedy implementation by the Maritime Administration.

ADDRESS BY CARL FENICHEL, LEAGUE SCHOOL FOR SERIOUSLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent address of Carl Fenichel, Ed. D., director of the League School for Seriously Disturbed Children in Brooklyn, which was delivered at the school's 17th annual luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria on May 9, 1970.

When the league school was founded in 1953 there were no day schools in the country for mentally ill children diagnosed as schizophrenic. During the past 17 years the school has won national and international recognition for demonstrating that seriously disturbed children, previously institutionalized as hopeless, can remain at home within the family and be helped within the community.

I commend to my colleagues the contents of Dr. Fenichel's address which outlines some of the more recent achievements of the school. I am sure that all Members of this body will concur in his concluding statement that "every child—

no matter how disturbed or disabled—is entitled to achieve his full potential and to live with human dignity in the family of man." His remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY CARL FENICHEL, ED. D.

Recent tragic events in Cambodia and on the Kent State campus have dimmed our memories of what happened a few short weeks ago when the world watched and waited anxiously as three astronauts struggled for survival in outer space close to the edge of disaster. The impact of that near-tragedy impelled many of us to identify closely with the anguish of other human beings bordering on the brink of doom. After four long days and nights of harrowing suspense, there was wide global relief and rejoicing when these three men touched earth again.

This afternoon I'd like to bring you up-to-date on the rescue of three other human beings that will never make the front-page headlines. It concerns three of our own boys who had been trapped in the long, dark terror of mental illness and whose future looked equally grim and hopeless when they first came to League School. For many years the disordered minds of these three boys were far out in space, hovering on the thin edge of life. Today we can all proudly rejoice for our three boys have now been returned to earth and have rejoined the human family.

When Simon was admitted to League School six years ago, he was diagnosed as autistic, ritualistic and withdrawn. His thinking was seriously disturbed and distorted. He had no self-control and no ability or desire to relate to people. After four years of education and rehabilitation at the League School, Simon was gradually and successfully absorbed into a full-time regular junior high program where his scholastic and social skills showed continued improvement. This June he will be graduating with superior grades of 90 and above in all but one subject. Simon is now the pride and joy of all his junior high teachers who have told us how much they will miss him when he moves on to high school in September.

Then there is Perry who, when he came to us ten years ago, was considered a classical case of childhood schizophrenia. He was overwhelmed by anxieties, phobias, compulsions and confused thinking that he found it hard to hold on to minimal contact with reality. After seven years of slow but steady progress, Perry was able to move on from League School to high school where he made a fine adjustment. This June, Perry will be graduating from high school with excellent grades and in September he will be entering a Brooklyn college.

The third boy is Ray who came to League School 14 years ago, diagnosed as hopelessly psychotic, withdrawn, disorganized and unable to relate to people or objects. Today I am proud to announce that this once severely disturbed boy is now a well-functioning young man of 23 and that within the next few weeks Ray will be graduating from a college in New England with highest academic honors.

We are happy to share these heartening news items with all of you good friends and supporters who have made it possible for us to reach out and bring many of our lost children back to earth.

Today we are gathered here to remember and to renew a commitment to the pioneering achievements of League School which over these past 17 years has broken through much of the doom and despair that have darkened the lives of deeply disturbed children and their families.

While the impact and significance of our School gains greater momentum and glows ever brighter with each passing year, it seems to many of us that much of the world outside has little to glow about. In fact, each

morning's headlines make many of our staff and our visitors wonder on which side of the League School door does sanity live—outside or in? It is a sad and bitter commentary on the so-called "normal" world outside that all too often our small corner of earth in Brooklyn—devoted exclusively to the most disturbed, disordered and disorganized children—is a shining sanctuary of peace, serenity, security and sanity in contrast to the mad, violent, unsafe and corroding world outside the League School doors.

As we move into the decade of the 70's the new "in" word on the tongues and minds of millions of concerned Americans is "ecology"—the science of man's interaction with his physical and human environment. The alarm is sounding and spreading across our nation and the world that mankind is fouling his own nest and plundering his home on earth, and that nature's deadliest parasite and murderer is man himself. We are waking to the urgent need for immediate and drastic action against the prospect of self-extinction that faces all humanity by the erosion and waste of our resources and the pollution of our land, our water and our air.

But unfortunately we have not yet fully awakened to the pollution of our hearts and minds by an agonizing war, racism, poverty, perpetual violence and hate, dehumanization and indifference to the needs of the hungry and the handicapped—each of which is as fatally poisonous to our human environment as the physical pollution of the earth on which we live.

We know that there are no easy solutions to the multitude of frightening and complex problems that confront our world today. And yet there are some important lessons that our League School experiences have taught us which I believe should make us feel a little more hopeful about our chances for survival and for shaping a better world tomorrow.

The basic lesson is that progress in a democracy doesn't just happen. It comes from the aroused and enlightened conscience and action of its citizens. All change starts with people. The League School didn't just happen. The League School is people who made things happen.

During the early years of League School, its chances for survival looked dismal indeed. They were years of endless struggle trying to keep our doors open and our untried ideas alive as we faced the daily specter of unpaid bills and the weekly crisis of meeting the perennial payroll. We had no wealthy benefactors, no endowment funds, no foundation grants, no government assistance, no community support. We were rich in nothing but hope and the resolute will of a small band of people filled with a sense of purpose and armed with the moral imperative that mentally sick children must not be excluded from the human race.

True, the opening of our School was gratefully welcomed by parents as the answer to their prayers and dreams of finding a place that would keep their child out of the state hospital. And yet for several years after our pioneering day school program was launched it met with little or no acceptance or support by professionals, government agencies or citizens in the community.

We know that old habits and traditions die hard. Exclusion and isolation had been society's prescription for the mentally ill down through the ages. Even in the enlightened 20th century, separation of the deeply disturbed child from his family was widely advocated and justified by professionals on the assumption that the child's mental and emotional disorders were caused by the disturbances and inadequacies of his parents.

We found most of our parents no more dis-

turbed than most other parents. Nor could we uncover any evidence in the early histories of our children that they had suffered rejection or parental deprivation. What we found instead were parents who had to go through life with the shattering experience of having a seriously disturbed child and whose personal grief and anguish were made heavier by professionals who put ambiguous labels on their child and the finger of blame on them as parents.

The League School refused to accept hospitalization as the best and only resort for all mentally disturbed children. What we struggled to achieve were more humane and more effective strategies and services that would give these children the comfort and care of home and school in place of the dead-end, cold-storage containment of the hospital.

It is worth noting that when the League School began, while there were day school programs for the blind, the deaf, the mute, the retarded, the cerebral palsied and the brain-injured, there were none for the seriously disturbed child. At that time it was the general belief of nearly every mental health authority that education could do little or nothing for children as disturbed as ours. The treatment most recommended but rarely available and much too costly for most families was psychotherapy. And yet the few experienced psychotherapists able and willing to work with severely disturbed children admitted having little or no success.

With each passing year League School has made it increasingly evident that teachers trained in special education have an important therapeutic as well as educational contribution to make and that—with the supportive skills of other clinical disciplines—the school day in a therapeutic classroom can do more for the mental health and emotional growth of the deeply disturbed child than a few weekly hours of psychotherapy in a mental health clinic or on a psychiatric couch.

Gradually, the quiet story of our work began to spread and eventually what was happening on an obscure little street in Brooklyn became known to parents and professionals across the cities and towns of America and beyond. Today our schoolhouse has become a place of almost daily pilgrimage as more and more state and private hospitals, clinics, mental health boards, and boards of education are hoping and planning to start similar day school programs as an essential community facility to help disturbed children. As Governor Rockefeller declared when he came to dedicate our new building about two and a half years ago: "Professionals from six continents beat a path to the League School to learn how to establish similar stations of hope for disturbed children."

The teachers and clinicians at League School work untiringly to stir and waken the closed and disabled minds of children; to stimulate and guide the withdrawn ones who live in silence and in solitude; to quiet and comfort the wild, explosive ones and help them find the peace that comes with self-control; to bring order and purpose to the chaotic minds of the mentally disordered so that they can begin to make sense of a world they cannot cope with or understand.

Our program has succeeded in rehabilitating many children who might otherwise have to spend and end their days vegetating in institutions. It has enabled us to reach and teach many children considered inaccessible and uneducable. It has furthered the emotional growth of severely disorganized children by helping them develop the many skills needed to play, work and relate appropriately with others. Through the years our program has made it possible for many of our children to move on to regular or special

classes in the New York City school system, to learn vocational skills and work habits, hold down jobs, earn a livelihood and lead meaningful and useful lives.

Now we don't want anyone to go away from here with the idea that we don't know the bitter taste of failure. No matter how hard we try to help each child—we don't always succeed. When you work with children as sick as ours, dedication is no substitute for knowledge. Even with the most tender loving care, expert handling and sensitive understanding, the knowledge and skills available today in the fields of special education, psychiatry, psychology, neurology and biochemistry are neither adequate nor precise enough to help every child. Despite all our efforts and hopes, we realize that some of our children will have to spend interludes or entire lifetimes within a totally supportive sheltered environment.

Our field needs far more information on how handicapped children learn and why many of them fail. And yet we cannot afford to wait until we reach that heavenly state of absolute wisdom before we start working to help these children. While we are humbly aware of the serious gaps in professional knowledge, we know too that because of a shortage of funds and a surplus of indifference much of what has been learned over the past few decades is *not* being used to help most mentally and emotionally handicapped children.

This was brought into sharp focus in the recently completed study by the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children which was established four years ago on a mandate from the U.S. Congress. The Commission's Final Report, which is the work of the nation's outstanding authorities in the mental health field, has now been submitted to Congress, and it presents hundreds of pages of damning evidence on the shameful plight of our mentally ill and other handicapped children.

Here are a few direct quotes from the Final Report on how our children are being shortchanged by national neglect and indifference:

"We proclaim we are a nation devoted to its young. Yet we find ourselves dismayed by the violence, frustration and discontent among our youth and by the sheer numbers of emotionally, mentally, physically and socially handicapped youngsters in our midst. It is shocking to know that thousands of children are still excluded from our schools, that millions in need go untreated, and that many still suffer from hunger and malnutrition."

Summarizing the Joint Commission's study are two simple declarative sentences which reveal our nation's lack of concern for mentally, emotionally and physically handicapped children: "There is not a single community in this country which provides an acceptable standard of services for its mentally ill children . . . We have knowledge and the resources to remedy many of these conditions yet we lack a genuine commitment to do so."

People and nations show their genuine commitment not by what they *say*—but by what they *do*. We *say* that our children are America's most precious resource. Let's see how precious they really are. A few years ago the Johnson administration appropriated over 1 billion dollars to support the price of cotton and 1/20 that amount for children's mental health services. By our actions, which do we value more—our cotton or our children?

Recently, the Nixon administration vetoed a budget of 19 billion dollars for our nation's health, education and welfare services because it was excessive and inflationary—but approved a budget of 23 billion for a war in Vietnam with no questions asked. By our

actions which do we value more—warfare or welfare, killing or helping children?

The Joint Commission's Report on the critical shortage or non-existence of educational and other services for the mentally handicapped comes as no surprise to heart-sick parents and frustrated professionals seeking to place children desperately in need of immediate help who end up nowhere except on long waiting lists that grow longer each day.

The basic reason for this shortage is money. Since special educational programs cost more than regular educational programs there is a greater reluctance to spend funds for the handicapped. Where such funds are made available they are almost always used for the mildly handicapped who are likely to need less help and at a cheaper per capita cost than the more severe cases.

Over the years our League School policy of working with the most severely disturbed has been questioned by many who claim that ours is too costly a program for children with so poor a prognosis. We know of at least three educational facilities in New York City that had been working with severely disturbed children up to this year but who now have decided to change their admissions policy and take only the mildly disturbed whose improvement will be surer and cheaper.

So there it is: the children who need help most usually end up getting little or nothing because it costs too much and takes too long. I believe the time has come for America, which puts no ceilings on what it spends on a barbaric war in Asia and on journeys to dead planets, to reverse its priorities and stop putting price tags on the welfare of our children—normal or handicapped. The worth of our society and its people will be judged not by its wealth or weaponry but by its dedication to human needs.

All over our nation are desperate parents searching for a more decent destiny for their handicapped children. And all around them are neighbors and fellow citizens blind to the needs and deaf to the cries of these children. The cries of these children should be thundering in the ears and minds of all America. We must waken our people and our government to an essential, moral and democratic principle: that every child—no matter how disturbed or disabled—is entitled to achieve his full potential and to live with human dignity in the family of man.

MY 1970 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, each year in an effort to more closely determine the attitudes and opinions of my constituents I conduct a thorough poll by mail.

It is my privilege to represent northeast Philadelphia, the most rapidly growing section of the city of Philadelphia. The total population of the district is now approaching 500,000 with the post office household count now at 141,378.

All of us know the frustration of trying to get our constituents' views. The population explosion has made it virtually impossible to talk to but a fraction of our constituents. I have found that using a questionnaire gives every family I represent in the Congress an opportunity to express its views.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I enter my current poll in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN JOSHUA EILBERG WANTS YOUR OPINION

JUNE, 1970.

DEAR FRIEND: As your Congressman, I am called on to vote in your behalf on a growing number of increasingly complex questions affecting the future of the Nation and the lives of each one of us.

None of these questions lend themselves to easy answers and frequently I am called upon to vote with a simple "yes" or "no."

I believe that to do my job more effectively I must know how you are thinking on the issues. As many of you know, I return home every weekend to meet with our community groups and to talk with as many of our friends and neighbors as possible.

But the days are never long enough. While I speak with many people I realize that they represent only a fraction of our Northeast Philadelphia community, now approaching a half-million in population.

That is why it is important that you take a few minutes from your busy life to answer this questionnaire. The job of governing the United States belongs to all of us.

Please fold according to the instructions and return it to me as soon as you can. Your answers will be confidential. The results of this poll will be mailed to every household in Northeast Philadelphia.

Because the technical requirements of a poll like this sometimes restrict the range of possible answers, I welcome any additional comments you may have. Thank you for your consideration and attention.

Sincerely,

JOSHUA EILBERG.

1. a. Do you believe that inflation is under control?
 - b. If not where has inflation hurt you the most? (check one)
 - (1) Food
 - (2) Housing
 - (3) Education
 - (4) Transportation
 - (5) Clothing
 - (6) Medical Costs
 - (7) Taxes
 - c. Do you think increased unemployment is an acceptable way to curb inflation?
 2. Which tax do you resent the most? (check one)
 - (a) Federal income
 - (b) State sales
 - (c) Local real estate
 3. Do you think the present Social Security benefits are adequate?
 4. Non-essential government spending must be cut. If you were writing the Federal budget, which program would you cut first? (check one)
 - (a) Crime
 - (b) Defense
 - (c) Education
 - (d) Foreign Aid
 - (e) Highways
 - (f) Housing
 - (g) Pollution control
 - (h) Space
 - (i) Welfare
 5. Would you increase or cut Federal aid to:
 - (a) Elementary and secondary public schools?
 - (b) Private and parochial schools?
 - (c) Colleges and universities?
 6. a. Which of the following constitutes the most serious threat to your health and the health of your children? (check one)
 - (1) Air pollution
 - (2) Water pollution
 - (3) Noise pollution
 - b. Who do you think has the greatest responsibility for curbing pollution? (check one)

- (1) Government
- (2) Private industry
- (3) The private citizen
7. a. I do not support an increase in first class mail postage to eight cents. Do you?
- b. Rather, I believe junk mail rates should be substantially increased to pay their own way. Do you agree?
- c. I support strict prohibition of the mailing of unsolicited pornography. Do you agree?
8. a. Do you support a Vietnam-type commitment in Cambodia and Laos?
- b. Do you believe we should withdraw from Vietnam?
- c. If yes, do you think we are withdrawing fast enough?
9. Do you think the United States should sell Phantom jets to Israel?
10. a. Do you feel personally threatened by crime on the streets?
- b. Do you think the police should be able to enter your home and search it without first knocking on your door?
- c. Do you think persons outside the Internal Revenue Service should be allowed to see your income tax return?
11. a. Would you reduce first offender penalties for possession of marijuana?
- b. Would you increase the penalties for those who sell drugs to school children?
12. Do you think that 18, 19, and 20 year olds should be permitted to vote?
13. Do you think Associate Justice William O. Douglas should remain on the Supreme Court?
14. What do you think are the three most pressing problems facing America today? Please list in order of urgency.
15. What one problem in the Northeast is of most concern to you?

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER
McCORMACK

HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute JOHN McCORMACK for his long and distinguished service to his country and especially to this body.

Throughout his more than 40 years in the House, Speaker McCORMACK's thorough dedication to his work, his sense of fair play, and his kindness and understanding have set a worthy example for all who have served with him.

During his remarkable career, JOHN McCORMACK has consistently fought for legislation with direction, purpose, and effectiveness—legislation that has benefited every citizen of this country.

Under his leadership as Speaker of the House, some of our most pressing national problems were faced with landmark legislation the end result: The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Environmental Quality Act of 1969, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968—the list goes on.

To JOHN McCORMACK, the House of Representatives has been a full-time job. Few men who have ever served here have served with such total dedication. Yet despite his many obligations as Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK always found time to take a personal interest in each Member and to extend to each of us his wise counsel and courtesy.

It is the true measure of this man that he is admired and respected by every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle.

I know I speak for all House Members when I say that JOHN McCORMACK will be fondly remembered by all who have known and served with him.

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS MARKS
27TH ANNIVERSARY AS HOUSE
REPUBLICAN WHIP

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly great men in the Congress of the United States marks an important anniversary today. It was just 27 years ago that the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS became the Republican whip of the House of Representatives.

LES ARENDS long ago established a record for having served in the position of whip longer than any other Member in history. In fact, that record was previously held by his immediate predecessor, Congressman Harry Englebright of California, who served as Republican whip from 1933 until his death in 1943, altogether about 11 years. LES ARENDS has thus served as Republican whip 16 years longer than any other Member.

It is indeed fortunate for the country and for his party that LES ARENDS came to Congress as a relatively young man. He is now completing his 18th consecutive term as Representative from the 17th Congressional District, which adjoins on the north and east of the 22d District which I have represented for the past 12 years. LES ARENDS has seen a lot of history made during his 36 years in Congress. I believe that perhaps the single most important element in his success as a party leader has been his ability to bring people together. No whip in such a controversial body as the House of Representatives could be successful without the ability to get other people to join in advancing their party's cause. LES ARENDS possesses this ability in the highest degree. And to this quality can be attributed some of the most stirring Republican legislative victories during his long service as GOP whip of the House.

Randall B. Ripley, in his book "Party Leaders in the House of Representatives," published by the Brookings Institution in 1967, tells us:

The name Whip was not formally applied to a Member in the House until the end of the 19th century.

Before then Members functioned as whips only in connection with important legislation on which there was a close division between the parties.

The first whip was a Republican, James Tawney, appointed by Speaker Reed in 1897. The following list of whips and their terms of service is taken from Mr. Ripley's book:

DEMOCRATS

Oscar Underwood, Alabama, 1900-01.
James Lloyd, Missouri, 1901-08.

Thomas Bell, Georgia, 1913-15(?).
William Oldfield, Arkansas, 1921-28.
John McDuffie, Alabama, 1929-33.
Arthur Greenwood, Indiana, 1933-35.
Patrick Boland, Pennsylvania, 1935-42.
Robert Ramspeck, Georgia, 1942-45.
John Sparkman, Alabama, 1946.
John McCormack, Massachusetts, 1947-49, 1953-55.
Percy Priest, Tennessee, 1949-53.
Carl Albert, Oklahoma, 1955-62.
Hale Boggs, Louisiana, 1962-.

REPUBLICANS

James Tawney, Minnesota, 1897-1905.
James Watson, Indiana, 1905-09.
John Dwight, New York, 1909-13.
Charles Burke, South Dakota, 1913-15.
Charles Hamilton, New York, 1915-19.
Harold Knutson, Minnesota, 1919-23.
Albert Vestal, Indiana, 1923-31.
Carl Bachmann, West Virginia, 1931-33.
Harry Englebright, California, 1933-43.
Leslie Arends, Illinois, 1943-.

GREECE AND OUR OWN
SELF-INTEREST

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 17604, the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1971 passed the House on May 20. Included among its provisions was an authorization for \$50 million for financing the U.S. share of the NATO infrastructure program.

The chairman of the committee (Mr. RIVERS), asked and was granted permission that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on this bill. Because of the particular authorization to which I have referred I wish to make a few remarks relating to the relationship that should exist between our country and Greece. The liberalism that is said to be a reflection of true democracy has obviously misled us somewhere along the way. The morning paper tells us that. And it is this kind of liberalism, the kind that burns down college buildings and views riots in the streets with complacency, that has given many people in the United States a wholly distorted view of Greece and its government today. Although I think that we do ourselves and the Greek people a disservice in adopting this attitude, I think it very much more important that in doing so we tend to forget our own national self-interest, the responsibilities that we share with the other members of all NATO, and thereby seriously limit the hard objectivity with which we should be viewing the Mediterranean area today.

Some perceptive realist once said that:

Self-interest is not only a legitimate but a fundamental cause for national policy, one which needs no cloak of hypocrisy.

Those wise words are being disregarded today. A person with any real understanding of what is best for this country cannot but wonder why we have a national policy toward Greece that is anything short of total cooperation. Its

location is of great strategic significance to the United States, particularly in the light of the massive Soviet incursion into the waters of the Mediterranean and the equally massive assistance that the Soviet Union is now granting to the Arab countries in furtherance of the explosive situation in the Middle East. The Soviet Union well knows where its self-interest lies.

We are constantly being reassured that international communism is no longer a monolithic conspiracy. We are told that the Soviet Union does not want war. We are begged to believe that the Soviets really want world peace. These are things that we are asked to believe. But are these views acceptable in the light of the Russian attitude in the Middle East? For that matter are they believable in the light of Hungary, Berlin, Czechoslovakia and Vietnam?

The national self-interest of the United States clearly dictates that we should accept our friends and allies where we find them. And when we take a hard pragmatic look at our country in relationship to today's world we find Greece among our staunchest and most important friends.

Just a few days ago in referring to the court-martial of members of the underground organization in Greece the Christian Science Monitor ended up its news story with these words:

Although the (Greek) government protagonists have emphasized severity and cold logic in the administration of justice, humanity also has crept in.

I cite this particular news story because it appeared in a newspaper that is hardly known for any radical persuasion either to the left or the right. The dateline of the story was Athens. It was not a story written in the newsroom of the Christian Science Monitor here in the United States. It represented an on-the-spot appraisal of the situation.

Is the present Greek Government lacking in some respects? I know of no government in the world today that can hold itself up as a model of absolute perfection. Congress could go out of session and the President could go on vacation if we achieved this kind of perfection in our own country. Difficult situations call for strong measures, and I do not think it is our obligation here in the United States to attempt to judge how Greece will run itself. That's up to the Greeks.

Our Ambassador to Greece, Mr. Henry J. Tasca, arrived there only this past January. It is my understanding that he was told to report back on the pros and cons of resuming arms shipments to the Greeks. I also understand that Mr. Tasca has submitted several reports on this subject and that they are now under study. My own view is that these arms shipments should be resumed. And while I have a number of reasons for holding this belief, I will suggest to those who disagree with the present Greek Government that they re-examine that so important matter: the self-interest of the United States.

Greek Premier George Papadopoulos

recently said that "The political and intellectual leadership should hoist the flag of legality against anarchy and impose the laws necessary to lead society to a safe harbor."

Now it may be true that Mr. Papadopoulos' definition and interpretation of some of those words just quoted might be somewhat different than you or I might have, but the words themselves taken at face value could well be applied to the needs of our own country today. We in this country have not reached a state of anarchy but we could hardly say in the light of today's events that our society is resting in "a safe harbor." When that is so, when we have achieved our perfection, then we can engage in telling the other countries of the world how they should run their business.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude on this note: the Soviet Union has not changed its spots, its aims are essentially today what they have been since the time of the Russian Revolution. Greece is our fellow member of NATO. The Middle East, if it gets out of hand, could supply the tinder for the beginning of another world war. Greece is an essential element to the maintenance of the United States' position in the Middle East. These are all facts, let's view them as facts, and as facts that deeply affect our own country and the world.

LAURENCE C. EKLUND RETIRES FROM MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, each of us who serve in public office understands and appreciates the importance of our official actions being reported accurately and fairly to those we represent. In a democratic system such as ours, of course, that function is performed by the news media—a function so vital to our process that it enjoys constitutional protection.

Yet, I am sure you would agree, Mr. Speaker, that any institution in our society—but especially the news press—is only as good as the men and women who work within it. In that connection, an able news reporter is always to be respected. His ability to report to his readers the important event of the day accurately, fairly, and within a context that makes them truly meaningful is a rare gift.

A man of such talent is Mr. Laurence C. Eklund.

Mr. Eklund, known to his many friends and colleagues as "Con," retired last week as Washington correspondent of the Milwaukee Journal. He will be sorely missed not only by his readers but by those about whom he wrote—sometimes critically but always fairly and accurately.

What I hope will be but the first chapter of his memoirs appeared in the Journal of May 17. A story recounting

Mr. Eklund's distinguished journalistic career of 44 years was published in the Journal of May 24. It is my privilege to insert both these stories in the RECORD at this point and recommend them to the reading of my colleagues.

To Con Eklund and his lovely wife, Ethel, go my best wishes for a relaxing and enjoyable retirement.

The stories follow:

A WASHINGTON MEMOIR

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

President Nixon, whose phenomenal memory amazes reporters, reminded me not long ago that he and I had arrived in Washington about the same time.

The president's recollection was correct. He began serving in January, 1947, as a 34 year old congressman from California. I came here the following month to establish The Milwaukee Journal's Washington bureau.

As it happened, I saw a lot of Nixon and another future president, the 29 year old congressman from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, while covering my first big story for The Journal's fledgling, one man bureau.

They were members of the House Committee on Education and Labor. It was holding hearings on the Taft-Hartley bill which, passed over President Truman's veto, amended labor relations laws in favor of management. Nixon was the lowest ranking Republican on the committee and Kennedy ranked next to the bottom on the Democratic side. The hearings involved testimony of many Milwaukeeans.

One of those witnesses, Harold R. Christoffel, former president of United Auto Workers Local 248 at Allis-Chalmers, went to jail for perjury after he testified before the committee that he was not a Communist. Both Nixon and Kennedy played a role in the long drawn out legal battle that was taken twice to the United States Supreme Court.

Nixon's testimony that he was present when the alleged perjury was committed was important in producing a conviction at Christoffel's second trial.

Kennedy made the motion to cite Christoffel for perjury. And he journeyed to Milwaukee as a member of a three man subcommittee that helped compile the case against the former union leader.

Another newcomer to Washington early in 1947 was Joseph R. McCarthy, who had toppled the 41 year old La Follette senatorial dynasty by beating Sen. Robert M. La Follette Jr. in the Republican primary. He then went on to defeat Democrat Howard J. McMurray in the general election.

McCarthy had a way, even then, of attracting colorful acquaintances.

When Paul Ringler, now an associate editor of The Journal, and I went to lunch at the Carroll Arms Hotel the first day I arrived in Washington, we found McCarthy eating with Prince Otto, pretender to the throne of Austria. The archduke, a pleasant young man of 34, was seeking the new senator's support on a project.

Before coming to Washington, I had interviewed McCarthy at length as he relaxed at the King's Gateway Hotel at Land o' Lakes after his victory in the Senate race.

It wasn't until years after that northern Wisconsin interview that McCarthy, buoyed by material from a friend on a Chicago newspaper, hit political paydirt with his speech at Wheeling, W. Va., against alleged Communists in government.

On Feb. 6, 1954, by which time there had been ample evidence that McCarthy was not a standard bearer for the liberal Republicans. The New Yorker magazine tossed back at me a portion of that northern interview, under this chiding headline:

"THE CLOUDED CRYSTAL BALL," (From a story by Laurence C. Eklund in the Milwaukee Journal, Nov. 10, 1946).

"In talking with McCarthy one gets the impression that he will make a record as a liberal Republican, and that he will be closer to Republicans of the type of former Gov. Harold E. Stassen of Minnesota and Senators Wayne Morse of Oregon and Joseph Ball of Minnesota than he will be to Sen. Robert Taft of Ohio, the apparent conservative choice for president in 1948. Evidently, he will not be satisfied with a Republican program that calls for "free enterprise."

That's what I wrote, all right.

But McCarthy chose to ignore my predictions and gleefully pursued the nonexistent Communists in the State Department—with the active support and connivance of Taft, although it apparently was not love at first sight.

In 1946, when McCarthy was seeking Republican support for his primary battle against La Follette, I obtained a letter from Taft to Lester J. Bradshaw, then of Milwaukee, in which Taft revealed a close political kinship with La Follette.

Publication of the letter in The Journal caused a sensation. Taft got it back from Bradshaw and denied having written it, but fortunately I had taken the precaution of having it photostated. The Journal also published the photostat.

And in Washington, when McCarthy and his administrative assistant, Victor Johnston, walked into Taft's office to meet the Ohio senator for the first time, Taft jumped up, pumped Johnston's hand, and exclaimed: "Glad to meet you, senator." The white maned Johnston looked more like a senator than his boss did.

Personally, I would rather remember McCarthy for his kind way with children and his home cooked chicken dinner (his secret was to use a lot of butter) than for his repeated attacks on The Journal as the "Daily Worker of Wisconsin." He never could understand that such attacks also were attacks on me as one of several hundred employers of a rather successful capitalistic enterprise. That is a point that other politicians, some long forgotten, have been equally unable to grasp.

It was over McCarthy that President Truman began his long feud with Dwight D. Eisenhower that didn't end until Nov. 25, 1963, at the funeral of President Kennedy.

The peppery Missourian excoriated Eisenhower for yielding to pressure to delete from a 1952 Milwaukee campaign speech praise of Gen. George C. Marshall, who McCarthy had attacked as a captive of a conspiracy to abet Soviet designs.

Sen. Wiley's usual greeting to me during his years as senator often included the complaint, boomed out at a cocktail party or across a crowded restaurant, that he wasn't getting enough ink in The Journal. I usually retorted mildly that his activities weren't exactly ignored by the newspaper and that, in fact, he was written up rather frequently. It got to be kind of a joke.

The fact is that Wiley, for all his back-slapping ebullience, was a good and gusty senator, as well as a great story teller with whom a luncheon in the Senate restaurant was a most jolly affair.

In his switch from isolationism to internationalism in the midst of World War II, and in his opposition to the Bricker amendment limiting the treaty making power of the president, he showed courage in the face of bitter opposition from the right wing of his own party.

And his long, successful fight for the St. Lawrence Seaway was a crowning achievement.

Wiley, 78, lost his cool during his dis-

astrous 1962 re-election campaign against Democrat Gaylord Nelson when he told me that Nelson was "stupid" and a "nit-wit" and only "half a Viking" who couldn't speak Norwegian while he (Wiley) was a full Viking who spoke Norwegian fluently.

What a pity he didn't retire voluntarily at the age of 78.

Besides recording national politics, the conscientious Washington reporter tries to stay in contact with visitors from his home state. He gets invited to a variety of semi-social events sponsored by home organizations; for instance, a chamber of commerce, a bankers' association or a rural electric cooperative.

These events occasionally produce news stories. But since 1949, the annual congressional dinner of the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce has been mainly social and predictably nonnewsworthy. That was the year that the guests turned on their hosts, and I reported it.

Democratic Rep. Andrew J. Blemiller of Milwaukee tangled with a sizable delegation of Wisconsin doctors who had flown to Washington to lobby against the Truman administration's compulsory health insurance bill, of which Blemiller was a sponsor.

And Rep. Frank B. Keefe of Oshkosh, a big man with an impressive voice, chided his hosts for demanding cuts in federal expenditures while seeking funds for such things as local airports.

"Every single chamber of commerce in the country wants that federal dough we're appropriating and you'll be the first ones to squawk and bombard us if we take it away," thundered Keefe.

"Hatchet Buried (In Skulls) at State Delegation Fete," proclaimed the headline over my front page story the next day. That did it. There hasn't been a good news story out of a state chamber dinner in the last 20 years.

Keeping in circulation in a town obsessed with propriety can be an amusing course in social studies.

Newspapermen generally have status in Washington, but socially they still rank below official people, including congressional secretaries. There even are social pecking orders among newsmen.

I brushed up against this in Navy protocol when I went with an official party to Norfolk, Va., to get the silver service off the battleship Wisconsin for display in the state capitol at Madison.

At a luncheon on board the battleship, the ranking guest was Rep. Glenn R. Davis, Waukesha Republican, who sat beside the captain. Next in order of precedence that had been worked out by the Navy several days in advance was Davis' secretary, Jack Cory, who more recently retired as editor of a chain of Milwaukee suburban weekly newspapers.

In the seating arrangement I ranked below Cory, but I was placed closer to the captain than was the reporter from Madison's Wisconsin State Journal, apparently because The Milwaukee Journal had a larger circulation.

And down at the end of the table, way beyond the salt, was the news photographer.

On three reporting trips to protocol conscious Scandinavia I fared a little better socially than I did around Washington.

In Sweden especially, presumably because I am of Swedish extraction, I occasionally got to sit next to the host or hostess and was called upon to make the "thank you" speech. And in the royal palace in Stockholm, the crown prince—now the 87 year old King Gustav VI Adolph—singled out me and three of my journalist colleagues, also of Swedish ancestry, for special, warm greetings. I have tried not to let all this go to my head.

The Scandinavian trips meant much more

to me than just another assignment, because they gave me an opportunity to learn about my family background.

Searching the records at Sunne, the Swedish community in provincial Varmland where my father was born, I was startled to learn that he began life as Jan Jansson, not John Eklund. My father, who emigrated to Tomahawk, Wis., in 1888, never happened to mention to us that he had changed to a surname meaning "oak park."

My brother Oscar feared there had been a scandal in the family. But Pastor Victor Rydinge of the Sunne church explained that it was customary to change one's name as my father had done when he went to Stockholm to become a carpenter for the king.

Orville Freeman, former Secretary of Agriculture, told me that a grandfather, also a Swedish immigrant, changed his name from Johnson to Freeman, because there were too many Johnsons in the Minnesota lumber camp where he worked.

Freeman figures that his forebearer's name change cost him 50,000 votes when he ran for governor of Minnesota in 1954, because many voters in the heavily Scandinavian state probably didn't know he was a Swede.

Through the church records, the Swedish Tourist Traffic Association located two sets of relatives on my father's side I never knew I had. I met them in 1965 when the Swedish government selected me as the American journalist to announce plans for Sweden's homecoming year aimed at getting Swedish Americans to visit the homeland.

It was a sentimental journey indeed when I went to Rada near Sunne to be feted by my newly discovered cousin Kark David Eriksson and his daughter's family.

I gave a bright new Kennedy half dollar to Hans Backman my cousin's 6 year old grandson. It was worth the entire trip to see the excited boy a towheaded Swede if there ever was one study the coin for a long time and then hear him exclaim to himself in Swedish: "God what a fine coin!"

I like to think that my young kinsman still cherishes it.

EKLUND GOT TOUCH OF POLITICS EARLY

(By Robert W. Wells)

It was a summer of more than 50 years ago in Tomahawk, a northern Wisconsin community that had been a lumberjack town, with the sawdust piling up at the Bill Bradley mill and the "shanty boys" hurrying into town on Saturday nights to spend a week's pay in the 30 saloons.

But now the times were changing and culture was not ignored. The Chautauqua movement which brought lectures on art, religion, and world affairs even to such northwoods communities was going strong. A Chautauqua meeting was scheduled at Bradley Park and the Eklund family had a picnic lunch packed and was heading toward this highlight of the Tomahawk social season.

A FLORID SOUTHERNER

Laurence C. Eklund who is retiring as head of The Milwaukee Journal's Washington Bureau, has traveled widely and known famous men since that day in his early boyhood. But he remembers walking across the pine needles in the park named for his father's boss to listen to his first live politician.

"He was a florid southerner," Con Eklund said. "I don't remember his name but I recall how he broke down and cried over how much money the United States had spent to build the Panama Canal. I think my interest in politics stemmed from that speech."

Eklund was born in Tomahawk, a fact which he had taken for granted until recently when he had to prove it to the satisfaction of the social security bureaucracy.

Record keeping was more informal in Lincoln County then than now and Eklund dis-

covered some years ago, when he wanted to apply for a passport, that there was no record of his birth at the courthouse in Merrill.

Eklund had his older brother, Oscar, go with him to the State Department and testify that Con was a native Tomahawker, which satisfied the passport people. But Oscar is now dead and the social security office wanted written proof that a Swedish carpenter named John Eklund and his wife had increased Tomahawk's population by one on May 16, 1905.

THE 1905 FILES CHECKED

Eklund called Graham Foster Jr., editor of the Tomahawk Leader, who checked the newspaper's 1905 files and found an item mentioning the birth. But it failed to give the baby's name.

The Eklunds had been members of what was then called the Norwegian Lutheran Church—"there weren't enough Swedes for us to have our own," Eklund explained, apologetically—so Foster got in touch with the Rev. Bruce Hanstedt of what is now called Grace Lutheran Church.

The 1905 church records were written in Norwegian, but the pastor got one of Con's old friends, Mrs. Delia Newborg, to translate. Not only Eklund's May 16 birth but the fact that he was duly baptized on Aug. 8, 1905, was recorded. The minister dispatched a document which satisfied Washington that there really was a Con Eklund and that he'd been born in Tomahawk.

Eklund's father arrived in that community in 1889 and built its first skyscraper—a frame building which rose to a full two stories, a Tomahawk record for the time. As a boy, Con tried his hand at carpentry but soon gave it up.

WENT TO UW

"I was a wood butcher," he said. "So I went to the University of Wisconsin and majored in journalism instead."

In his senior year, Eklund was associate editor of the Daily Cardinal, which meant semester had hardly begun before he was being denounced by the Janesville Gazette as a "harebrained adolescent" and being scolded by The Milwaukee Journal for daring to say editorially that "Prohibition has been an incentive to student drinking."

The Capital Times, however, defended Eklund's editorial and the following June offered him a job. In August, he wrote the editorials. The Journal hired him away from the Madison paper, raising its initial offer of \$25 a week to a princely \$30 when Eklund pointed out that this was what he was already making.

JOINED JOURNAL IN 1927

Eklund joined The Journal on Aug. 27, 1927, so his retirement ends an association of nearly 43 years with the paper.

He helped cover the 1928 campaign in which Herbert Hoover beat Alfred E. Smith, but like most young reporters he worked on a variety of other assignments, including the Courthouse, City Hall, the Federal Building and an occasional police story, such as a fruitless FBI chase through the north woods for gangster John Dillinger.

While Eklund was a university student, Philip La Follette, then a young district attorney, had noticed one of his editorials and invited him to a series of Sunday night suppers. When Eklund was assigned to report the activities of the Legislature in 1935, La Follette was governor.

"He was one of the most colorful guys I've covered," Eklund said. "There are some others on that list—Gov. Julius Heil, Walter Goodland, Alexander Wiley and, of course, Joe McCarthy. I got to Washington shortly after McCarthy went there as senator."

Eklund continued to specialize in politics in Wisconsin until 1947, when he became The

Journal's first full time Washington correspondent. Two future presidents arrived as congressmen that year—John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon. The latter headed a list of dignitaries and old friends who sent telegrams wishing Eklund well after his retirement was announced.

Eklund manned the bureau alone until 1963, when a second man was added. He continued to specialize in reporting political news, helping cover national political conventions in nine presidential election years.

In 1949, 1959 and 1965, Eklund went on reporting trips to Scandinavia. During the last such visit, the Swedish Tourist office found relatives he never knew he had in the province of Varmland where his father was born.

In 1960, he went to Antarctica. His younger brother, Carl, was a widely known polar explorer for whom the Eklund Islands in the Antarctic were named.

JOINED GRIDIRON CLUB

Four years ago, Eklund was elected to Washington's Gridiron Club, a newspapermen's organization limited to 50 active resident members.

Last month, the Wisconsin State Society of Washington, composed of former Wisconsin residents, presented Eklund with a certificate of merit for distinguished service.

Eklund has been married for 39 years to the former Ethel Chipman, the daughter of a rural Columbia County state legislator whom he met while she was working with a private welfare organization in Milwaukee. They have a son, John, who is with the Post Office Department in Washington.

Eklund's last day on the job will be Tuesday. He will continue to live in a Washington suburb, Bethesda, Md.

PARTY TO BE GIVEN

A cocktail party for about 200 persons, including his fellow members of the Gridiron Club, other Washington news colleagues and federal officials, will be given in Eklund's honor by The Journal Monday evening at a Washington hotel. The newspaper will be represented by Irwin Maier, chairman of the board of The Journal Company, and Arville Schaleben, associate editor.

John W. Kole, a member of The Journal's Washington Bureau who will succeed Eklund, and Frank Aukofer, who is moving from the paper's Milwaukee staff to the bureau, will be introduced.

In his new status as a man of leisure, Eklund plans to do some traveling, including a trip to Tomahawk, which he hasn't visited in 30 years. While there, he's going to stroll under the virgin pines in Bradley Park, remembering what it was like to be a small boy listening to a politician from the outside world who could shed tears over the cost of the Panama Canal.

GODDARD PARK

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Rotary Club of Auburn, Mass., has built a strikingly beautiful park as a memorial to Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard—the visionary scientist whose pioneering work in rocketry made the space age possible. As a young physics instructor at Clark University in Worcester, Mass., Goddard carried out his early rocket experiments on Auburn's countryside. It was there

that on March 16, 1926, he launched the world's first liquid fuel rocket.

Bordering a lake and a waterfall, the park spread over two acres of lawns and flowerbeds in the center of Auburn. A simple granite monument—bearing a plaque honoring Dr. Goddard—commemorates the rocket experiments that eventually led to this country's manned landing on the moon. A replica of Dr. Goddard's first liquid fuel rocket is exhibited in the park. The most spectacular exhibit, however, is a giant Polaris rocket donated by the U.S. Navy. At its base is a fountain, illuminated at night so that its spurting water simulates a blastoff.

The Auburn Rotary Club, now 25 years old, built the park as its silver anniversary project. Club members labored a year clearing land, seeding lawns, laying flower beds, building concrete walkways and the exhibits. Contributions from members and other Auburn residents financed the park.

The club and its president, Len White, deserves commendation for this remarkable tribute to the father of the space age.

On May 25—the day Memorial Day is marked in Massachusetts—the park was dedicated. Dr. Goddard's widow and Edwin Aldrin, Sr., father of the second astronaut to step foot on the moon, took part in the ceremonies. I was honored to give the principal address.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD my talk, a Rotary Club bulletin outlining plans for the park, and the program for the dedication ceremonies:

GODDARD PARK

Reverend Clergy, Mrs. Robert Goddard, Commander MacElvaine, members of the Auburn Board of Selectmen, President of the Auburn Rotary, Mr. White, ladies and gentlemen, I have a feeling as we take part in these ceremonies here today that we are helping the world and especially the United States to repay a debt.

Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the great genius in whose memory we are dedicating this monument, was virtually unrecognized at the time of his death.

He was one of the most inspired visionaries of all time. As the father of modern rocketry, he, more than anyone else, made the space program possible. We owe him much.

Memorial Day is an apt time for the dedication of this park. Like the soldiers who sacrificed their lives on battlefields, Dr. Goddard did not seek public honors or personal rewards.

He dedicated his life to scientific inquiry. It is just this kind of selfless dedication that we honor on Memorial Day. For soldiers it led to victory in two world wars. For Dr. Goddard, it led to the most staggering achievement in the history of civilization—a manned landing on the moon.

I think of how frustrating, how unfair life must have seemed to this physics professor who as early as 1909 became fascinated with rocketry.

That was a year before he was graduated from Clark University, where he later taught physics.

As a boy, Robert Goddard dreamed of shooting an arrow into space. He even tried it, and from the experience realized that some method must be developed to give the arrow added push after it reached the maximum altitude to which a bow could send it.

This was the crude beginning of modern rocketry.

Goddard continued his experiments. By 1916, he had demonstrated the soundness of his theories and revealed by actual tests that rockets had more thrust in vacuum than in air.

When he prepared a report about a rocket that would go to the moon, the result was widespread ridicule.

He was called a crackpot and a faker, terms that hurt. But nothing daunted him. Thank God he was not a quitter!

Goddard was so convinced that his theory was right that he finally managed to bring the Smithsonian Institution to his support, the first he had received from anywhere.

On a \$5,000 grant, he was able to go to work on the world's first liquid-fuel rocket—and here on March 16, 1926, he gave it its first test.

The importance of this moment in bringing on the space age was unrecognized at the time. The flight lasted less than three seconds, covered only 184 feet, and reached a speed of 60 miles an hour.

Here, again in 1929, Dr. Goddard launched the first rocket to carry a payload—a barometer, thermometer, and camera.

But the noise caused such alarm that he was barred from making any more rocket tests in his home State.

However, the moment was not without its reward, for the resulting furore caught the attention of Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh.

This distinguished aviator came to talk with Dr. Goddard and, as a result, managed to obtain for him a \$50,000 grant from the Guggenheim Fund. This was the money that enabled Goddard to set up a workshop near the White Sands Proving Ground in New Mexico and to produce much larger rockets.

But he still had not met with complete success, when World War II came, he was unable to get the war department to take interest in what he was doing in behalf of national security.

Meanwhile, somewhat ironically, on the other side of the Atlantic, the Germans were adopting his methods and applying them in the production of V-2's.

Goddard's death in 1945 came many years before the world realized what a genius he was.

Working virtually alone, he made it possible for us to produce the great spaceships that have taken our astronauts to the moon.

If he had had the facilities and financial support he needed and deserved, it is difficult to estimate how far he might have gone before his end came.

Despite our lack of understanding and lack of support, he brought us into the most exciting age of all time. You can catch this excitement and realize its significance when you look up to the moon and ponder that this nation succeeded in sending men there to explore its surface—Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin Jr., Alan Bean, and Charles Conrad, Jr. What an incredibly fantastic, magnificent achievement! It clearly demonstrates the staggering technological achievements in the nation's space effort—the expertise and knowledge and courage of our astronauts. And think of it! Dr. Goddard was a pioneer in the effort that culminated in the nation's success in space.

We can never add to his memory too much honor and to much tribute. I can sense, too, the great pride that Mrs. Robert Goddard, who is with us today—a distinguished person in her own right—takes on this occasion as we honor her illustrious husband.

I come to commend the Charles P. Tuttle Post #279, American Legion, and the Auburn Rotary for sponsoring this Memorial Day exercise and the dedication of Goddard Park.

We dedicate this beautiful, unique park to Dr. Goddard's memory—in his name and

for the continued peaceful exploration of space. This place and all that it represents will be an inspiration to the young to continue to reach for the stars as they recall the life and works of Dr. Goddard.

For what is being done here today and its meaning for the future, I express the gratitude of the United States of America.

In recent testimony before Congress, I recall, Dr. Thomas O. Paine, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, said:

"This Nation cannot afford not to have Robert H. Goddards in the future."
He is right.

AUBURN SHOOTS FOR THE MOON

On March 16, 1926, the world's first liquid propellant rocket engine was flown at Auburn, Massachusetts by Dr. Robert H. Goddard.

The Rotary Club of Auburn is justly proud of this modern heritage and the event is recorded in the design of the Club banner. Many senior members remember Dr. Goddard, and one Club Past-President, his nephew, still owns the land where Dr. Goddard made the flight, which ended on the moon in 1969.

This year, the Rotary Club of Auburn is twenty-five years old. For the Silver Anniversary, President Len White elected to have the members construct a park to honor the memory of Dr. Goddard. Two acres of wasteland near the historic site and the center of Town, were granted to the Club by the Auburn Selectmen.

The site is on the shore of Mirror Lake, and is visible from the Massachusetts Turnpike and Interstate Highway 290. Plans were drawn in May and approved by Mrs. Goddard and the Town officials.

The plan for the park includes a large fountain, the center of which will feature a modern Polaris rocket donated by the United States Navy. The fountain, which sprays water downward from the base of the rocket, will be illuminated at night. Red underwater lights will give the illusion of the rocket starting flight and the upper portion will be bathed in white light.

A system of concrete walkways will connect the fountain site and parking areas with a full-size model of the original Goddard rocket on the lawn of the Town Library across a small brook which borders the park.

A system of underground lawn sprinklers and area lighting of the walkways is included, as well. Adjacent to the fountain, there will be a large granite monument bearing bronze dedication plaques to Dr. Goddard and sponsors of the project.

Work was begun at the time of President Len's installation in June. About 8000 cubic yards of earth embankment was donated by a company developing a local shopping center. The Club membership was broken down into Committees and work assignments were scheduled for successive weekends. Auburn is a young Club and the groups responded enthusiastically in reporting for work and obtaining free materials from building suppliers. A finance committee solicited contributions of one hundred dollars each from private patrons and industrial or commercial sponsors. The money contributed is to pay for materials and services unobtainable as gifts. The members, young and old, have participated in all phases of the work, pouring the concrete for the rocket base, fountain and walkways; installing electric wiring and sprinkler piping; and grading, seeding and planting lawns and shrubs.

The Club's Rotary Anns participated by serving morning coffee at the project site and returning with a charcoal grille to offer a welcome lunch. Not to be outdone by the men, the Rotary Anns will also install some 2000 tulip bulbs in the planting area at the

fountain, and construct flower beds in other sections of the park.

Dedication will take place on Memorial Day, 1970. Mrs. Robert H. Goddard, wife of the late Doctor Goddard, will participate in the dedication ceremonies together with Town, State and Federal representatives, and the Club officers.

The park will preserve the memory of a great American scientist and his historic achievement. It will also serve a useful recreational function for the people of Auburn. For Auburn Rotarians, it will stand always as real testimony of the Rotary ideal of Service above Self.

EXERCISES AT GODDARD PARK

Master of Ceremonies: Roger P. Magnuson, Past Commander, Chester P. Tuttle Post.

1. America the Beautiful: Auburn High Band.
2. Invocation: Rev. Bergstrom, Chaplain, VA Hospital Jamaica Plains.
3. Pledge of Allegiance: Boy Scouts & Girl Scouts.
4. Welcome: Mr. Robert Hunter, Chairman, Auburn Board of Selectmen.
5. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address: David Young.
6. Flanders Field: Joan Turnblom.

GODDARD PARK DEDICATION BY ROTARY CLUB OF AUBURN

(Mr. Leonard White, President)

7. Speakers: Congressman Boland, Mr. Edwin Aldrin.
8. Selection: Althea Grotto Band.
9. Presentation Rotary Anns: Mrs. Ralph Proctor.
10. Honored Guest: Mrs. Robert Goddard.
11. Benediction: Father O'Rourke, North American Martyrs Church.
12. National Anthem—Auburn High School Band.

ROTARY COMMITTEE

Mr. Leonard White, Mr. John Beadreau, Mr. Harold Proctor.

THE POWERFUL INFLUENCE OF JOURNALISM

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, two excellent articles dealing with various aspects of communications, published in the spring 1970 issue of the Columbia Journalism Review, clearly illustrate the powerful influence of journalism and recommend steps to assure thoughtful, responsible coverage of national and international news. The one article covering the scope and role of television journalism by Sir William Haley, formerly editor of the Times of London and director general of the BBC; and the second, covering mass media and violence from the Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, deserve wider circulation based on their enlightening and informative qualities. They follow:

WHERE TV NEWS FAILS

(By Sir William Haley)

(Television newsmen have become technology's captives. To escape they must go beyond showing "happenings" and reintroduce "rifling, reporting, and evaluating.")

In 1944, when victory in World War II was clearly in sight, the British Broadcasting Corporation arranged a Commonwealth Broadcasting Conference in London to discuss postwar service. When the war had begun in 1939 the BBC, which had started the first television service in the world, had had to shut the service down. As most of those at the conference had never seen TV, we opened the transmitter for one afternoon and showed them transmissions on closed circuit. A discussion followed about how TV was likely to develop. I said that I thought its main long-term service would be in news. As communications developed—we could not foresee satellites but we were sure that some sort of relays would eventually span the globe—every country would have visual access to every other country's happenings. The TV screen, wherever it might be, would be a window on the world. (It was, I think, the first time that metaphor was used for the TV screen.) And I forecast that for the completely natural use of this service flat TV receivers would have to be designed so that, like windows, they could be fitted flush into the walls of every home (and, while this is not yet a practical possibility, it will come).

There are three points to this story. The first is the youth—one might say infancy—of TV even in 1970; less than twenty-six years ago well over 99.99 percent of all those now viewing throughout the world had never seen TV. The second point is the incredible scientific and technical strides the new invention has made in that short time; as I write this the BBC is on the eve of receiving in England its first color program direct from Australia. The third—and by far the most important—point is that although the closed circuit showing resulted in some discussion of this conception of international news by television, there was none at all of the problems it would create. The point can be made even stronger. Although many of those present at the conference had been responsible for handling radio news for up to twenty years, no one foresaw that the televising of news would bring problems exclusively its own.

One can make excuses. We were still at war. The 1936-39 TV programs were a novelty and not an integrated service. Before the war the BBC's news had not acquired the importance, authority, philosophy, and stature that came during it. In 1944 we had neither the time nor the men to engage in deep thinking about the principles of televising news. Even if we had thought about them the problems could not have been foreseen. They could emerge only in practice. And what emerged in the early days was not final. Not only did the resources of TV change and evolve; the news itself changed and evolved. Neither the BBC nor the American networks nor other countries' television organizations faced as recently as 1960 the deep and confusing issues that they are having to wrestle with in 1970.

One of the problems my immediate colleagues and I did recognize as soon as we restarted TV in 1946 was that it was not possible to put the BBC's famous *Nine O'clock News* before the cameras and just leave it at that. It is perhaps necessary to explain that the 9 p.m. news, the BBC's main news program throughout the war, became a national and, to some extent, an international institution. Inside the United Kingdom it achieved such authority that, no matter what the British newspapers might report, people did not accept it until they had heard it on the 9 o'clock news. The BBC's news bulletins were also the main lifeline to occupied Europe and a major factor in the Resistance.

This authority of the BBC's news did not depend solely on its accuracy. Just as im-

portant to the millions who listened was its sense of news values. The length and placing of each item were objectively and professionally considered. Even the serious British newspapers would compare their main news page stories with the selection in the 9 o'clock news. They would go their own way, but they wished to study their judgment alongside that of the BBC.

It was quickly found that preserving this judgment in TV news was a seemingly impossible task. Visual news values are in almost inverse ratio to real news values. What is most exciting to see is generally the least important to know about. To start a TV news program with an item of the seriousness and length it would be given in radio news would in all likelihood result in losing the viewer's attention. He would do something else until the news was over.

The BBC was not prepared to have two standards of news values for its programs—one for radio and the other for TV. So in the first years after the war the BBC had no televised news. It merely read the 9 o'clock radio news in the TV program without any attempt to add visual material. Later, TV news programs were started. Much professional skill has been brought to bear on the problem of visual values and real news values, and some progress has been made, but the problem is still far from solved.

I think it has been solved even less in the United States. Sixteen months of American viewing left me with the conviction that the truth has not yet been realized that even supposedly exciting events by their recurring similarity lose all interest. By and large, fires, floods, and sinking ships, railway and car smashups, even earthquakes have little originality. They all look the same on the TV screen. The same is now true of demonstrations. There is little significant visual difference between them, whether they be in the United States, in Britain, in France, Italy, Germany, or Japan. Yet they go on being shown because they represent action. They assume a bogus interest. In fact they bore the viewer. Worst of all, they waste scarce and valuable time that could have been given to items that really matter.

It is sometimes argued that this time-wasting is not serious because American TV stations give so much more time to news than the British and stations of other nations do. This is a fallacy. Once stories are not tautly edited and lose proportion and significance, the whole idea of news loses significance for the viewer. And the loss of significance is not made up by deep treatment of important and serious news items in documentaries. What documentaries I saw during my stay in the United States convinced me that the BBC is far ahead of the networks in this field. American TV documentaries have not the skill at getting at essentials, and the deep probing into them, that British documentaries have. All too often the longer they go on the more superficial they become. This is possibly one reason for the present reluctance of American TV stations and sponsors to sink money and time into news documentaries. Whatever the reason, the lack of enthusiasm for news documentaries struck me as one of the most serious developments in the tidal wave of TV that has swamped the American public's time and attention. It can have grave consequences for American democracy—unless the news stories are restructured or a corrective is provided in some other way.

These are elementary facts. It has been necessary to start with them because they are fundamental. They are as much at issue today as they were when TV was restarted twenty-four years ago. In some ways they are more so. The journalist has not been able to withstand the engineer. More and more technical resources and devices have been offered him. They have mastered him, and

not he them. The outcome is even more crucial now that satellite communication is becoming common. Because the satellite relay does stand to open up the whole of the free world, because its cost is high, and because no conceivable distance—not even that from the moon to the earth—is any longer a bar to immediacy, both significance and journalistic judgment are in danger of suffering greater blows than ever before.

For some time now the immense engineering resources available to TV reporters and correspondents have highlighted the ordinariness and inanity of much of what those resources are employed to transmit. The old metaphor of using a sledgehammer to crack a nut can all too often be modernized into "using a satellite to relay a television correspondent." It is not the correspondent's fault. He is as much a victim as the viewer. The urge to show things as they have happened or, better still, while they are happening leaves no time for the old journalistic skills. Air travel and the international telephone similarly in some way hamper the newspaper correspondent. Men are flown half across the world to a trouble spot they have never seen before and are expected to send back measured dispatches within twenty-four hours of their arrival. Even then the newspaperman has some little time to think and write. The TV camera team must move in at once. It gets wherever it can as quickly as it can, the correspondent being left with the job of conveying the idea that what the viewer is seeing is the whole—or at least representative of the whole—of whatever is being covered. It can be neither.

The occasional roundups are even worse. They purport to be a summing-up, a considered general judgment. Hardly a situation in the world today can be thus treated properly with the resources and the time the TV correspondent has at his disposal. The camera is always pressing upon him. So is the editor at home, anxious to use the satellite—not only to televise him but other correspondents as well. The more commonplace the use of the satellite becomes, the more will station prestige (and eventually correspondent prestige) demand that everyone shall use it. The cost being so high, each use will be only a fraction of what it ought to be—if it is to be used at all. Thus there will flash on the home screens of Britons, Americans, Frenchmen, Italians, Germans, and others a succession of *obiter dicta* from men who are forced to do an inadequate job and who look as if they knew they were doing it.

For in yet another way the pressures on the TV journalist are greater than those on his newspaper brother. Not only is he expected to do twice as much twice as fast in a tenth of the space; he has the added load of having to be seen for much of the time he is doing it. This personalizes the news, making it more difficult than ever to form a true opinion of its objective value. It also debases the role of the journalist by making him, consciously or unconsciously, and at the very best to some infinitesimal degree, an actor.

That being so, it seems to me TV reporting from one country to another should not be left solely in the hands of the regular correspondent. The more important the events being covered, the more vital it is that journalists of the country where the news is originating should be used to complement the TV network's or station's own man. *And both men should be given time to do a thorough, responsible job.*

The existence of the TV international relay and of the satellite ought to make TV news editors and managers reconsider the whole scope and role of television journalism. (One of the major weaknesses of TV journalism in some countries is that both editors

and managers have a say in the matter.) The old patterns were never very good; these new inventions make them completely outworn. Instead of using the new aids for yet more variegated and more heterogeneous news stories, the journalists of this new television age should scrap present methods and use the new devices to increase the depth of treatment of the news that has significance and really matters. The faster communications become, and the more widely their net is thrown, the greater is the need to eschew any immediacy that has to be paid for by perfunctoriness. TV news should be more than a peep show. People may be titillated by the latest incident, whether it matters or not, being flashed to them in a split-second across thousands of miles. That is not journalism. It often is not news.

What is news? Some of us discussed this at one of the Columbia-duPont Broadcast Survey luncheons last year. Someone asked what had been the greatest TV newscast of the year. The Apollo's pictures of the first man landing on the moon were suggested. Stress was laid on the many hours the program had lasted and the world excitement at the event. I objected that it had not been news. It was a show—admittedly a most historic and spectacular show—but a show nonetheless. News is not a happening. It is what journalists make of it. It is the sifting, reporting, and evaluating of what has happened. In the case of the moon landings this was done subsequently. It was not done by the Apollo camera automatically sending to earth the pictures of the first men treading the lunar surface. This may seem to be a fine distinction. I believe it to be a fundamental one. And it is precisely because I do not believe that TV newsmen are making this distinction that I think TV news has so far missed its purpose.

This would not matter so much if newspaper readership in the United States and Britain was still on the increase. When TV started I forecast that its inability to deal with news adequately would give newspapers a second chance—in Britain at any rate. To some extent it has done so. But the opening of the whole world to news, the speed with which it is now communicated to newspapers, radio, and TV, the multiplicity of seemingly insoluble national and international dilemmas, have led to a flight from the news by those who, if a nation is to be healthy, should most be following it. Added to this is the increasing specialization in all kinds of activity. Here, too, results which used to take months, if not years, to circulate internationally now do so in days. It has all become too much of a load for many of those who have the world's work to do. A growing number of business and professional men and women now need only the publication that gives them the specialized information they need; for the news as a whole they depend on the nightly TV news broadcast.

This habit is, I think, more common in the United States than in Britain. In both countries the economic forces attacking newspapers are the same. Geography makes the consequences different. In the United Kingdom 54 million people live in an area slightly smaller than that of Wyoming. In spite of casualties it is therefore still possible to have eight national newspapers, with varying coverage of national and international news, able to get onto any British breakfast table. The vast continent that is the United States makes national newspapers well nigh impractical. Casualties among American newspapers have left the overwhelming majority of cities with only one newspaper. Often its coverage of national and international news is not such as to make it obligatory reading. In addition, the vastness of the United States precludes there being many single focal points of news interest.

Americans have nowhere near the same interest in the proceedings of Congress as the British have in daily reports of the meetings of the House of Commons. The uncertainty of the General Election date keeps British politics continuously alive to some degree. The various sections of the nation are conscious of their abiding or changing political loyalties, and have papers to cater to them. Among the serious newspapers there is the *Daily Telegraph* to meet the needs of the Right, the *Guardian* those of the Left, and the *Times* those of the center. The popular newspapers also have identifiable stances. And the fact that all these papers circulate through the whole of the kingdom gives the British press a place and a voice that has not yet suffered much from TV.

British newspapers also do a better job than TV in reporting on the arts, law, science, local government, and the whole range of subjects which traditionally make the best complete newspapers. On neither side of the Atlantic so far has TV news sought to give a regular service in these news areas. Here, too, geography may make it more difficult for American TV to deal adequately with this responsibility. But the need is there; it must be met.

While geography can modify the consequences of scientific, economic, industrial, and social progress, it cannot quarantine them absolutely. Their effect on different countries is mainly a matter of time and degree. The most widespread problem of journalism today—of TV journalism more than of newspaper journalism—is the problem of every avocation. It is the problem of men and women everywhere. Mankind is falling to cope with the vastly increased speed of its communications. Jet travel—soon it will be supersonic—leads statesmen in time of crisis to fly to see each other before they have had time to consider what they are going to say when they get there. The greater the emergency, the less time they take to assess it. Businessmen start negotiations at the end of long flights when they are in no condition to do so. (Some large business organizations now recognize this and impose a forty-eight-hour assimilating period on their executives.)

News arrives in such proliferation and at such a rate that before it can be digested and judged it is overtaken by the next day's flood. Correspondents and reporters are mentally breathless. Refuge is sought in generalization. Speculation takes the place of judgment. Today's big news may prove to be tomorrow's trivia.

It is perhaps too much to ask television journalists to be the pioneers in reversing a trend that is bedeviling all mankind. But as their influence grows so does their responsibility. And that responsibility is to make the gadgets—even the satellites—their servants and not their masters, and to remember what is the true function of a journalist.

REPORTING CONFLICT IN AN AGE OF CHANGE

Conflict is part of the crucible of change. It may yield progress or repression. But conflict is not a state of social equilibrium. Whether conflict is resolved by violence or cooperation will depend in part upon the actors' perceptions of the world about them. Providing an accurate perception of that world is the media's most important responsibility . . .

Collectively, and within their own organizations, the news media can accomplish much before . . . disorder starts. Indeed, how much they do may determine whether it starts at all or how much it grows . . .

The most controversial and difficult issue for radio and television centers on the delay of news. Where the news event is of a kind likely to symbolize past injustices to any sig-

nificant group in the community, there is a danger that such an event may trigger a large-scale disorder. Moreover, once a crowd has begun to gather at the scene of such an event, immediate broadcast of the event and its precise location is likely to draw additional persons to the area and add to crowd control problems of the police, thereby contributing to the likelihood of a violent outbreak and its severity if it does occur . . .

Once it is decided that the incident is potentially inflammatory or may attract a crowd to the scene, most of the newsmen with whom we have been discussed the problem suggest a delay of at least thirty minutes to confirm the story, make sure the facts are clear, and to avoid exaggeration. Under particular circumstances it may require a delay of an hour or longer. Media transmittal of unconfirmed reports, emotional or unbalanced accounts, and visual portrayals of violence without perspective can do at least as much damage as news delay.

Where communitywide guidelines are in effect, it is best to designate one journalist representative to determine the length of the embargo. Such centralization eliminates the competitive pressures that tend to undermine this policy. A complete embargo beyond one hour, and preferably beyond thirty minutes, probably cannot be justified . . .

In reporting both incidents that may grow to disorders and the disorders themselves, the media can make additional preparations within their own organizations. Some TV stations, for example, have already made the decision not to cover riots with live mobile television units. Rather than send conspicuous shoulder-braced sound cameras to a riot, they can plan to send the much smaller, hand-held silent camera, plus a man with a tape recorder to pick up random sound. Similarly, they can use black and white instead of color film, which requires more light; in this way, they can reduce the need for crowd-attracting lights and apparatus. They should plan in advance the deployment of manpower within the news organization, what the process for assimilation shall be and who shall exercise responsibility at each stage.

A neighborhood fight should not be called a riot. A disturbance should not be designated racial without confirmation. Accuracy should have priority over speed. The story, particularly its violent aspects, should be kept in perspective.

If, for example, the police radio carries a report of a National Guardsman being shot, it is tempting to put this on the air, because it has the surface authenticity of a police report. Many of these reports are based on rumors and are simply requests for confirmation by a police officer. The story is skimpy; no details substantiate it. During the tension of a riot, the police can act hastily and carelessly. Moreover, the day is past when everything the police say should be broadcast as "truth." The report must be confirmed . . .

News is the unusual, the extraordinary; it is something that doesn't happen every day. The media have no need to report each airliner that arrives safely; it is not a matter of general public interest. The objection, however, is not that the media focus upon the unusual; rather it is that they focus on the unusual aspects of the unusual. Recall, for example, the coverage of the meeting at Watts, devoted to discussing grievances and what could be done to calm a tense racial situation. The media focused on the extremist statements of one sixteen-year-old-boy. This was not a representative portrayal of a legitimate news event . . .

The media have properly rejected the suggestion that they report "good" news simply because it is good. It apparently has not occurred to very many newsmen, however,

that events should not go unreported simply because they involve a nonviolent resolution of conflict. One function of the media is to aid in coordinating society's response to change. They can fulfill this function in part by telling the public how conflicts are resolved nonviolently and by giving such resolutions the same prominence they give the violent manifestations of conflict. . . .

The press does provide a marketplace for ideas, but it is not of the sort commonly supposed. The increased level of violence in this country today is partially owing to the sluggish response of our institutions to social change; but the press shares in this sluggishness, and an important part of its inadequacy is the inability of new and different voices to gain routine and peaceful access to the centralized news media. . . . It should become habitual editorial policy to display fairly and clearly the opinions, analyses, and solutions offered by a wide variety of people, expert and nonexpert, covering the spectrum, regardless of the proprietor's personal position.

Too many news organizations fear social ideas and social action. As a result, they stimulate, dissatisfy, and arouse anxiety only to fall silent or limit themselves to irrelevant clichés when thoughtful solutions are required. Alternative solutions to our most urgent social problems, based on the work of our most imaginative social thinkers, and written with the clarity that only a good journalist can produce, ought to be standard. . . .

America can look forward to change—the only certainty. This will require not only information about events, violent and non-violent, but ideas about what to do about these events. . . .

Specifically we recommend:

A. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting be provided with a budget for news and public affairs programming comparable to that of the television networks. . . .

B. The Justice Department and the Federal Communications Commission should scrutinize carefully all mergers, license applications, and license transfers which would result in greater concentration of media ownership. . . .

C. Perhaps most important is that the government must stay abreast of new technological developments in the communications industry and be prepared to assure that further concentration of control does not occur. This is particularly important with respect to CATV. . . .

D. There is a good deal of confusion, particularly among practicing broadcast journalists, about what the fairness doctrine requires. . . . We recommend that the FCC clarify this ambiguity and resolve it along the lines indicated.

E. Each year the Federal Communications Commission must pass on approximately 2,500 broadcast license renewal applications. . . . If the Commission is to effectively discharge its mandate, it must develop at least broad guidelines for such determinations in order that its staff can bring to the Commission's attention those cases that raise serious questions. . . .

F. Journalist should reexamine the degree to which existing news judgments incorporate obsolete standards, including a tendency to report violence because it is sensational, rather than because it is significant. Moreover, in reporting conflict, the press should develop a special sensitivity to the danger of overstating the degree of conflict.

G. Beyond reexamining existing standards for reporting violence, newsmen should reconsider the contemporary utility of well established newsgathering practices. Perhaps most important is the interpretive news stories—which can be written with time for calm reflection and balanced judgment—be

allocated more resources and be given greater prominence. For newspapers, this means running such stories regularly on page 1. . . .

H. We strongly recommend: 1) that the media hire and train increased numbers of newsmen from minority groups; 2) that the media provide the kind of regular surveillance of minority group activities which it applies to other segments of the community; 3) that the media provide information to local groups about preparing press release and, more generally securing access to the media through traditional channels short of demonstration, confrontation, and violence; 4) the use of ghetto "stringers"; 5) inclusion of members of minority groups in day-to-day news, such as births, deaths, weddings, business, and social functions; 6) more background and in-depth stories on social issues and particularly those stories dealing with facets of the American scene with which the majority of the audience have little actual experience.

I. There is a need for greater interaction between the news media and the community and for responsible criticism of media performance. There are a number of ways in which this can be brought about:

1) News organizations should establish and publicize the existence of grievance machinery or internal appeal boards to hear the complaints of persons who feel that their viewpoint has been unfairly excluded from the press or that the press coverage of an event to which they were involved is inaccurate. Such a program has worked well at the Louisville *Courier-Journal*.

2) News organizations should encourage local press councils to provide a continuing exchange of views between the news media personnel and representative members of the community.

3) Journalism schools should ingrain in their students a tradition of continuous re-examination and self-criticism through, *inter alia*, the establishment of journalism reviews and programs designed to prepare the student to apply new findings in communications theory to the practical problems of communicating the news.

4) The establishment in other major metropolitan areas of publications like the *Chicago Journalism Review* which provide a forum for public debate on news media performance.

5) News organizations should freely criticize other news organizations and report on their performance the same as they would any other institution in our society. . . .

J. We endorse the mid-career training programs offered at some universities and urge that more media owners and operators, particularly television, make time and funds available to their newsmen to take advantage of these programs.

K. We recommend that every news medium establish a code or other form of guideline to be followed in the coverage of riots or other events involving group violence. . . .

L. We recommend that news organizations resist those critics who would have them deny coverage to protest. The news media can reduce substantially whatever incentive they provide for violence by providing balanced treatment of at least four aspects of demonstrations:

1) The purpose of the demonstration. What is the nature of the grievance? Why are the demonstrators there?

2) The events leading up to the demonstration. Have other remedies been sought; if so, what has been the response of those addressed?

3) The demonstration. How many people were present? How did they conduct themselves? Do not focus only on the most extreme conduct or dress.

4) The provocations, if any, and the official response. Why were the demonstrators

trying to provoke the police? Did the police use more force than necessary to maintain order? Were there any extenuating circumstances, such as physical exhaustion or personal security of political candidates?

The standard for determining whether an event will be covered should place more emphasis on the nature of the grievance, the number of people affected, the severity of the grievance and less emphasis on the willingness of the aggrieved to engage in violence or the likelihood that they will. . . .

URGES SALE OF JETS TO ISRAEL

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a letter I sent last Monday, June 1, to the President of the United States urging that the administration announce a new declaration on Middle East policy and recommending a seven-point action program including the immediate granting of Israel's request to purchase additional jet aircraft.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that a vast majority of the Members of Congress, the representatives of all the American people, support the valiant State of Israel in the serious threat to its security. It is vital to the interest of the United States as well as to the very existence of the State of Israel that this request for jets be fulfilled as a response to the Soviet escalation in the Middle East conflict and as a deterrent to a horrendous confrontation that could engulf the entire world.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The recent school bus tragedy in Israel near the Lebanon border is but one of the unjust cruelties being perpetrated by the Arab terrorist groups. Innocent bystanders are dying as the Russian and French governments support the vengeful Arab drive to liquidate Israel, to finish Hitler's dirty work. We must not let this happen.

We have heard repeatedly that the Administration stands behind Israel. And there is no question of the American people standing almost solidly behind Israel in its struggle for existence and freedom. Yet despite this great support there remains a residue of fear about how flexible is our policy.

So that our friends may be reassured and that our enemies not miscalculate, a new forthright declaration on Middle East policy is essential. But, Mr. President, it must do more than voice phrases. Actions must occur.

I propose that the United States government immediately take the following actions to meet the crisis:

1. Announce without further delay the provision of additional Phantom and Skyhawk jets and other weapons required by Israel.

2. To enable Israel to pit its meager finances against the combined economies of the Soviet Union, France, and the Arab world, the United States must assist Israel financially to cover the cost of the necessary arms.

3. Proclaim that the U.S. government will not tolerate the intervention of the Soviet armed forces against Israel, whether openly or covertly through so-called "volunteer" bomber pilots, naval personnel, and so forth.

4. End the illusion of Israeli capitulation

