

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BLACK BUSINESS CURES POLLUTION
PROBLEM

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, currently there are those who argue that the recent emphasis by Congress, by students, and by others on pollution and the environment is a "copout" on the entire issue of racial justice. Clearly if we allow the emphasis on pollution to replace our concern for racial equality, then this would amount to a desertion of one fundamental concern for another. However, I believe that both areas are important and both merit our attention. Recently in the Christian Science Monitor, Merelice Kundratis wrote of a merging of the two concerns into a black-owned and operated paper recycling plant. This business, while providing employment and income to black residents of Chicago, is also contributing to the national effort to stop pollution. The article is illustrative of one of the opportunities which exists whereby two important national interests not only become compatible, but complement one another. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

WASTE PAPER RECYCLED—BLACK-RUN BUSINESS JOINS CHICAGO POLLUTION FIGHT

By Merelice Kundratis

CHICAGO.—Old newspapers—instead of adding to waste woes—are helping to build economic power in one of Chicago's large black communities.

Cashing in on the popular pollution fight are certain businessmen, environment-concerned citizens, and black-community developers here. At the same time, they still seek to benefit the black community.

These Chicagoans contrast with many discouraged civil-rights workers throughout this nation who charge that fighting pollution is a "cop-out" which leaves ghetto problems unresolved while a new cause gets popular. The Chicagoans ask instead whether the many crusades which bombard the public can be combined rather than competing for attention.

Because of them, the cycle now reads: from trees, to pulp, to paper, to newsprint, and then to a black-owned and black-run business.

The business is the West Side Paper Stock Corporation. Backed up to the far end of the plant, a trailer truck dumps its cargo of old newspapers little by little.

Two young men rake the papers onto a large conveyor belt which carries the papers up to an automatic unit that fluffs and then compresses them for baling by another man.

"Each ton of newspapers recycled saves 17 trees," explains Edward Kress. Mr. Kress was the first manager of the paper stock corporation. Now he is out drumming up suburban support and finding good locations for the huge, steel paper-collection boxes which are picked up each week and replaced with empty ones.

Among the staunch suburban workers are Dallas Jones and his wife, Mary Lou.

"My husband was working through our church with the West Side and learned of the need for paper," Mrs. Jones explains.

"In the meantime, I have been concerned not only about the city but about the entire environmental problem."

When her community of Wilmette, Ill., began to talk about needing a garbage train to transport waste to burying spots, Mrs. Jones decided it was time to let people know that at least some of their waste was raw material for a business.

Now, boxes collecting about 100 tons of paper a month are placed at three permanent locations.

"The response is terrific," notes Mrs. Jones, adding that people respond for different reasons and run the gamut politically and socially.

ANTIPOLLUTION EFFORT AIDED

"We accept all kinds of newspapers—underground to the conservative Chicago Tribune," she quips.

Observes Mrs. Kress: "This also helps the community that is helping us because pollution is a problem." His promotion efforts soon will result in boxes being placed in at least five more Chicago suburbs. Each filled drop box saves 187 trees or 1,060 cubic feet of landfill, Mr. Kress emphasizes.

Quiet catalysts behind this emerging urban-suburban cooperation have included Container Corporation, the First National Bank of Chicago, and Robert C. Strom, president of Metropolitan Consulting Associates, Inc.

Mr. Strom, energetic and determined, brought business together with the West Side Community Development Corporation (WSCDC), a coalition representing the five main West Side power groups: Garfield Organization, Conservative Vice Lords, Egyptian Cobra Nation, Student Afro-American Group, and the West Side Organization.

PAPER SUPPLY NEEDED

He points out that the Pioneer Paper Stock Division of Container Corporation is always looking for new sources of old newspaper which is baled and ready to be whisked off to its de-inking plant, otherwise recycled, and used again.

Confirms Lloyd E. Williams of the Pioneer Division: "Our company is the nation's biggest recycler of waste papers—about 10 percent of all that is recycled and made into new products."

To tap Chicago as a source of newspapers, Container Corporation helped set up the West Side Paper Stock Corporation by: Guaranteeing a loan of \$250,000 from the First National Bank of Chicago to buy the plant and equipment.

Providing training and continuing technical help for black employees at the new plant largely through Leroy H. Murphy, who periodically spends several days on site.

Purchasing all the baled paper the black-run plant produces at agreed-upon prices.

THREE SHIFTS PLANNED

"Obviously we want them to succeed," Mr. Williams sums up.

The fledgling plant needs more paper before it breaks even, but those involved speak of running three shifts at the plant as more and more people join the antipollution brigade.

For WSCDC, the paper plant is just a first step. It is, in fact, described by some as only a "psychological boost to the community" not a "cure-all."

"The community has been frustrated by failing attempts," explains Frederick Douglas Andrews, director of the Garfield Organization. Mr. Andrews sees the paper plant as a "concrete symbol" that the black community can obtain "the accounting and management skill to receive money and be successful."

When the plant gets in the black, the profits will go to WSCDC to be plowed back into other community projects.

Among them, the five groups in WSCDC have launched such businesses as gasoline stations, a car wash, restaurants, ice cream franchises, and a supermarket. The paper plant is their first joint venture—bringing together former rival groups, including two youth organizations that at one time vented their energies on street-gang activities.

Next on the docket are plans to develop a chain of dry-cleaning franchises and to establish a key punch and computer center.

"Instead of depending on proposals and handouts year after year, the organizations are trying to work on economic development," stresses Chester Robinson, director of the West Side Organization and president of WSCDC.

Jointly with Malcolm X College here, and with the support of leading Chicago businessmen, WSCDC is in the midst of a \$5 million fund-raising drive to finance more "do-it-yourself" ventures.

Entertainer Sammy Davis Jr., who with his recent bride has just finished a two-week Chicago engagement, plans to do benefits throughout the world on behalf of these West Side efforts. His two benefit performances here brought in some \$250,000.

He says he sees a connection between the West Side help-yourself philosophy and that of his own book, "Yes, I can."

"Does this solve all the problems of Chicago?" he asks rhetorically. "No, it does not," he notes. "But if street-corner guys can get a program 'cooking' here, then the brothers elsewhere have got to follow suit."

QUESTIONS ON VIETNAM: VII. EFFECTS ON THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has hurt the United States in many ways besides just the tragic losses of American lives. It also has hurt the stability of the U.S. economy as we can clearly see in the current rising inflation and the wild gyrations of the stock market. In this final question the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars at Cornell University talks about how the war has hurt our economy:

WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THE WAR ON THE AMERICAN ECONOMY?

Contrary to popular notions of "war prosperity," the Vietnam war has (i) been costly for Americans in terms of the things most needed and (ii) been the source of our most pressing current economic problems, inflation and unemployment.

(1) Costs of the War

The personal income tax surcharge, the telephone and other excise taxes have been necessitated by the Vietnam war. The total dollar costs of the war now exceed \$100 billion. Examples of what this figure means in terms of opportunities foregone; nationally, the cost is \$2 million dollars per hour; New York City spends more on the war than on New York, the Vietnam war share of personal income taxes paid by New Yorkers exceeding

the city budget; Tomkins County (population 60,000) spends over \$700 per hour to support the war. Begin to think about what these figures mean in terms of schools, hospitals, public transportation, housing, etc.

(ii) Current Economic Problems

a. Our present rapid inflation arises from deficit spending required to finance the war; the federal budget deficit for 66-68 was over \$32 billion, the biggest inflationary shock to the economy in the post-World War II period.

b. The measures adopted by the Nixon administration to deal with inflation leave untouched the heart of the problem—military expenditures, especially for the war. Inflation cannot be stopped short of a cutback in military expenditures and a corresponding redirection of the economy towards increasing the supply of needed goods and services. Such a 'reconversion' policy would allow increasing employment, whereas administration tight money policies have increased unemployment.

c. One of the areas hardest hit by administration tight money policies is housing. By government standards we need at the very least 26 million new units over the next decade; at the current depressed level of housing starts, we will have fewer than 10 million additional units by the end of the 70's.

THE NATION'S HEALTH NEEDS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the things facing us today is that the basic, funding cycle, which involves the local community turning to the States, and the States turning to the Federal Government, is putting the Congress in a position where we have a rapidly escalating number of very heavy demands, and little assurance of adequate, incoming funds to meet all of them; in fact we cannot hope to fund them all. But we must do our best.

Under the present manipulations, the deficits could be felt in many critical areas of governmental and socioeconomic programs of great moment to the economy and the people.

I have in mind one which we all evaluate very highly as to priority, and that is medicare and health programs.

Where are we going with these programs with our hospitals crowded, hospital rates going through the ceiling, shortages of doctors, nurses, specialists and technicians appearing on almost every scene in the land?

Lack of sufficiently trained doctors coming out of the medical schools every year, and all the deficiencies that we have in trying to implement the overall medical care program, and make it the effective and helpful one we had great hope for, when it was first inaugurated, are plaguing us no end. Millions of sick people are being denied the care to which they are entitled and so badly need. Countless lives are in this precarious balance of deprivation of adequate medical care and treatment.

I am greatly concerned about the very serious problems developing in health, medical, and hospital care and treatment, because the rates and costs are

bounding into infinity, while the money and programs available to meet basic needs are generally inadequate, and will become much more so with the passage of time. This fact does not seem to be fully recognized, even in Congress which is moving too slow, so I suggest with utmost respect.

Obviously, the big problems are money and proper planning, and the people can not help that very much except by paying more taxes which many are not able to do, and planning wisely, adequately and well is for government and private hospital and health leaders.

Fundamentally, we must face up to the facts that our entire hospital system, its equipment and personnel are presenting gigantic problems, because obviously we do not have enough of the necessities to go around in the country, and we have great needs. More new hospitals should be constructed, more should be implemented with adequate, modern equipment and personnel, including doctors and nurses, specialized talents, and be furnished with much more modern equipment that is becoming available so fast in our technology, and yet is very expensive, costly, and in many instances beyond the reach of the ordinary hospital, if indeed the larger ones can afford them and are being squeezed by funding needs. Domiciliary and rest homes, modern theories to cope with killer diseases, chronic disabilities, for children and adults are urgently needed.

I have thought for a long time that Congress must take a new and careful look at this whole hospital-medical picture and complex, because to my mind the situation is deteriorating very fast, and the time may come soon—if it is not already here—when many more people no longer will have the means to pay out of their own pockets or plans for total, modern, medical care, not to speak of the crying needs of unfortunate children and adults.

High rates, shortages of doctors, nurses and developing shortages of hospital beds and up-to-date hospital buildings for all classes and ages are compelling problems. But they must be solved real soon, and we will have to find some way too before long to step up the number of spaces in medical schools, so that thousands of aspiring medical students may be assured of admission to medical schools, and later to up-to-date hospitals, where they can take their internships and residencies without suffering from the welter of delay, rejection, favoritism and discrimination that attends their present efforts for medical education and training.

We all have known of many capable, dedicated, well-trained young men applying across the board to get into medical schools, who are frustrated and disappointed they could not pursue the career of their choice because of lack of openings for highly qualified boys, who often must step aside for their inferiors from home and from abroad.

I think that the Congress will have to set up a huge, coordinated program with massive funding that will embrace all our health, medical, hospital, nursing,

specialist and medical school needs, and we must act now, and we cannot wait any longer.

I hope and urge that the appropriate committees of Congress will get together with all possible dispatch to make the elaborate studies and analyses necessary to ascertain the total needs, and then set up the remedies and the implementations that we need to insure adequate, reasonably priced, medical services for all. The alternative is socialized medicine, which we are likely to have sooner than we think, if we fail to move now.

At the present time, medical costs are anything but reasonable for the average person and family. Neither current medical and health plans or incomes can possibly meet them, as everyone must know.

In fact, the rich can afford these high costs; the poor can usually have them paid by welfare. But the rank and file of hard-working breadwinners, and ordinary working men and women of this great and prosperous Nation, are hard put, because they do not have the means to pay for excessively high-level costs, medical and hospital services, yet, since they are gainfully employed, they are not considered for special assistance payments.

I hope that the leaders and the members of the Congress, and particularly the chairman and members of pertinent committees will take careful note of my suggestions having to do with our urgent, present needs for greatly increased and vastly enhanced hospital-nursing medical care, service and treatment and medical school needs as well as many special programs for specially afflicted groups.

REPRESENTATIVE BLACKBURN'S ANSWER TO REPRESENTATIVE UDALL

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to reply to the statement of my colleague (Mr. UDALL) which appeared on page 16814 of the May 22 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that Mr. UDALL is unaware of the current status of the Nation's postal employees in regard to the right to join or not to join union organizations. Mr. UDALL states that H.R. 17070, the postal reform bill, "neither advances nor retards the right-to-work movement." He states that H.R. 17070 "retains the status quo." Nothing could be further from the truth.

The "status quo" refers to Executive Orders 10988 and 11491, the former issued by the late President John F. Kennedy, the latter issued by President Nixon:

Each employee of the executive branch of the federal government 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.

Section 222 of H.R. 17070 states labor-management relations would be "subject to the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 7—the National Labor Relations Act, as amended—of title 29." Under this clause in the National Labor Relations Act, the employees have the right to refrain "except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

Mr. Speaker, this is by no stretch of the imagination an extension of the "status quo." I would classify it rather as a complete repudiation of the aforementioned Executive orders and an open invitation for proponents of involuntary union membership.

I would suggest that my colleague read the National Labor Relations Act and section 222 of H.R. 17070 for himself. The conflict between these two clauses and the Kennedy-Nixon Executive orders is apparent to even a cursory study. I am compelled to remind my colleague that local postal installations are Federal property and there is a legal question as to whether or not the local State right-to-work laws would be applicable. There have been instances in many of the 19 States having right-to-work laws where workers on Federal property have been subjected to compulsory unionism. In my own State of Georgia, the State right-to-work legislation specifically excludes employees of "the United States, or any State, or any political subdivision thereof," from its provisions. I do not want to subject Georgia residents, who enjoy freedom of choice, to compulsory unionism. My colleague's own State, Arizona, enjoys the benefits of a right-to-work law; is he willing to risk the negation of his State's law?

In closing I would like to address myself to Mr. UDALL's comments on the congressional offices "being flooded right now with alarmist mail." I suspect if Mr. UDALL had received a heavy volume of mail in favor of his position, he would have termed it "a sincere expression of public support." However, since the mail is running adverse to his position, he terms it "alarmist." I have a heavy volume of mail on this vital issue, and I welcome it. I am more than happy to answer my constituents' queries and to read their views. I only wish that more of them would give me the benefit of their opinions. But as to the mail being "alarmist," I must disagree. My definition would be that it is "concerned."

Mr. Speaker, two letters in particular of the many that I have received on the issue of compulsory unionization of the postal workers are especially worthy of note to my colleagues.

One is from the Governor of the State of Arizona, the Honorable Jack Williams. The other is from the Governor of the great State of Wisconsin, the Honorable Warren P. Knowles. I trust that no one will consider these two letters as "alarmist," but rather as informed and concerned. I attach these letters for the benefit of my colleagues:

MADISON, WIS.,
May 14, 1970.

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLACKBURN: I have your letter of May 6 and certainly agree that the whole area of collective bargaining in the public sector is a difficult one to deal with. We in Wisconsin have had more experience in this area than most other states in that collective bargaining procedures have been authorized since 1961. I personally vetoed the agency or union shop provision, and we are studying the entire problem at the present time trying to bring about some mechanism whereby good labor management relations in the public sector may be maintained.

The difficulty that we encountered, of course, is that all our public bargaining units attempt to apply the rule of the private sector and it simply won't work. We are not dealing with a profit-making business but rather a service organization which is financed by taxes, and the ultimate goal of most bargaining is economic and translated into dollars. I am advising members of my congressional delegation and hope that they will support your proposal for reasonable legislation.

Sincerely,

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Phoenix, Ariz., May 18, 1970.

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLACKBURN: As Governor of a Right To Work State, I certainly agree with your letter of May 6th.

I have discussed this with Senator Paul Fannin and am taking the liberty of sending him your letter with a request for any recommendations that he may have for this office to undertake.

Sincerely,

JACK WILLIAMS.

DRUGS ARE BIG BUSINESS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the problem of drugs can no longer be considered a local problem, rather it has taken on national significance in America, stretching from our inner city ghettos to our well-to-do suburban neighborhoods to our midwestern rural farming areas. To shut our eyes and say that the problem does not exist is to close our eyes to obvious reality. To date no one has come up with the answer to solve what is fast becoming a crisis in this Nation.

Part of the problem is our seeming lack of perspective about the drug trade in general and the particular application to the United States. We are all too ready to believe that the users are the social outcasts who gather together for a quick "trip" or who "shoot up" in a dark alley. Unfortunately the truth is that the problem runs deeper than that—much deeper.

To put the local drug trade in perspective, I believe that the following article—the first in a series to be published

by the Christian Science Monitor—describes how drugs are, in reality, big business on the world market. Just as demand increases, supply is all too ready to expand to fill the need. Before one can have a full understanding of the breadth of the drug problem, one must appreciate the fact that the traffic in drugs is a most lucrative occupation. John Hughes describes that business in the following article:

WORLD "JUNK" TRAFFIC—"WE'RE DEALING WITH AN EPIDEMIC"

(NOTE.—During the past few months enough heroin has been smuggled into the United States to supply 150 million individual shots for addicts. In other words, enough for all the young people in the U.S. between the ages of 15 and 24 to have at least four "fixes." Staff correspondent John Hughes has followed the narcotics trails round the world. In the first of 10 reports he spells out the international drug situation.)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—A five-month investigation by this newspaper into the international narcotics traffic reveals that illicit drugs are swirling like a floodtide down the clandestine channels that lead to the addict user.

To the United States, the principal consuming country, the flow is massive, and increasing.

True, seizures are up. Heroin seizures by American customs agents have increased 1,200 percent over the past five years.

The Nixon administration is devoting major effort to disrupting the traffic. At home and abroad, American narcotics agents are doing a yeoman job. Whether shooting it out with opium traffickers in Turkey, or penetrating the heroin factories of Marseille, France, they are often men of remarkable courage, working undercover for long periods at considerable risk.

But the market for narcotics has expanded phenomenally, too. Some believe it has doubled in the past six months. It now caters to 11- and 12-year-olds. President Nixon says 180,000 Americans are addicted to heroin. Each requires several "fixes" a day of the white powder that has brought death to hundreds and so-called "living death" to thousands more.

So far as "soft" drugs are concerned, more than 6 million Americans are using marijuana, according to a United States congressional committee of inquiry.

FLOW INCREASED

Ironically, increased governmental attention to the drug traffic has boosted the current flow. Traffickers fear that traditional sources and channels may be sealed off. So they have been moving large consignments while they can.

Narcotics agents believe 3,500 kilos of heroin have been hastily funneled down the pipeline from Turkey to the United States in the past few months. When diluted, that is enough to supply more than 150 million individual shots of heroin to addicts.

Turkey is the largest grower of illegal opium. France is the major converter of opium into heroin. The process is dominated by a tough Corsican underworld ring operating in Marseille. From these two countries originates 80 percent of the heroin used in the United States. Much of the balance comes from Mexico. Two other countries with booming opium production—Iran and Afghanistan—are likely to cause trouble.

But even if production could be wiped out overnight, enough has been stockpiled to meet world demand for several years. Buried in remote areas of Turkey are several hundred tons of opium. It is guarded by fierce hill folk for whom defiance of authority is practically a point of honor. They can dis-

pose of their caches at leisure. Neither opium, nor morphine (its next stage), nor heroin (the end product) deteriorates with age.

The United Nations says the drug traffic is snowballing and that it is "imperatively urgent" to find ways to cope with it.

A top American narcotics agent puts it more bluntly. "We're dealing," he says, "with an epidemic."

The United Nations estimates illegal production of opium at 1,200 tons a year. Many experts find that calculation conservative. As for marijuana, it grows untended like a weed in dozens of countries.

Last year a startled London housewife found two stands of it growing 6 feet high in her back garden. In New Orleans, agents picked up a college professor and his wife found growing 260 marijuana plants. Across the Mexican border alone, authorities believe, some 1,100 tons of marijuana flow into the United States each year.

For the past several months I have been exploring the pipelines down which this illegal traffic flows and the men who control them. In the course of a round-the-world trip I found that with no especial entrée to underworld circles it was possible, with time and money, to buy every major illegal drug.

In Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Thailand, I came easily to the point of purchase for opium. In Laos I could have bought it by the small plane load.

Sometimes there were difficulties when sellers suspected me of being an undercover narcotics agent or a police officer. But with only a little more effort, I could have bought opium in India, Turkey, and Mexico. In Hong Kong I need walk but a few steps from my office to get the distinctive scent of smoking opium from the neighborhood vendor.

In Beirut a Western diplomat offered me introductions to cocaine sellers in a number of nightclubs.

Second-grade heroin in small doses was easily obtainable in Mexico and Hong Kong. But in Marseille I could have bought top-grade heroin by the kilo (2.2 pounds). It would have taken an advance payment of \$3,000 and several days isolation in a hotel room while the sellers checked me out. If they were satisfied, I could have been reasonably sure of emerging with a kilo of pure heroin. So skillful and careful are the traffickers, however, that the transaction would have been completed without my ever meeting the deliverer.

The movement of heroin from southern France to the United States was once dominated by the American Mafia. But now the Corsican heroin manufacturers have so much to sell that they meet all the Mafia's requirements and have plenty to spare. So in addition, they sell to Cuban, American Negro, and Puerto Rican buying rings who have newly set up shop around Marseille, as well as to "independent" purchasers.

As for hashish and marijuana, I could have bought this as easily as toothpaste or candy throughout much of Asia, the Middle East, and parts of Mexico. In Afghanistan, hashish sellers distribute pamphlets advertising their own special brands. Hospitable policemen offer foreign hippies a puff of "hash." In Nepal, hashish comes cheaper than tobacco. In Pakistan, a police officer opposed to the narcotics traffic told me he had sold a kilo of hashish to make money for his son's birthday present.

CHILDREN ACCOSTED

For the new synthetic drugs—the amphetamines, the barbiturates, the hallucinogens—the trail started no farther than the beach in front of my home in Hong Kong. There the pushers are trying to proposition American children from the international school nearby. American schools in Bangkok, Thailand, and Ankara, Turkey, have encountered similar problems.

One finding of this Monitor survey is that in addition to the traffic in cultivated drugs, there is a sharp upsurge in the movement of the synthetics. Pioneered in the United States, they are flowing in particularly across the borders of Western Europe.

A leading Italian psychologist says 30 percent of young people between 14 and 22 in Rome are using some kind of drug. Use of stimulants is so serious in Sweden that the Swedish Government is in the forefront of a campaign for strict new international controls. Deaths from heroin use have startled France.

Even the Soviet Union has admitted some "thefts of narcotic drugs from pharmacies and hospitals." The Soviets say illicit traffic poses "no problems" in their country. Other sources say Soviet officials are quietly concerned about the smuggled inflow of drugs from the West.

Pep pills are in vogue with some Czechoslovakian youths. The Prague weekly *Kvety* says drug addiction in the capital is reaching alarming proportions. Some addicts have been getting high on cactus extract stolen from Prague's botanical gardens.

There may be one positive aspect to this. European governments, which until now have paid only lip service to drug abuse and traffic, are beginning to take it more seriously.

Though it is relatively easy to buy illegal narcotics, smuggling them across international borders, and particularly into the United States, is a much more hazardous business.

In countries like Turkey and Lebanon, the narcotics seller is often an informer, too, particularly upon small-time or amateur traffickers. Having made the sale, he tells the police. For this service, he gets immunity from prosecution. But the buyer is picked up.

In some countries, the police go out of their way to arrest foreigners. This helps build their case that foreigners, not local citizens, are responsible for the narcotics traffic.

Several hundred Americans have had tormented personal experience of this. They are serving long sentences for narcotics offenses in such hellholes as Sands prison, just outside Beirut.

Crammed 40 to 50 in a cell, the prisoners have one hole in the floor for a toilet, one faucet for a shower. Many have suffered the humiliation of violent homosexual assault. A fortunate few have bribed their way into mental institutions where treatment is better.

Despite the hazards, the profits from drug smuggling are immense. If transported successfully to the United States and "cut" into 45,000 packets for individual users, a kilo of heroin that costs a few thousand dollars in Marseille sells for more than a quarter of a million dollars.

With this kind of money to be made, involvement in the narcotics traffic extends into the most pseudo-respectable circles and into the highest ranks of a number of governments.

In Lebanon, a leading politician is one of the largest owners of hashish-producing land.

The uncle of one Middle Eastern monarch reputedly controls the transportation of narcotics through his country.

The sister of another head of state is persistently linked to the operation of a morphine-producing factory.

In one Asian country, an American diplomat told me:

"We want the drug traffic out of here stopped. But we have a problem. If American narcotics agents start nosing around here too closely, they're going to uncover some links to pretty high places."

In Laos the Army is involved in the opium business, and Lao Air Force planes transport opium.

In Thailand the massive outflow of narcotics could hardly take place without collaboration at fairly high levels. In the past, involvement in the drug traffic has extended into the Cabinet. It may still today.

AMBASSADOR ARRESTED

The diplomatic bag, immune from customs scrutiny, is an ideal vehicle for narcotics traffic. A number of Latin-American diplomats have been caught moving narcotics, including ambassadors from Mexico, Guatemala, and Uruguay.

This year Italian police arrested a Pakistani ambassador on narcotics charges. Other diplomats are being watched. Personnel of a number of international agencies with diplomatic privileges, particularly in Southeast Asia, are under suspicion.

In Lebanon, a traveler in trouble with the law who needs new documents can visit the ambassador of one Central-American country. No questions are asked. The fee for a brand-new passport of that country is \$1,000 in cash. One recent purchaser was an LSD chemist on the run from British police. He used his new passport to travel to North America.

Money, however, is not always the reason for involvement in the drug traffic. Sometimes the motive is political or ideological.

Western agents, for instance, believe the Israeli intelligence service permits Arab smugglers to move shipments of narcotics across Israeli-held territory. The smugglers are Bedouin tribesmen. In return for the transit route, they give the Israelis military information about Arab positions.

There is also narcotics-smuggling across the Arab-Israeli border for straight gain. The hashish that visiting Jewish hippies buy in Israel comes from Lebanon.

In Laos, some of the main growers of illegal opium are tough mountain tribesmen upon whom the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) relies heavily in the campaign against the Communists. Opium is the principal cash crop in the non-Communist part of the country. Clearly, the CIA is cognizant of, if not party to, the extensive movement of opium out of Laos.

One charter pilot told me that "friendly" opium shipments get special CIA clearance and monitoring on their flights southward out of the country. The same source alleged two or three flights without this "protection" crashed under mysterious circumstances.

Communist intelligence agents are similarly involved with the use and transportation of narcotics.

Soviet agents posing as newsmen in India are known to have made use of narcotics in the course of their intelligence work. In the no-holds-barred world of espionage, it is a logical instrument.

The Soviets accuse the Chinese Communists of manufacturing narcotics and unloading them on the world market with political design. The Chinese undoubtedly do manufacture drugs. But there is no evidence that they are employing them abroad on such a massive scale, for instance, as did the Japanese prior to their invasion of China in the 1930's. Before their military onslaught, the Japanese poured in opium to sap Chinese resistance.

SANCTUARIES PROVIDED

For drug smugglers from Turkey and the Middle East, Communist countries on the road route to Western Europe are a sanctuary. Opium shipments are stored there, road trailers dropped off or switched, and truck registration papers and licensed plates changed.

A café in Sofia, Bulgaria, is the known haunt of Arab smugglers. Yet rarely do the Communists interfere with narcotics shipments from Middle Eastern countries for whose friendship they are anxious.

Whatever their motivation, the merchants engaged in this multimillion-dollar "junk," or narcotics, business resort to the most bizarre, the most extreme, the most ingenious methods to get their wares through.

Along the Turkish-Syrian border, the authorities have strung barbed wire and planted minefields. But the smugglers moving convoys of raw opium snip the wire and drive herds of goats ahead of them to explode the mines.

Camels carry opium in metal cylinders in their stomachs. One cheerful Afghan showed me how to slit the skin of a sheep, slip a wad of opium in, and sew the skin up again before herding the shaggy animal across the border into Iran.

From Laos, charter pilots air-drop opium in watertight bags in the Gulf of Siam. Deep-sea fishing boats from Thailand pick it up, sail to Hong Kong, then sink it in shallow water off the coast. Chinese fishing junks trawl for it later and quietly run it ashore.

HIDING PLACES ARE MANY

Narcotics are smuggled in hollowed-out books, in scuba tanks, and molded into chessboards. They are disguised as lemons, and hidden in pierced watermelons, and sealed in cans of peaches, coffee, and olive oil. They are carried in dolls, and toy horses, and even in babies' diapers.

Women couriers conceal them in girdles and brassieres. California customs agents caught one "pregnant" woman coming off a President liner with 40 pounds of narcotics in a false stomach. In Turkey, police found a "hunchback" with nine pounds of narcotics in his "hump."

From Colombia, one smuggler tried to ship 95 pounds of marijuana into the United States in a crate full of boa constrictors.

Others have tried molding narcotics as rosary beads.

But still favorite hiding places for traffickers are the false-bottomed suitcase and the concealed compartment in a truck or automobile. A surprisingly large amount of narcotics travels through the international mail labeled as innocent gifts. In one big haul in Hong Kong, narcotics were packed as insulation in the walls of a shipment of refrigerators.

One more interesting fact about the major criminals behind the narcotics traffic: Rarely do they use drugs themselves. They know better.

A SAD DAY FOR COUNTRY, BUT A TIME TO PAY TRIBUTE

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day this year, Saturday, May 30, the Kentucky Post—which serves many of my constituents in the northern Kentucky area—ran a front page story listing the men who have given their lives for their country in Southeast Asia. The four paragraphs preceding the list of brave men expresses the sentiments of many people in the Fourth District and across America. The article follows:

A SAD DAY FOR COUNTRY, BUT A TIME TO PAY TRIBUTE

This is the saddest Memorial Day in the recent history of this republic. For added

to the people's grief for the fighting men who have fallen in the cause of American liberty, there is a cloud of disloyalty and disunity that reaches from sea to shining sea.

Political distrust is natural and proper in a popular form of government like that of the United States. But today subversive forces evoking the name of political dissents, but directed by traitors and deadly enemies, have seduced the minds of groups of Americans who are immature, disturbed, gullible or disgruntled.

And in the name of a false peace which they hypocritically do not actually seek, they make war to the death on the mind and soul of America. Thus they seek to discredit the heroism of this country's military martyrs—a vicious enterprise that we condemn as utterly contemptible.

With the hope of compensating in one small way for the attempts of the unworthy to diminish the stature of the brave men who have died for this country, we inscribe below the names of the servicemen of northern Kentucky who have lost their lives in the war against the tyranny of pagan communism in southeast Asia. We salute them; we honor them; we remember them with tears in our eyes and a thrill in our hearts for their deathless valor.

KENTON COUNTY

1. Pfc. William Joseph Gallagher, 21, Covington, Oct. 13, 1965, Marines.
2. Sgt. Robert Lovelace, Taylor Mill, Feb. 9, 1966, Marines.
3. Pfc. Louis R. Randall, 20, Covington, Sept. 25, 1966, Army.
4. Sp. 4 Donald Robert Duncan, 22, Morning View, Nov. 24, 1966, Army.
5. Sp. 4 Carl William Mueller, 22, Covington, Feb. 13, 1967, Army.
6. Sp. 4 Louis Ray Soward, 20, Covington, Feb. 15, 1967, Army.
7. Cpl. Donatus Joseph Gellen, 23, Covington, Feb. 28, 1967, Marines.
8. Sp. 4 Guy Eckman McNay Jr., 22, Erlanger, May 19, 1967, Army.
9. Sp. 4 Timothy Matthew Flammer, 21, Elsmere, July 3, 1967, Army.
10. Pfc. Roderick Lee Weiss, 20, Erlanger, July 24, 1967, Marines.
11. Lance Cpl. Everett Stratton Jr., 22, Ludlow, Aug. 4, 1967, Marines.
12. Lance Cpl. Nicholas Owen Wagman, 19, Ludlow, Sept. 2, 1967, Marines.
13. 1st Lt. James Louis Ante, 25, Covington, Sept. 3, 1967, Army.
14. Staff Sgt. Frank Bellew Dunford III, 20, Covington, Oct. 22, 1967, Army.
15. Lance Cpl. Paul H. Webb, Elsmere, Jan. 11, 1968, Army.
16. Medic Jeffrey Aker, 20, Taylor Mill, Jan. 18, 1968, Navy.
17. Lance Cpl. Thomas Retschulte, 20, Covington, Jan. 21, 1968, Marines.
18. Sp. 4 Samuel G. Hurry, 24, Covington, Feb. 3, 1968, Army.
19. Lance Cpl. Samuel T. Marshall, 26, Erlanger, Feb. 7, 1968.
20. James Penny, 19, Covington, July 15, 1965.
21. Sgt. Ronald Lee McCollum, 20, Covington, Feb. 18, 1968.
22. Lt. Dennette A. Edwards, 25, Independence, Feb. 27, 1968.
23. Pfc. Gary W. Litton, 19, Edgewood, March 5, 1968.
24. William Eldridge, 22, Covington, April 18, 1968.
25. Sp. 4 Danny Lee Boone, 18, Ludlow, May 19, 1968.
26. Lance Cpl. Thomas Lee Loschiavo, 21, Winston Park, May 31, 1968, Marines.
27. Staff Sgt. Emmett S. Orr, 37, Covington, Oct. 10, 1968.
28. Sgt. Randall Welch, 20, Covington, Oct. 18, 1968, Army.
29. Pfc. Howard Wilhoit Jr., 19, Ludlow, Nov. 23, 1968.
30. Pfc. Raymond B. McKinney, 18, Covington, Nov. 25, 1968.

31. Sgt. Ronald Niewahner, 20, Villa Hills, Dec. 13, 1968, Army.

32. Pvt. 1C Clifford Lee Newberry, 18, Crescent Springs, Jan. 25, 1969, Marines.

33. Seaman 1C James Everett Pierce, 21, Covington, Feb. 10, 1969, Navy.

34. Pfc. Steve Tanner, 19, Bromley, Feb. 19, 1969, Marines.

35. Pfc. Alan Morris Sharp, 19, Covington, Feb. 25, 1969, Marines.

36. Pvt. Chester Wartman, 19, Ft. Mitchell, May 11, 1969.

37. Sgt. James L. Todtenbier, 21, Lookout Heights, June 6, 1969, Army.

38. Pvt. Hank Sally, 18, Independence, June 6, 1969.

39. Pfc. William Hammons, Covington, July 23, 1969, Marines.

40. Cpl. Michael Dwyer, Covington, July 25, 1969, Marines.

41. Pfc. Frankie Stanley, 21, Covington, Aug. 26, 1969.

42. 2d Lt. David Stoppelwerth, 26, Ft. Mitchell, Jan. 18, 1970.

43. Sgt. Gary Schoborg, 20, Covington, April 13, 1970.

CAMPBELL COUNTY

1. Pfc. Frank Leslie Adamson, 20, Dayton, June 24, 1965, Marines.

2. Cpl. Ronald Vincent Silbersack, 25, Cold Spring, April 20, 1966, Army.

3. Pfc. Charles Marshall Bradford, 22, Newport, Oct. 4, 1966, Army.

4. Capt. Charles Frederick Swope, 32, Newport, Nov. 9, 1966, Air Force.

5. Lance Cpl. Jay C. Tipton, 21, Newport, Nov. 22, 1966, Marines.

6. Pfc. Gary Stephen Jordan, 21, Newport, Feb. 24, 1967, Marines.

7. Sp. 4 Richard Barry Sams, 21, Southgate, March 11, 1967, Army.

8. Pfc. Edward Arthur Smith, 20, Newport, June 17, 1967, Army.

9. Lance Cpl. Marvin Schafer, Grant's Lick, April 30, 1967, Marines.

10. Pfc. Gerald Rolf, Newport, June 29, 1966, Army.

11. Sgt. Albert Francis Sayer Jr., 31, Ft. Thomas, Sept. 8, 1967, Air Force.

12. Sp. 4 Clarence Hall, 19, Newport, Nov. 20, 1967, Army.

13. Sp. 4 John C. Freppon, Silver Grove, Dec. 12, 1967, Army.

14. Lance Cpl. Delmer Anderson, 19, Bellevue, Jan. 13, 1968, Marines.

15. Cpl. David A. Jones, 22, Ft. Thomas, May 1, 1968.

16. Sp. 4 Fred Bauerle III, 19, Dayton, April 28, 1968, Army.

17. Pfc. Micky Ray Highlander, 21, Dayton, Aug. 17, 1968, Army.

18. Corp. John B. Becker, 22, Cold Spring, Aug. 27, 1968, Marines.

19. Pvt. Bobby R. Sumpter, 19, Alexandria, Sept. 8, 1968, Marines.

20. Sgt. Eugene Spencer, 23, Dayton, Oct. 30, 1968.

21. Sgt. Kenneth M. Bryant, 21, Cold Spring, Dec. 25, 1968, Army.

22. Sp. 4 Robert J. Blaut Jr., 18, Alexandria, Feb. 23, 1969, Army.

23. Pfc. Patrick E. Blagg, 20, Newport, April 12, 1969, Marines.

24. Lance Cpl. Troy E. Powell, 20, Newport, May 2, 1969, Marines.

25. Sp. 4 Dennis L. Henry, Bellevue, Sept. 3, 1969.

26. Pfc. John Edward Cottingham, Newport, Sept. 23, 1969.

27. Sgt. Thomas Jefferson Gabbard, Highland Heights.

BOONE COUNTY

1. Pfc. John Wayne Malapelli, 23, Burlington, Feb. 9, 1965, Army.

2. Sp. 4 George Columbus Roden Jr., 27, Hebron, Oct. 8, 1965, Army.

3. Sgt. Montague Lyons, Walton, Dec. 11, 1967, Marines.

4. Arthur T. Kramer Jr., 22, Burlington, May 4, 1968.

- 5. Sgt. Harlan Secress, 21, Hebron, Dec. 31, 1968, Army.
- 6. Sp. 4 Gary Leslie Moore, 21, Elsmere, March 12, 1969, Army.
- 7. Sp. 4 Jimmy R. O'Banion, 20, Florence, April 8, 1969, Army.
- 8. Sp. 5 Edward A. Barlow, 21, Hebron, May 11, 1969.
- 9. Sgt. Charles C. Fleek, 21, Petersburg, May 27, 1969, Army.
- 10. Sp. 4 Marlon L. Zipp, 23, Elsmere, Aug. 12, 1969.
- 11. 1st Lt. William J. Brewer Jr., 23, Erlanger, May 14, 1970, Army (first Northern Kentuckian to die in Cambodia).

BOURBON COUNTY

- 1. Staff Sgt. Walter Kenneth Morris, 40, Paris, Oct. 24, 1963, Air Force.
- 2. Pfc. Francis Allen Hughes, 20, Paris, July 11, 1967, Army.
- 3. William Daniel Collins, 21, Paris, July 29, 1967, Army.

HARRISON COUNTY

- 1. Staff Sgt. Clifton Frederick Jr., 37, Cynthia Jan. 22, 1967, Army.
- 2. A1C David Glenn Woodruff, 20, Cynthia, Sept. 5, 1967, Air Force.
- 3. Sp. 6 Paul B. McKinley, 28, Cynthia, Nov. 22, 1967.
- 4. Pfc. Paul J. Lively, Cynthia, Jan. 11, 1968, Army.
- 5. Sgt. James Harvey Bennett Jr., 24, Cynthia, Feb. 15, 1968.
- 6. Sp. 4 James O. Fryman, 19, Cynthia, Sept. 18, 1968, Army.

MASON COUNTY

- 1. 1st Lt. William Boyd Tully, 31, Maysville, Nov. 5, 1962, Air Force.
- 2. Staff Sgt. Billy Eugene Snipes, 33, Maysville, May 17, 1966, Army.
- 3. Cpl. Ernie Wayne Rosser, 21, Maysville, Dec. 11, 1966, Marines.
- 4. Lance Cpl. Donald Randell Lewis, 21, Maysville, Feb. 25, 1969, Marines.
- 5. Sp. 4 Billy Ray Lucas, 20, Maysville, May 19, 1970, Army.

OWEN COUNTY

- 1. Cpl. John R. Grimes, 19, Owenton, Feb. 18, 1967, Army.
- 2. Pfc. William Lee Juett, 26, Owenton, Nov. 8, 1967, Army.
- 3. Sp. 4 Robert A. Osborne, 21, Needmore, March 23, 1969, Army.

FLEMMING COUNTY

- 1. Pfc. Billy Gene Conley, 24, Flemingburg, Feb. 18, 1967, Army.
- 2. Sp. 4 Ray Melvin Harmon, 22, Flemingburg, Feb. 21, 1967, Army.

CARROLL COUNTY

- 1. Sgt. Paris Dale Dusch, 34, Carrollton, Nov. 15, 1965, Army.
- 2. 1st Sgt. Luther M. Chappel, 34, Worthville, June 30, 1969.

GALLATIN COUNTY

- 1. Staff Sgt. James Albert Smith, 31, Warsaw, Aug. 18, 1965, Marines.

GRANT COUNTY

- 1. Cpl. Ernest Howard Wilson, 22, Corinth, Jan. 11, 1967, Marines.
- 2. Pfc. Edgar L. Tomlinson, 19, Williams-town, Sept. 12, 1968.
- 3. Sp. 4 David Knight, 21, Williamstown, Dec. 31, 1968, Army.
- 4. Lance Cpl. Gary Hisle, 20, Williamstown, May 23, 1969, Marines.

PENDLETON COUNTY

- 1. Pvt. 1st Class, Bradley Bowling, 21, DeMossville, May 31, 1968, Marines.
- 2. Boatswains Mate 1C John Franklin Bobb, 25, DeMossville, Navy.
- 3. Cpl. Clyde David Downard, 19, Fal-mouth, Oct. 24, 1968.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, APRIL 1970

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the April 1970, civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, APRIL 1970

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of April was 3,089,175 as compared with 3,011,293 in the preceding month of March. This was a net increase of 77,882, due primarily to temporary Census employment.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of April totaled 3,053,060. This was a net increase of 77,868 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of March. Employment by months in fiscal 1970, which began July 1, 1969, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1969.....	3,049,502	+9,140	
August.....	3,015,864		-33,638
September.....	2,945,752		-70,112
October.....	2,927,741		-18,011
November.....	2,913,598		-14,143
December.....	2,912,661		-937
January 1970.....	2,893,593		-19,068
February.....	2,892,469		-1,124
March.....	2,975,192	+82,723	
April.....	3,053,060	+77,868	

Total employment in civilian agencies of the Executive Branch for the month of April was 1,830,924, an increase of 83,852 as compared with the March total of 1,747,072. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in April was 1,222,136, a decrease of 5,984 as compared with 1,228,120 in March.

The civilian agency of the Executive Branch reporting the largest net increase was Commerce Department with 74,257, reflecting an increase of 74,389 in temporary employees involved in taking the Nineteenth Decennial Census.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Navy with 3,320, Army with 1,809 and Air Force with 652.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in April was 2,820,120, an increase of 80,806 as compared with March. Total employment outside the United States in April was 23,940, an increase of 2,938 as compared with March.

The total of 3,053,060 civilian employees of the Executive Branch reported for the month of April 1970 includes 2,567,613 full time employees in permanent positions. This represents a decrease of 4,754 in such employment from the preceding month of March. (See Table 2 of accompanying report.)

The Executive Branch employment total of 3,053,060 includes some foreign nationals employed abroad, but in addition there were 106,317 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during April who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in March was 108,022.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in the month of April totaled 29,501, an increase

of 229 as compared with the preceding month of March. Employment in the Judicial Branch in the month of April totaled 6,614, a decrease of 215 as compared with March.

DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

The total of 3,089,175 reported by the Committee for April includes 18,642 disadvantaged persons employed under federal opportunity programs, an increase of 501 over the preceding month of March. (See Table 4 of the accompanying report.)

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during April 1970, showing comparisons with June 1969 and the budget estimates for June 1970:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1969	April 1970	Estimated June 30, 1970 ¹
Agriculture.....	83,425	82,030	83,000
Commerce.....	25,364	25,260	25,600
Defense:			
Civil functions.....	31,214	30,049	30,700
Military functions.....	1,225,877	1,154,177	1,165,900
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	102,941	103,913	102,500
Housing and Urban Development.....	14,307	14,341	14,900
Interior.....	58,156	59,573	59,300
Justice.....	35,106	37,033	37,600
Labor.....	9,723	9,836	10,300
Post Office.....	562,381	565,048	567,000
State.....	24,658	23,825	23,900
Agency for International Development.....	15,753	14,633	15,000
Transportation.....	60,386	62,012	63,600
Treasury.....	79,982	85,331	86,700
Atomic Energy Commission.....	7,047	6,971	7,000
Civil Service Commission.....	4,970	5,070	5,300
General Services Administration.....	36,176	36,343	36,400
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	31,733	31,391	31,400
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	2,856	2,139	2,400
Panama Canal.....	14,731	14,624	14,700
Selective Service System.....	6,584	6,756	6,600
Small Business Administration.....	4,099	4,027	4,100
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	11,987	12,481	12,300
U.S. Information Agency.....	10,500	10,012	10,200
Veterans' Administration.....	147,606	146,951	148,500
All other agencies.....	26,200	23,787	27,800
Contingencies.....			10,000
Total.....	2,633,762	2,567,613	2,602,800

¹Source: 1971 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.

QUESTIONS ON CAMBODIA: VI. NEGOTIATING A PEACE SETTLEMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, with the recent invasion into Cambodia the administration is understandably pessimistic about the possibility of peace negotiations. In a May issue of Newsweek, President Thieu made it very clear in an interview with editor Osborn Elliot that he had no intention of negotiating a peace settlement with the Communists. Prof. George Kahin further explains the reasons why we cannot expect successful peace negotiations since the Cambodian invasion:

QUESTIONS ON CAMBODIA

THE ADMINISTRATION'S QUESTION

Are we accompanying these operations with any new diplomatic initiatives?

THE ADMINISTRATION'S ANSWER

Obviously we may make some new diplomatic initiatives at some point. But we see no sense in ignoring the fact that the other side has steadfastly refused to negotiate seriously. It will be up to them to decide whether or not they are ready to negotiate a settlement or spill more blood.

OUR ANSWER

President Thieu's most recent response to this question was given in a May 11, 1970 interview with *Newsweek* editor Osborn Elliot. Thieu made clear that he had no intention of negotiating a peace settlement with the Communists and that Vietnamization is a policy which permits continued fighting toward the goal of winning a military victory.

With respect to prospects for "new diplomatic initiatives at some point", one simply cannot overlook Thieu's intransigence on the question of diplomatic initiatives which is well-known and of long standing. Further, the invasion of Cambodia and allied involvement in the Cambodian civil war make diplomatic solutions to the Vietnamese conflict infinitely more difficult. Clearly the responsibility for initiating negotiations does not fall entirely on the enemy. The responsibility for shedding more blood also lies with the U.S. and its allies, particularly our intransigent dependent, President Thieu. Indeed, if there is any one aspect of the Administration's strategy upon which there is widespread agreement, it is that negotiations have been definitely downgraded. This has been evidenced by the President's refusal for some time to name a man of political stature to replace Ambassador Lodge in Paris. Instead, the President appointed a foreign service officer who served as an assistant to earlier negotiators and who never even occupied the post of Ambassador.

THE PROUD HERITAGE OF IDAHO BASQUES

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, there recently appeared in the Idaho Free Press of Nampa and the News-Tribune of Caldwell, a long feature on the Basques of Idaho, the proud people who have so enriched my State over the years with a heritage and unique culture dating back thousands of years.

Basques are very unique people. Coming from the Iberian peninsula of Northern Spain and Southwestern France, these people are known for their love of freedom and independence, despite their persecution by the Franco Government of Spain. Euzkadi—the Basque country—was independent until 1789, when France annexed that portion north of the Pyrenees. The southern portion lost its independence in 1839. Euzkadi regained its independence briefly during the Spanish civil war, only to lose it again. The years since have been marked by continuing repression of the Basque people by the Franco Government. Despite this, the Basques continue to maintain their heritage and their culture.

Idaho now has the largest Basque community outside of the Iberian peninsula. Centered in Boise, the Basque community is active in all walks of life and in all professions. They have made a remarkable addition to the life of my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the feature from the Idaho Free Press and the News Tribune, written by Barbara R. Miller, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IDAHO'S BASQUES PROUD TO RETAIN OWN HERITAGE

(By Barbara R. Miller)

The days of the lonely Basque sheepherder are past.

Today's Basque is found in offices, classrooms, factories and department stores.

He is a second or third generation Basque who probably knows little of the native language. One of his parents may be of Irish or German descent, or one of the other "melting pot" nationalities.

His home is typical Americana, except for the occasional "txorizua" or other Basque dish which may be prepared for special events.

If it weren't for his name, and possibly his dark coloring, he would be indistinguishable from a Smith or a Jones whose ancestors immigrated from other parts of Europe. He is an American.

But despite the fact that he is absorbed in the life and culture of modern America, there are occasions when his sense of heritage is vividly awakened—not with the nostalgia his newly-migrated parents may have felt, but with pride in the knowledge that he has a birthright to a great historical treasure.

His son or daughter may be one of the young Oinkari Dancers, and he may feel this awakening of pride watching them perform the traditional La Jota—or while taking a turn at it himself during one of the annual Basque celebrations held in the Boise Valley.

The third generation Basques are causing an upsurge in interest in the Basque culture, according to one of the leading Basque citizens of this area, Joe Eiguren of Homedale.

Eiguren, who is an aide at the Nampa office of the State Department of Employment, said he felt his generation tended to lose contact with the Basque culture in their efforts to "fit in." Young people today, however, are recognizing the value of the old language and customs.

"Basques are beginning to realize they can adapt and still retain their own heritage," he said.

That heritage includes a mystery. Who are the Basques? Why is their language unrelated to any other spoken language today?

Scholars have advanced several theories, but answers to satisfy everyone have yet to be found.

One theory states that the Basques are direct descendants of the Iberians, the original inhabitants of the peninsula now occupied by Spain and France.

The Iberian peninsula was invaded by several groups of people, but according to this theory, they had very little influence on the life or language of tribes who lived high in the Pyrenees, present home of the Basques.

Another theory contends that Basques are the descendants of inhabitants of the legendary Atlantis, a continent which was supposed to have extended into the present Atlantic Ocean, uniting Africa with North America. The continent gradually sank into the ocean, so the theory goes, and some of the people fled into Africa and from there to Spain.

Other scholars have compared the Basque

language with the ancient Chaldean language of the Near East, giving support to the legend that the Basques are descendants of Tubal, the fifth son of Japheth, one of Noah's sons.

Still another theory is that the Basques are descendants of Paleolithic, or Stone Age, people who inhabited the Pyrenean region and borrowed from the Iberian language. The theory is supported by the fact that in Basque practically all the names of sharp instruments and tools are derived from a word which means "stone."

The only point of agreement among scholars seems to be that the Basque language is the oldest language spoken in Europe and that it dates back at least 10,000 years.

The Basque Country, or Euzkadi, is located in the north-central part of the Iberian Peninsula and southwestern France, extending both north and south of the Pyrenees. Three-fifths of the land is in Spain and the rest in France.

It extends approximately 80 miles inland at the farthest point and stretches 110 miles along the coast.

The seven states of Euzkadi were for the most part independent until 1789, when at the end of the French Revolution France annexed the section north of the Pyrenees.

The southern states lost their independence to Spain in 1839. Spain then proceeded to try to stamp out the Basque culture, prohibiting use of the language in schools or other public places and even in homes.

Euzkadi gained its independence again briefly in 1936 after the inception of the New Republic of Spain, only to lose it after Fascism took over the Country.

Again, an attempt is being made in Spain to prohibit all use of the language.

The performance of ancient Basque dances is also prohibited, along with the operation of all Basque institutions and centers of learning.

Basque people continue to speak the native tongue in their own homes. However, the language is in danger of dying out, according to Eiguren, who spent much of his youth in the Basque country and recently wrote a textbook on the language.

Eiguren said the language is being "diluted" with Spanish and is not being kept active by the addition of new words adapted to modern life.

The language is also fading in France, where the number of Basque people is small, he said.

The complexities of the language discourage most young American Basques from learning it, Eiguren said, even though they may be interested in preserving the culture.

Progress is being made with the addition of a course in Basque at the University of Nevada, and the beginning of a collection of historical items at the University of Idaho.

Several European nations have made an even greater effort to preserve the unique tongue by establishing institutes for its study. These are located in England, Belgium, France and Czechoslovakia. Similar institutes have been established in South and Central America, Mexico, Venezuela and Argentina.

Presently, there is an estimated 2.5 million Basques in Euzkadi, of whom only one million can speak Basque. Another 2.5 million reside in other parts of the world, many of them in the Americas and Australia, and of that number it is estimated that well below one million can speak the language.

Eiguren estimated that there are some 12,000 Basques in Southwestern Idaho and Eastern Oregon, including the second and third generations.

They began coming to Idaho in the 1890s from California and Nevada, most of them accepting jobs as sheepherders because the lonely task did not require knowledge of English and offered a chance to accumulate a nest egg.

Contrary to what is widely believed, the scrubby Idaho desert did not remind the Basques of their homeland.

As one Basque noted, Idaho is "the farthest from it." The Portland area does remind him of Euzkadi, he said.

The real drawing card of the Western United States was the opportunity to be free and independent, a right denied the Basques in Spain.

Husbandry and agriculture were not the occupations of many of the Basques before they migrated here. Those from the coastal regions were fishermen, shipbuilders, carpenters and masons. Nevertheless, they took naturally to the job of sheepherding and were soon in demand. Those who enjoyed the new life they found wrote to their relatives and friends in Euzkadi, and soon those people were on their way.

Jordan Valley, Ore., became one of the most typical Basque colonies in the West, with more than half the population Basque from about 1910 to 1950.

The first Basques arrived there in 1897. They were Antone Azcuenaga and Joe Navarro, who started out as sheepherders and eventually built a small financial empire.

Other Basques like them worked hard at sheepherding or other ranch work, living frugally and saving their money for the chance to buy a piece of land of their own.

As Basques settled in the communities, boarding houses and hotels sprang up where they could gather and speak their own language. Boise had several such establishments.

Through the years, the sheep business dwindled in importance and Basques gradually diffused into every other occupation. Many remained in ranching, however, and in this area today names like Basel Aldecoa, George Goiri and Dick Gablica are prominent in the business.

Others have gone into the professions, commerce and politics, with the name of Pete Cenarrusa, Idaho's secretary of state, the most well known in the latter category.

Other states have their well-known Basques, too, including Nevada, whose governor, Paul Laxalt, is a French Basque.

Although Basques have "gone their separate ways" economically, they still enjoy getting together socially.

Some 500 individuals from Ontario to Mountain Home belong to an organization based in Boise called "Euzkaldunak," or literally, "The Basques."

Their main activity is the Sheepherder Ball, held each December at the Basque Center, 601 Grove. The proceeds have been donated to charity every year since inception of the event in 1928.

Similar dances are an annual event in other area communities. They all feature lively music by the Jim Jausoro band, hot-dog-like "txorizuk", a lamb auction and lots of fun for the entire community.

Another special event is the St. Ignatius Day picnic, held the last of July or first of August at the Boise Municipal Park. St. Ignatius of Loyola is the saint of the Basques."

The day-long celebration is begun with Mass, either at the park or at St. John's Cathedral, and ends with street dancing in front of the Basque Center. In between, there are traditional food and sporting events, including weight-lifting and wood-chopping.

A highlight of most Basque activities is a performance by the Oinkari Dancers ("Oinkari" means "fast feet"), a group of young people first organized in 1962 to represent the Basques at the Seattle World's Fair.

The group today consists of some 40 youths, ages 14 to 22. To join, a boy or girl must have at least one Basque parent who belongs to Euzkaldunak.

The dedicated youths have performed the traditional Basque dances at the New York World's Fair in 1964, the Denver Folk Festival in 1965, Milwaukee Folk Festival in 1966, The Smithsonian Institute in 1968 and at Boy Scout and Girl Scout Jamborees.

Family events are celebrated with the same fervor as the community-wide affairs. The Basque center is the scene of many wedding receptions that stretch into the wee hours of the morning, with eating, drinking and dancing.

Observing the Basques at one of their traditional celebrations, it is easy to pinpoint the qualities that enabled them to adapt so readily to a strange new land.

Basque blood runs strong in even the second or third generations. A Basque will always be a Basque—proud, vigorous and self-confident—even if he is an American.

And America is so much richer for it.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW GIVES GOOD ADVICE FOR ALL AMERICANS, BOTH IN AND OUT OF PUBLIC LIFE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Vice President AGNEW addressed the graduating class at the U.S. Military Academy in West Point, N.Y., yesterday and while the bulk of his text was directed to the graduates, I believe his comment that we should all emphasize what is right with our country and encourage pride in our country while recognizing that there will always be difficult problems to solve, was good advice for all Americans, both in and out of public life.

I insert the text of his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

It is an honor to address you on your graduation day and to speak also to those classes you have helped to train as well as to your families and friends. There is an intense sense of shared pride in you, not just among those here, but among most other Americans who believe deeply in the traditional values of this country. A great deal depends on you and on what you will accomplish.

While it would be an honor to give the commencement address at West Point in any year, it becomes especially meaningful to me at this time. These are years of great national confusion, much of it contrived confusion brought about by a clever, sustained assault on America's system and institutions. This is a time when application, achievement and success are derided as callous, corrupt and irrelevant. This is a time when the criminal misfits of society are glamorized while our best men die in Asian rice paddies to preserve the freedoms those misfits abuse. This is a time when the charlatans of peace and freedom eulogize foreign dictators while desecrating the flag that keeps them free.

No one need tell you that this is a difficult time, especially for those who serve their nation by defending it in a world which many wishfully view as less dangerous than the recurring hard realities reveal it to be. But difficult times are not unfamiliar to our Army—indeed, they may be said to be the customary circumstances of the American soldier. To these recurring challenges generations of West Pointers have brought courage, strength, resolve, and dedication as strong and dependable as the rock foundations of these Highlands. I believe these qualities are founded in the solidity of the West Point experience. What makes it so solid and so valuable is what I would like to turn to first.

West Point fosters an ethically informed

and achievement-oriented system of values. It is based on a belief instilled in each man that demonstrated merit will be rewarded, and likewise that shortcoming will be penalized. Since the system is run by human judgment, it is not perfect; but it still remains valid to a high degree. This idea of life "played by the rules" may very well be the most important part of the West Point experience. It is reflected in nearly every aspect of cadet life, from academics to standards of personal conduct, to leadership and military aptitude. There is constant recognition that education for high public responsibility has two purposes: first, to teach; second, to remove and recruit those whose talents are incompatible to the skill sought or those who lack the personal commitment to succeed.

The constant testing and challenging which are integral to cadet life implement the second principle. To survive, one must have both the talent and the heart to continually rise to the occasion, to meet the requirement, to produce under pressure with no prospect of respite. Those who excel are rewarded with more difficult leadership responsibilities, advanced and enriched academic challenges, and opportunities for independent effort. Those who fall short must look elsewhere for a career.

This kind of orientation is indispensable to men in training for the defense of the nation, where a good try that fails is not enough. Equally important, the training is coupled with ethical values which emphasize that the means must be as admirable as the ends. The result, ideally, is a high-principled and achievement-oriented leader who can get things done.

A man so constituted can have enormous impact upon those he interacts with in his professional and personal life. He is a man who has made the transition to maturity. He has accepted the discipline and standards of an institution he believes in and transformed them through self-discipline into standards of achievement that are with him for the rest of his life. The strength of this system of values seems to me to be the solid contribution of West Point. Her graduates have influenced the Army, and indeed the nation as a whole, with these beliefs.

Our hopes for you who are graduating today stem from America's great need for the perpetuation of such values. There is a need for balance in one's concept of his role in society. With such balance "doing your own thing" includes being responsible for your own actions. It means being self-controlled, self-motivating, and self-correcting. It means feeling a sense of obligation to make the most productive use of one's given abilities and opportunities, no matter how modest or extensive they may be.

It also means recognizing the individual's responsibility to others—to the unit he serves, to the colleagues who share his hardships, disappointments, successes, and ultimately, to his oath of office and the nation he represents. This kind of responsible maturity recognizes the possibility of genuine differences among reasonable men, approaches their reconciliation with earnest good will, and exercises restraint in pursuit of one's own legitimate goals so as not to interfere with others in pursuit of their own.

You are going out into an Army today that has borne the brunt of a lonely and difficult war, far from home, and in the face of open and hostile lack of support from a minority of our citizenry. Despite that, our deployed forces have stood between our Vietnamese allies and powerful enemies who were on the verge of enslaving them. They have simultaneously fought the big battles, advised and trained Vietnamese forces, helped them mobilize and expand, re-equipped and armed them, and protected a remarkable series of genuinely free elections

resulting in the formulation of a constitutional government in the midst of war.

All of this has been done without complaint by a magnificent Army of military professionals, citizen/soldiers and mobilized Reservists. In the midst of the hard, tough going they have also found time and heart to turn to the Vietnamese with compassion and brotherhood. This is the side of the story you seldom see reported. Our soldiers have tended the sick, helped build schools, fed children, collected and distributed clothing, and done a thousand other things which said, "I care." You can go out into this Army and assume the positions of leadership entrusted to you with gratitude, pride and humility.

In these days, in which we hear so much talk about involvement, you can also take pride in a profession which exacts the ultimate involvement—an unlimited commitment in the service of something greater than self. As John Gardner has pointed out, the geniuses of history have been "characterized not only by very high intelligence, but by the desire to excel, by perseverance in the face of obstacles, by zeal in the exercise of their gifts." We have need of such future in our nation.

A leader in today's world needs a strong resistance to adversity. He needs also to realize that leadership in a free society, unable to call on authoritarianism, must rely all the more heavily on the persuasive and inspiring example—on the authority of superior competence, and the impact of demonstrated and effective dedication and concern. He must lead by resisting and rejecting a way of life in which reckless agitation becomes an end in itself, and in which the institutions that have made the Republic possible are being gradually destroyed in the name of improving it.

At any level of responsibility, a leader must be motivated by legitimate objectives, must have the wisdom to choose policies which will advance them, and the moral courage to pursue those policies even in the face of opposition. Particularly is this true when there are requirements for contradictory goals such as peace and security, and the existing situation presents only the options of peace with tyranny or security through war.

All our knowledge of the history of the world indicates that conflict is rooted in the nature of man. Perpetuation of the hard-won elements of civilization and the ideals of a society of free and responsible men will not come about through happenstance. Only if we are prepared to defend our freedom can be expect to retain it. That preparedness includes not only the means of defense, but also the will to resist aggression.

General Pershing wrote in his final report as Commander in Chief of American Expeditionary Forces in World War I that "our armies were conscious of the support and cooperation of all branches of the Government. Behind them stood the entire American people, whose ardent patriotism and sympathy inspired our troops with a deep sense of obligation, of loyalty, and of devotion to the country's cause never equaled in our history."

I believe that a nation possessed of that kind of resolve and common purpose in pursuit of noble ends is indomitable. The lack of that kind of support leaves the United States a precarious existence in this dangerous world. We are privileged to be citizens of a remarkable nation. Probably no other in any time has been so generous with its wealth, so sympathetically concerned with the affairs of all mankind, so unselfish in making sacrifices so that others could continue to enjoy freedom.

Our armed forces have turned back aggression in Europe and Asia. Our partnerships with other nations committed to peace and freedom have done much to prevent renewed

violence. In the wake of conflicts not only our allies, but our former enemies as well, have prospered with our assistance. The Marshall Plan and the successor foreign aid programs have provided billions of dollars to those in need in other parts of the world. The success stories of West Germany, Japan and South Korea would not have been possible without America's help.

We often lose sight of the essential grace and nobility with which America has played her role as a great power. We should not let preoccupation with our problems diminish our pride in our wonderful country. Certainly we have problems, and they command all of our abilities and earnestness of purpose.

We will, no doubt, always have problems of one kind or another. That is the human condition. We are constantly in process of becoming. But the man who devotes all his best efforts to moving us toward our ideal, not the one who stands aside loudly bewailing the distance yet to go, is the true producer. And it is the sum of the contribution of millions of people who in their daily lives do the best they can, then try to make that best a little better, that establishes the national character. Given this, we can meet our problems with optimism and good will bolstered by remembering all that is right with America.

There is an important lesson in this for each of you as you approach your first assignments. Your years at West Point have been, in many ways, an idealization of life. You have been privileged to consider, under the tutelage of one of the best schooled and motivated faculties in America, all manner of things of the broadest compass. Matters of national policy have been discussed with you by many of the most senior officials of the Government. From this somewhat rarefied atmosphere you move now as the young leaders of our troop units to close daily contact with a multitude of problems and challenges.

You may feel some pain in making the transition. You may feel that you are at the bottom of the funnel. You may often find yourself with too few men, not enough spare parts or gasoline, and too many requirements to be met. But you will make do, you will get the job done, and you must never doubt that your individual actions are significant.

At this time, as we move toward an Army of volunteers, the quality of Army life is all-important. This administration is committed to providing major improvements in pay, housing, and other benefits. But what you must provide, and it is perhaps the most important factor of all, is an environment and a way of life that our best people will find challenging, meaningful and satisfying. There are no magic schemes for achieving this. It is largely an intangible result of the bond between a commander and his men.

People like to be in a good outfit doing a worthwhile job. They like to be challenged and find, in meeting the challenge, that they are more than they thought they were. They like to work for someone who is bright, but not overbearing, understanding, but not permissive, ambitious, but not callous. They respond to loyalty, enthusiasm, encouragement and good will. Your individual actions, then—the kind of man you are and the kind of inspiration and example you set—will be extremely important.

Even more important will be the cumulative impact of all of you as a class. Going as you are to many parts of the world and to nearly every major unit, you will have a very real and immediate influence on the quality of Army life. Coming at this particular time in our national life, that influence may be every bit as important as anything you will do individually or collectively in more senior positions in the years ahead.

You are embarking upon careers that offer challenge and opportunity in abundance. You will deal in what may practically be

viewed as the primary indispensable: survival of the sovereign nation. You will find little ease and fewer tangible rewards than you deserve. Much of what you will be called upon to do will be dangerous, arduous or unpleasant. But it will matter, and you never need doubt that you count—for what you do or fail to do will make the difference.

We all have need for purpose in our lives, and for authority as well. Happiness cannot be pursued as an end in itself. It comes, as the Greek philosophers recorded long ago, only as a by-product of giving our best efforts for a cause in which we can believe. West Point teaches this, not only as an abstract theory, but as a satisfying and meaningful way of life. It accounts for her solidity and for our high hopes as you go forth today. I am proud of you for achieving this goal, and wish for you all good luck and Godspeed in the years ahead.

MEMORIAL DAY

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, last Saturday, Mr. Wilbur C. Hall, a prominent attorney in Leesburg, Va., delivered the annual Memorial Day address at the courthouse square in Leesburg.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hall's Memorial Day address be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEMORIAL DAY

How very good it is that so many of you have found it possible to be here today—to gather in this historic and lovely courthouse square on such a truly significant day for all citizens of this great Commonwealth and great nation. I want you to know how happy I am to be a part of this program. I am so very grateful—for so many reasons—for this opportunity to share with you a few thoughts I have about this day we know as Memorial Day.

I am certain that many of you read the long article about Leesburg that appeared in the May 21st issue of the Washington Post. I shall not attempt to comment on the accuracy of its appraisal of the future of our community, but I do want to refer to its closing thought. The article concluded:

"It is hard to think about the future when the past is so present."

Our past is very much with us on this day. It is here about us, physically, in these buildings that have looked out upon so many gatherings of this kind, on so many generations of citizens of this town and this county. We live in a historic community, and each of us is touched in different ways by this sense of history that is always at our fingertips.

But our past is present today in other ways. There is a spiritual presence that is manifested in our tribute today to those who sacrificed all their tomorrows that we might have ours. The memory of all those who have died for this beloved country of ours is uppermost in our thoughts at this hour.

The tender reflections of the moment make it difficult for us to contemplate the future and the responsibilities each of us bears for what we will do with it. Yet, we cannot escape the obligation we feel so deeply, the obligation not to waste this precious gift that so many others have made possible.

The future is present today, also, in a physical, tangible way. The young people who are in our audience are indeed the future—

of Loudoun County, of Leesburg, of Virginia, and of America. I am particularly pleased to see such a large group of Boy and Girl Scouts. They have always symbolized for me all that is fine and good and wholesome in American youth. It is young America at its best. I congratulate you young men and women for being present today; I pray that you will take away from this program a renewed awareness of your dedication to unselfish service in behalf of your God and your country.

I wonder if everyone here realizes that this is the last time that we shall observe Memorial Day exactly as we have for 102 years. In 1968, just a few weeks more than 100 years after May 30th had first been proclaimed as Memorial Day, our national law was changed to make patriotic holidays such as Memorial Day and Veterans Days a part of a new American tradition—the long, three-day weekend. Beginning next year, Memorial Day will fall on the last Monday in May. Every so often, May 30th will indeed be Memorial Day again, but as for me, I am saddened that such concessions are made by our Congress. I submit that this day should be one of solemn remembrance and sober introspection—and not a planned part of the summer's first big outing. Isn't it ironic that May 30th has already become identified with an automobile race in Indianapolis—where men try to go faster and faster around a vast circle, where even the winner winds up exactly where he started.

The true symbolism of this day was established long ago in heartfelt gestures of sweetness, tenderness, and sorrow. Columbus, Mississippi, does not rank among the great battlefields of the War Between the States—Manassas, Antietam, Gettysburg—but the tides of war had washed nearby, and the cemetery at Columbus had become the final resting place of many fallen men. There were graves of both Confederate and Union soldiers, and among them were many who had marched off to battle from Columbus itself. On a spring day in the mid-1860's—perhaps a day much like this one—three young women took flowers to visit the graves of their husbands and sweethearts. Soon they were joined by a fourth young woman whose heart was filled with extraordinary compassion for the wasted promise that the graves symbolized. She hesitated—as we are often hesitant to share our very innermost thoughts with others—but then, gathering courage, she suggested to her companions: "Why don't we break our bouquets and place a flower on each grave?" Quietly, without further word, they united their flowers, and as long as the blossoms lasted, they placed a loving remembrance on the graves of the fallen heroes. When others saw what had occurred, they, too, were deeply touched, and soon a procession of the women of Columbus wound among the crosses, and every grave—Confederate and Union—was decorated with loving care.

Many others came to know of what had taken place at Columbus, Mississippi, and wherever Christian sensitivity and love dwelt in the hearts of man and women, they, too, adopted the practice of setting aside one special day when fresh flowers would be carried to the gravesides. In the North, as well as throughout the South, the practice became widespread, and various forms of official recognition followed. In 1868, the Grand Army of the Republic adopted May 30th as the day when special floral tributes would be made to its dead comrades. The New York legislature gave the date a legal status that became nationwide. In some states the day is known as Decoration Day—in others, as here, it is Memorial Day. The name matters little—it is the purpose that is noble and sacred.

In the century that has followed our epic War Between the States, many thousands of Americans have been called upon to give their

lives in the name of liberty, justice, and human dignity. Today, we honor the dead of all our battles.

Because Americans hold so dear their freedom, we have been willing to oppose those who would deprive us of it, and we have been willing to help defend for others this precious right. America's finest young men have met the enemy on distant fields of battle, in the hope that war's horrors might never again visit this land.

So it is on this day we turn our thoughts to friends and loved ones who kept faith with us and our country at places like San Juan Hill, the Argonne Forest, Iwo Jima and Guadalcanal, Normandy and Bastogne, Korea's Heartbreak Ridge, Viet Nam's jungles mountains.

Three years ago it was my privilege and honor to speak here on another Memorial Day observance. Now, it may seem to many of you that one who has lived as long as I have does not consider three years a very long time. But when one looks upon each individual day as a single, treasured gift from God, then three years is indeed a long, long time.

When I spoke to you then, I said how very distressed I was that American boys were continuing to die in Viet Nam, that the rows of crosses were lengthening. Words cannot bespeak the sorrow and anguish I feel that the passage of these three years has not brought an end to this far-flung military effort. I spoke then of the tragedy of Viet Nam, but today that tragedy has taken on new dimensions that are affecting each of us in alarming ways.

No matter how we may feel about the best ways to achieve this illusive goal of peace, all of us must certainly feel caught up in a tremendous, almost overpowering sense of frustration.

We are caught in a paradox of frustration. On the one hand we suffer the frustration of the powerful, on the other the frustration of the powerless.

The United States is the most powerful nation the world has ever known. We have sent men to the moon and brought them back. We enjoy a standard of living virtually incomprehensible to the bulk of this world's population. We have overcome disease and we have mastered science and technology. We are approaching a trillion dollar national economy. We are the recognized leader of the free world, and we have become, for better or for worse, a global policeman, with military outposts across the world. We have such vast resources, yet we have this immense sense of natural frustration. I am reminded of the Uncle Remus story of Brer Rabbit and the Tar Baby—no matter what we may do to break free, our very efforts tend only to increase our difficulties, to deepen our frustrations. We are powerful, but there are limitations—often self-imposed limitations—upon the ways in which we as a nation can use that power.

And, then, there is the frustration of the powerless. Many of us must feel this kind of frustration as individuals. We ask ourselves what can we do, as individuals, to help in this hour of need and crisis. And no matter how clear the answer may be to each of us, we tend to feel frustrated because the accepted, established procedures of rational discourse and action seem so slow, so unresponsive. We know the frustration of speaking out and being uncertain that anyone has heard us. We see and read of events in Viet Nam and Cambodia, at Yale and at Kent State University, and we feel frustrated because we cannot fully understand the forces that are at work within our nation and our society. With horror, we witness the spectacle of Americans shooting other Americans because we cannot agree on how to stop a war. We feel so helpless, the frustration of the powerless.

And in this situation, our self-imposed

restraints often give way. Some turn to overt acts of violence to vent their feelings, to make certain that somebody takes notice. I cannot and do not accept this. I condemn this alternative in the strongest terms possible. I have devoted my life to the study and practice of the law. Unless we are to slip into utter despair, we must hold to the belief that rationality, sound judgment, and wisdom will prevail. I believe our greatest hope rests in the preservation of law and order amongst all our citizens. We must not become anarchists, in action, in words, or in attitudes. We must resist, as best we can, both violence and any over-reaction to the threats of violence. History will teach us, if we only pause to listen, that repression can emerge from situations such as the one in which our nation finds itself today. Dissident groups assemble and say things that offend our sensibilities—and many cry out for controls that would not only limit the dissidents, but would impose restraints on the rights and privileges of all Americans. Small fractions of student bodies erupt into violence on our campuses, and many cry out for repressive measures that would punish all students by depriving them of funds and other support. We must be careful—in thought and in action.

Anyone who has worked within the structures of our court systems and the American system of jurisprudence has had to learn the necessity of patience. Not every issue can be decided *now*, or tomorrow, or the next day. If time is sometimes the enemy, it can also be your ally. We must be patient—with our youth, with our President, with our Congress, with ourselves. I believe that this great nation is still responsive to the national will, of the majority of its citizens. I have faith in its legally constituted processes. I hope you do, too.

We are all familiar with the term "the silent majority". Many of us present today might be considered members of this silent majority. Our "demonstration" here is orderly and non-violent, and in that respect only is it silent. We are, in a real sense, speaking out. One might assume that the soldiers, sailors, and airmen whose memories we honor today are also silent now in their sleep. But they, too, are speaking out—especially on this Memorial Day.

John McCrae gave his life in World War I, but before he died he wrote a poem that continues to pull upon our emotions at times like this. I know you are familiar with it:

"In Flanders Fields the poppies grow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky,
The larks, still bravely singing, fly,
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

"We are the dead; short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved; and now we lie
In Flanders Fields.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe!
To you from falling hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high!
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders Fields.

This is what the skirmisher who died at Cold Harbor is saying to us today. This is what the soldier who died defending Corregidor is telling us. This is what the Marine who perished in the bitter cold of the Chosin Reservoir is crying to us across the years. This is what the young man who fell yesterday to a sniper's bullet in Cambodia is wanting us to hear. Simply this:

Keep faith with me!

Keeping faith means more than finding an honorable solution, an honorable peace in Viet Nam. It means more than military victory. It means making certain, both in our national resolve and in our personal resolve,

that we never abandon the values of mind and spirit that have made America worth dying for.

We must preserve our freedom as a nation and as a people. We must be free both from violence and from repression. We must hold tight to our dignity as human beings and our pride as American citizens. If we do this, we will have kept faith.

Our dead will not have died in vain.

In the words of Roselle Montgomery, who said "What does it mean to be an American?"

What does it mean?

I look across the years . . . I see them come, But through a mist of tears, our gallant forebears,

Full of hopes and fears.

I see them leave behind for conscience sake The home they left,

The ties so hard to break,

Their questing, wandering, westward way to take.

I see them face and fight the wilderness,

Undaunted by its danger, its duress,

And from its wilderness,

Wrest and win success.

I see them take their living from the soil,

The men and women join in homely toil,

Where they then planted,

Now our heart roots coil.

I see them build their homes, their house of prayer,

And when its bell rings out upon the air,

I see them kneel in simple worship there.

I hear the drum of war's alarm beat,

I see them seize their arms, rise to their feet,

Their enemies—and liberty's to meet.

I see them face and conquer every foe,

I see their cities rise, a nation grow,

To whose broad breast earth's eager pilgrims go.

To be an American is to be one,

In whom these brave inheritances run,

A worthy daughter or a noble son.

INFLATION IN NEW YORK CITY

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, inflation has been wreaking chaos throughout our country. In no place has there been more harmful damage than in New York City. The most recent damage inflicted on New York City residents is the raise in rent for rent controlled apartment units.

I would like to insert a brief statement on this development into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

Mayor Lindsay's rent control law as it is now proposed is quite complex. It would raise rents on all apartments that have not had raises within the last two years based on complicated formulas that would result in an approximate 10% raise for most tenants.

LINDSAY BILL WILL BE CHANGED BY COUNCIL.

As a former Chairman of the Citizens Committee for Rent Control, I was among those testifying against the bill because it would throw a heavy burden on many people who can least afford it. I am certain that the City Council will change the bill and I will keep you informed of new developments.

CXVI—1164—Part 14

MORE HOUSING WITH FEDERAL AID IS THE ONLY ANSWER

With today's high interest rates, construction costs, operating and city taxes, private builders can not build low or moderate income housing.

We are in a state of housing emergency and New York City and State must build a vast flow of low and moderate income housing, with Federal aid. I have and will continue to fight in Washington for more aid to housing.

Decent housing must come before Super-sonic Transports, moonshots, foreign intervention and aid, rivers and harbors pork barrel, highway programs, and agricultural subsidies on our list of priorities.

We must demand!

No more destruction of sound housing;

No rent raises for the elderly;

No rent raises unless there is adequate maintenance and service.

While this emergency exists there must be no more destruction of sound apartment dwellings to create office buildings, parking lots or luxury apartments.

The plight of many of our senior citizens living on Social Security must be recognized, and special provisions made to see that they are not driven onto welfare by rent hikes.

Furthermore, in any case where a rent raise may seem to be warranted, provisions should be made to assure that no raise is given to any landlord not providing adequate maintenance and services.

In no circumstances should a new owner be allowed a raise during the first two years of his ownership.

I testified in opposition to the administration's rent control bill before the Board of Estimate on May 26, 1970. My testimony was similar to that in this statement. I will continue my fight to support rent control.

NAMES OF IDAHO COUNTIES

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in 1805, Lewis and Clark passed through the area that was later to become Idaho. Their journals recorded many interesting and colorful place names which the Indians had given the topographical features in the area.

Since that time, additional names have been added to the maps of Idaho. These names are varied in their origin. For the most part they are English, American Indian, Spanish, and French.

Dr. Lalia Boone, a member of the faculty of the University of Idaho and an authority on place names, is currently doing a study on place names in Idaho.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Boone's article, "Names of Idaho Counties," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NAMES OF IDAHO COUNTIES

(By Lalia Phipps Boone)

What we know of the earliest place names in Idaho comes from the records of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, 1805.¹ The explorers

Footnotes at end of article.

encountered small, scattered groups of Indians who had been pushed westward by the white man and weakened by tribal wars. From these Indians, they learned and recorded many tribal names for topographical features and trail markers; none commemorated great battle scenes or historic events. The penchant for name-giving however, was as strong in the white explorers as in the Indians. To Clark goes the credit for the first English place name of a major feature in Idaho, *Clearwater River*, which he translated in 1805 from Nez Perce *Koos-koos-ka* "water-water-clear"—*Clearwater* was later given to the county drained by the river.²

From that date until the last county was created in 1919, British-American influence dominated the area in politics and commerce, and therefore in nomenclature as well. The British-American fur traders who streamed in and out of the area for the 50 years after 1805 brought French trappers and traders with them, hence the French place names that dot the Idaho map from Lake Pend Oreille to Boise.³ Then came the miners, mostly American. Spanish interest in the area ended in 1819, but some indirect Spanish influence on place names continued until 1900.

The names of the existing 44 counties of Idaho come from the four language groups that played a part in the early history of the state. Twenty-nine come from English, nine from Indian dialects, five from French, and one from Spanish.

English: Ada, Adams, Bear Lake, Bingham, Blaine, Bonner, Bonneville, Boundary, Cassia, Clark, Clearwater, Custer, Elmore, Franklin, Fremont, Gem, Gooding, Jefferson, Jerome, Lemhi, Lewis, Lincoln, Madison, Owyhee, Payette, Power, Twin Falls, Valley, Washington.

Indian: (Shoshoni) Bannock, Idaho, Minidoka, Shoshone; (Nez Perce) Latah; (Coeur d'Alene) Benewah; (Kutenai) Kootenai; (Chinook) Camas; (Iroquois) Oneida.

French: Boise, Butte, Caribou, Nez Perce, Teton.

Spanish: Canyon.

This division might well be questioned, since there has been so much modification, commingling between the source languages. Some of the names designated as English, for example, are so classed because they derive from the names of English-speaking people, regardless of the ultimate origin of the names themselves. *Clearwater*, as already noted, is a translation of a Nez Perce word; *Owyhee* is a phonetic spelling of Hawaii; and *Lemhi*, which suggests Hebrew origin but for which no etymology has been found, makes its first appearance in an English-language publication, *The Book of Mormon*. *Nez Perce* is a Canadian-French name for Indians of the Shapapan family who called themselves *Chopunnish*; it is classified French, though it might well be considered Indian as it commemorates the tribe whose own name gave way to the French. The Indian names come from six language divisions. Furthermore, the Iroquois word *Oneida* is a toponym of *Oneida*, New York, which in turn was a name of an Iroquois tribe; and *Idaho*, which is thought by Rees and Brancroft to be of Shoshone origin and is so classed here, has been in such dispute that one hardly knows whether to call it an Anglicized Indian word or a coined word.⁴

The patterns of place-naming of the counties show little variety. Sixty percent of the names commemorate either individuals or Indian tribes. Thirty-three percent derive from descriptive features—topographical, natural, and man-made. And the few remaining names are almost equally divided between toponyms and local incidents.

White persons of national and local importance account for 20 of the 44 county names. (Indian names will be discussed separately.) Five presidents are represented:

Washington, Lincoln, Adams, Jefferson, and Madison. Blaine County honors American statesman James G. Blaine. Only one county, Gooding, bears the name of a state governor, though Governor Bunn (1885) was privileged to name Bingham County for his friend Congressman Bingham, of Pennsylvania. Lewis, Bonneville, and Fremont counties bear the names of early explorers Captain Merriwether Lewis and Captain B. L. E. Bonneville, and pathfinder John C. Fremont respectively; and Custer County, that of General George A. Custer.

Early settlers and developers account for the names of six counties: Bonner, Caribou, Clark, Franklin, Jerome, and Payette. E. L. Bonner established the first ferry across Kootenai River, and the settlement that grew up near the ferry is to this day known as *Bonners Ferry*. "Caribou" Fairchild, nicknamed "Caribou" by Canadian-French when he was a prospector in the Caribou fields of British Columbia, was important in the development of the silver mines in North Idaho. Sam Clark was an early settler; whether the fact that he bore the same name as the explorer affected the choice of his name for Clark County is not recorded, but I strongly suspect that it did. Franklin D. Richards, a Mormon who led the first permanent colony of settlers into Idaho (1860), gave rise to the name *Franklin County*. Jerome County honors Jerome Kuhn, one of the promoters of the Twin Falls North Side Irrigation Project, which sparked development of the area. The Hudson Bay Company placed Francis Payette in charge of old Fort Boise during its existence, and Payette County, created in 1917, was named in his honor. Ada County is named after the first white child born in Boise City, Ada Riggs, daughter of the Honorable H. C. Riggs. In somewhat the same manner in which *Ada* symbolizes the birth of a white community, *Lemhi* symbolizes the birth of a Mormon community (*Lemhi* is a character in *The Book of Mormon*).

Donald McKenzie, leader of the Snake River Expedition sent out by the Hudson Bay Company in 1818, named Bear Lake because of the great number of black bears in that area; and the name was transferred to the county in which the lake is located.⁵ *Cassia* derives from the cassia plant growing plentifully along Cassia Creek, also named by Hudson Bay trappers. In a similar manner *Twin Falls*, *Clearwater Canyon*, *Teton*, and *Valley* are named for their most distinctive features. All of these except *Valley* might be called "shift" names, for they are transfers from the names of topographical features. *Clearwater County* is named for *Clearwater River*; *Butte*, for *Big Butte*, the largest of three buttes serving as a landmark to early immigrants traveling the Oregon Trail; *Teton*, for *Teton Peaks* in Eastern Wyoming, which overlook the county; and *Canyon County*, for the *SNAKE RIVER CANYON*, which forms a natural boundary on the southwest. *Valley* derives its name from the very beautiful valley forming the most important portion of the county.

Non-topographical descriptive titles are to be seen in the nomenclature of *Boundary*, *Elmore*, and *Power* counties. *Boundary County* joins the boundary lines between the United States and Canada. *Elmore* is named for the *IDA ELMORE QUARTZ MINE*, one of the greatest gold-producing mines of the 1860's; this is the only county name known certainly to be derived from the precious minerals that gave fame to the state during this period. And *Power County* is named for the *AMERICAN FALLS CANAL AND POWER COMPANY*, which drew settlers to the area after 1908. The last county, *Gem*, is now an agricultural "gem," though it was the gold rush that attracted its first settlers. The name *Gem* is said by local residents to be a clipped

form of the popular state epithet, "Gem of the Mountains."⁶

Local incidents evoked the "shift" names of *Boise* and *Owyhee* Counties. In 1834, French-Canadian trappers, when they came upon a wooded area along a stream after many days' travel through sagebrush and dust in the heat of summer, exclaimed, "Les bois! Les bois! Voyez les bois!" The *Boise River* is still often called "Wooded River" and the town, "City of Trees." *Owyhee County* receives its name from an incident of 1819. Donald McKenzie, Hudson Bay trapper, outfitted three *Owyhees* to trap the stream draining the southeastern part of Idaho. Indians found and murdered the men and their bones were found on the banks of the stream; hence the river and the area came to be called *Owyhee*.⁷

Counties bearing Indian names follow two patterns: those derived from names of tribes or chieftains, and those from descriptive words. The *Bannack*, *Kootenai*, *Coeur d'Alene*, *Nez Perce*, and *Shoshone* tribes continued to hold tribal councils, gather camas roots, fish, and hunt in Idaho long after statehood was achieved; and some of these tribes still follow their ancient tribal customs to some degree despite the supposedly civilizing effects of reservation life. All of the tribes listed above except *Coeur d'Alene* gave rise to names of counties.

The meaning of the names has some interest for the etymologist. The *Bannack* tribe belongs to the Shoshonean family and derives its name from two Shoshone words meaning "hair" and "backward motion," from the manner in which the tribe wore a tuft of hair thrown back from the forehead. The name of the county, however, is "*Bannock*, rather than *Bannack*. *Kootenai* means "water people," for these Indians lived, virtually, in the water. The *Nez Perce* Indians were so called by French-Canadian trappers, one source says because of the custom of piercing their noses; however, this tribe did not practice nose piercing. It is more likely that the correct translation of *Nez Perce* is "pressed nose," as the nose of the *Nez Perce* is naturally flattened, or compressed. The primitive sign of this tribe, made by seizing the cartilage of the nose between the thumb and index finger of the right hand, lends credence to the latter translation.⁸ *Benewah County* is named for an old *Coeur d'Alene* chief. *Oneida*, as explained earlier, comes ultimately from the name of an Iroquois tribe and was brought to Idaho by permanent settlers from New York.

Idaho, *Latah*, *Minidoka*, and *Camas* come from descriptive Indian words. *Idaho* has been interpreted as an Indian expression meaning "light on the mountain," though Rees says that the county was named after the *Steamboat Idaho*, which plied the *Columbia River* throughout the 1860's.⁹ *Latah* is an acronym of two *Nez Perce* words: *lakah* "place of the pines" and *tah-ol* "pestle." In tribal days the *Nez Perce* found a stone in present *Benewah County* out of which they made pestles for grinding and pulverizing *camas* roots; pines grew plentifully there. *Minidoka*, Shoshone for "broad expanse," is especially appropriate, for the county occupies the broadest part of the *SNAKE RIVER* plains. And *Camas County* bears the *Chinook* name for the edible root found over much of the state, but especially plentiful in this area.

Further examination of the county names in relation to the chronology of their assignment reveals a significant change in the place name patterns, as well as the sophistication of the name-choosing body.¹⁰ This change reflects both a growing pride in statehood and a diminishing influence of Indian nomenclature.

Idaho Territory was established by congressional act in 1863 with four counties: *Shoshone*, *Nez Perce*, *Idaho*, and *Ada*. The

first three of these names are either of Indian origin or name an Indian tribe; they were assigned by Washington Territorial Legislature and retained by the newly created *Idaho Territory*. From 1863-67, *Idaho Territorial Legislature* established five new counties. Two (*Kootenai* and *Oneida*) are of Indian origin, and two (*Boise* and *Owyhee*) derive from local incident.

The period from 1867-1890, when *Idaho* achieved statehood, saw new influences on nomenclature. Problems with the Indians had been fairly well settled, and the gold rush had ushered in a new breed of transients and settlers. With the increased population, establishment of 12 new counties became mandatory, for the seats of government were too far apart. Only one of these, *Latah*, is of Indian origin; but six are namesakes of famous statesmen and pathfinders—*Washington*, *Lincoln*, *Bingham*, *Blaine*, *Fremont*, and *Custer*; three are descriptive—*Bear Lake*, *Cassia*, and *Elmore*; and one is from *The Book of Mormon*.

Though it was under the administration of *Lincoln* that the *Idaho Territory* was established, his name was to be proposed several times before he was to be honored with a namesake. *Lincoln* was proposed in 1879 for the county established as *Washington*, but the proposal was defeated because the legislators felt that no other president should be honored before the first. Then mindful of the great contribution made by early pathfinders, they named *Fremont County* after *John C. Fremont*, who headed a government expedition in 1843-50 to survey routes to the West. Again in 1881, the name *Lincoln* lost to *Custer*, for *Custer's* last stand and his death at the *Battle of Little Big Horn* were fresh in the minds of *Idaho* settlers. Governor *Bunn* might have chosen *Lincoln* for the name of another county in 1885, when the *Territorial Legislature* gave him the privilege; however, he chose *Bingham* instead. The same session saw the creation of *Blaine County*, named after the American statesman the Honorable *James G. Blaine*. Then 13 days later, when division of *Blaine County* seemed advisable, *Lincoln* finally came into his own, for the new county was named in his honor, 22 years after he had exerted considerable influence in establishing the *Idaho Territory*.

Thus, the period of 1867-1890 marks a time of recognition of statesmen, pathfinders, and generals important to the development of the area, and the initiation of names descriptive of certain natural and developmental features. In the next ten years are seen only two addition to the existing counties, one descriptive (*Canyon*) and the other Indian (*Bannock*).

The number of names derived from people of importance to the development of the state rises sharply in the period between 1900 and 1919. *Bonner*, *Caribou*, *Clark*, *Jerome*, and *Franklin* reflect local importance; *Lewis*, *Bonneville*, *Payette*, *Benewah*, and *Gooding*, state and regional; and *Adams*, *Madison*, and *Jefferson*, national. It seems that *Jefferson*, who was responsible for acquiring the area for the *United States* in the first place, was even more flagrantly neglected than was *Lincoln*, for he was not given a namesake until 1913.

Descriptive titles also assume a new importance during this period. *Twin Falls*, *Clearwater*, *Teton*, *Butte*, and *Valley* are topographic names; *Boundary*, geographical; *Gem*, a clipped toponym; and *Power*, *Camas*, and *Minidoka*, descriptive. The last two and *Bannock* and *Benewah* are the only county names derived from Indian sources after *Idaho* achieved statehood.

It is obvious that English influence on the nomenclature of *Idaho* counties has increased in proportion to the growing importance of English-speaking people to the development of the state. In like manner, the influence of French and Indian has de-

creased, and that of Spanish (indirect by any explanation, the one name being a transfer of a Spanish generic term from the Southwest) disappears altogether. Moreover, the patterns of English-derived names show somewhat more variety than do those from other languages. Spanish, French, and Indian names are either descriptive or commemorative of individuals or tribes, with some influence from local incident. English names, on the other hand, are commemorative of people of local, regional, national, and religious significance; descriptive of topographical, geographical, and man-made features, and of flora and fauna; plus some local incident and one coined word.

FOOTNOTES

¹ O. D. Wheeler, historian, traveled over the Lewis and Clark Trail in 1904, comparing it with the diaries of the Lewis and Clark Expedition and noting changes found. He quotes copiously from the diaries and includes some photostats of pertinent pages; he also points out errors made by the explorers resulting from misinterpretation of their Indian informants. Both the photostatic excerpts and Wheeler's commentaries pertaining to the Idaho portion of the Trail have been examined. O. D. Wheeler, *Trail of Lewis and Clark, 1804-1806*, 2 vols. (New York, 1904), *passim*.

² "Major feature" is referred to here, for there are records of at least two other instances of the assignment of names, *Hungry and Colt-killed Creeks* (both have been renamed), before this instance.

Lewis and Clark recorded *Koos-Koos-ka* "Kooskooskee." Wheeler cites evidence that the explorers possibly misunderstood the word as being the name of the stream, when it was only descriptive of the waters of the stream. His information comes from Silas B. Smith, grandson of Chief Comowool, Clastop Tribe; Smith, an educated and intelligent man, has this to say about Indian name-giving: "I wish to state this proposition, which cannot be overthrown, that the Indians of the Northwest country, extending as far back as the Rocky Mountains, never named a river as a river; they name localities. . . they may say this water leads to such a place . . . but never name a stream" Wheeler, II, pp. 19 and 224.

³ Cram's Superior Map of Idaho, based on U.S. Land Survey, shows the following place names of French origin in this area: *Pend Oreille, Caribou, Chatcolet, St. Maries, Santa, Desmet, Nez Perce, Bruneau*, and *Boise*.

⁴ John E. Rees, *Idaho: Chronology, Nomenclature, and Bibliography* (Chicago 1919), pp. 46-51; H. H. Bancroft, *History of Washington, Idaho, and Montana* (San Francisco, 1890), pp. 399-400; John P. Harrington (Bureau of American Ethnology), "Origin of Our State Names," *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 34, No. 8 (August 15, 1944). These authorities attribute the word *Idaho* to *Shoshoni* origin, but they interpret the word variously as "Gem of the Mountains," "Light on the Mountains," "Sunrise Mountain," and "Riverite." Both Rees and Bancroft knew *Shoshoni*, and Harrington consulted adepts in the *Shoshoni* language; I have therefore accepted their classification. Others dispute the *Shoshoni* origin, but they did not know the language. For the most complete bibliography on this subject, see Erl. H. Ellis, "That Word 'Idaho'" *Studies in Humanities*, No. 2 (University of Denver Press, 1951).

⁵ See Rees, pp. 54-55, and *Idaho Encyclopedia*, compiled by Vardis Fisher (Caldwell, Idaho, 1938), p. 221.

⁶ *Idaho: American Guide Series* (New York, 1950), p. 281, and Rees, p. 67. The contour of Gem County resembles that of the state and may have influenced this choice.

⁷ Rees, pp. 68 and 99.

⁸ *Nez Perce* is discussed under Indian

names primarily because it honors the tribe that gave up its own name for the French designation; it reflects Indian influence. For an explanation of its meaning, see Rees, p. 95.

⁹ Rees, p. 48.

¹⁰ See the following references for the dates and accounts for establishing Idaho counties: *Idaho Encyclopedia*, pp. 210-346; and *The Idaho Almanac*, published by the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development (Boise, Idaho, 1963).

GENERAL CARROLL E. ADAMS, JR.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1970, Brig. Gen. Carroll E. Adams, Jr., commanding officer of the 937th Engineer Combat Group of the U.S. Army Engineer Command in Vietnam was killed as a result of a helicopter accident caused by hostile fire. General Adams, known by his many friends affectionately as "Hap" was an outstanding officer and leader and was highly respected among the men he served with.

General Adams was born in Pawtucket, R.I., on June 7, 1923. He was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, in 1945. He held a masters degree in civil engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1949, and a masters degree in international affairs from George Washington University, 1963. He graduated from the Engineer School, Fort Belvoir, Va.; Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, D.C.; and the Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

He served for 1 year, 1949 to 1950, as assistant division engineer, New England division, where he had responsibilities for both water resource and military construction programs in that area. Miscellaneous assignments followed, interspersed with educational periods.

General Adams served from 1959 to 1960 in Baffin Island, Canada, and Keflavik, Iceland, on military construction work. From 1960 to 1962, he was assigned to the Corps of Engineers Ballistic Missile Construction Office, Los Angeles, Calif.

After graduating from the Army War College, in 1963, he was on the college staff for another year. In 1965 he went to Europe as battalion commander, 3d Engineer Battalion, 24th Infantry Division, U.S. Army Europe. From January 1966, to January 1967, he was with the Central Group Headquarters, near Heidelberg, Germany, and, from January 1967 to January 1970, he served with great distinction as District Engineer of the U.S. Army Engineers' Norfolk District in Norfolk, Va. General Adams did an excellent job as district engineer in Norfolk, where he was responsible for the Corps of Engineers program for this district. Nearing the completion of this assignment he requested duty in Vietnam and reported there in early February 1970 as

commanding officer of the 937th Engineer Combat Group.

On June 9, 1945, General Adams, then a second lieutenant, and Dorothy Ronne were married at Pawtucket, R.I. They had three sons—Robert A., a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, in the class of 1968, who was on duty in Vietnam at the time of his father's death and was severely burned about his hands and arms in Vietnam 4 days before the death of his father while rescuing and saving the lives of a pilot and copilot from a burning helicopter; Jonathan, a student at Deerfield Academy, has received an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy—William, at home in Norfolk—and a daughter Ronnie, a school-teacher at the Army Dependent School System in Germany. I know I speak for all the members of the committee in expressing our sincere regrets to his wife, Dorothy, and his sons, Robert, Jonathan, and William, and his daughter Ronnie.

Immediately prior to the crash of the helicopter in which he was a passenger, a promotion to brigadier general had been approved. Because of his excellent and outstanding record as an officer he was promoted to brigadier general posthumously. General "Hap" Adams served in the finest tradition of engineer-soldier of the Corps of Engineers and he will be missed by all of us.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. DOROTHY O'HARA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, an article in the *San Pedro, Calif., News Pilot* recognized an active and personable lady, Mrs. Dorothy O'Hara. Mrs. O'Hara, who is the newly elected president of the San Pedro Garden Club, has a most interesting background. I would like to further honor her by commending to my colleagues and inserting in the *RECORD* the following article dated May 22, 1970, which reveals the grand personality and activities of Dorothy O'Hara:

GARDEN CLUB INSTALLS MRS. O'HARA

Dorothy O'Hara newly elected president of the San Pedro Garden Club, calls herself a geographical oddity.

She is probably the only native Californian who reversed the usual procedure, and went to live in Arkansas. Usually it is just the opposite. Because her father was in the mining business, she spent most of her childhood traveling all over North America.

She was the first white baby in Gold Field, Nevada, learned to walk in Mexico City, and went to school in San Antonio for three months. This was the only formal schooling she had till she was in the ninth grade. Because of all the traveling, she required a private tutor, who let her do about as she pleased. She was far ahead in English, history, and languages, but confesses that she still does not know her multiplication tables, or whether to spell *Oat* with one or two K's.

After her father switched from mining to oil, he settled down in Little Rock long

enough for two years of high school for his orbiting daughter. The late Dick Powell was one of her close friends, but no one in the teen age crowd ever thought it would be curly headed, cherub faced Dick, who would make it big in Hollywood.

In 1921 Dorothy moved to Los Angeles and was graduated from Los Angeles High, then on to USC to major in creative writing. Then off again for a junket through Europe, four years in Florida and West Texas, Amarillo, where her father brought in the largest gas well ever drilled. It remained the world's biggest fire hazard for years.

She lived in Vienna one year until she returned to California for good.

It was in 1942, when she moved to the Harbor Area, and lived in a house for the first time in her life, that she became interested in gardening.

Living in hotels and being the perennial gypsy, does not give one much chance to put down roots.

It was when she discovered that flowers did not always come from florists, or parks, that she bought a package of Zenia seeds. The results were quite baffling to her, till a neighbor explained that the reason so many different kinds of plants grew from one packet of seeds, was that about half of them were weeds.

Once she learned to tell the difference, the Zenias grew fabulously. Nothing she has planted since has done as well. Beginners luck, but it was all it took for her to get hooked and become a flower child.

Two years ago, it became evident that the weeds were far more persistent than the flowers, so when they started giving aid and comfort to the gardener's arch enemy, the snail, she sold her home and moved into a dandelion free apartment at 677 W. Thirteenth St.

This makes her the only garden club president without a garden, unless you count a plant stand full of ferns, and an 18 by 36-inch replica of a desert, landscaped with small, unusual cacti. There is even a miniature ceramic snail creeping over the sand dune, "Just for old time sake."

Mrs. O'Hara is the mother of two sons, John and Danny. John is personnel and public relations director at Todd Shipyard Corp. Both live in the San Pedro area and have made Mrs. O'Hara a grandmother three times over.

In addition to active participation in the garden club, she has been a member of United Church Women, women's fellowship at First Christian Church and president of Tenth District PTA.

Mrs. O'Hara still keeps a hand in creative writing, and studies current events as they relate to history (the Plantagenet kings) and Shakespeare. She loves music as well.

ANOTHER SETBACK FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, following months of discussion and debate, the House Committee on Agriculture, Tuesday, experienced another setback. On the eve of expected approval of a compromise farm bill the committee adjourned in confusion with the outlook for completion of its work more uncertain than ever.

The committee has been meeting in continued sessions for more than a year

attempting to iron out differences but hit a serious snag. The snag developed when a political issue rather than a policy decision seemed to dominate the thinking of several members of the committee.

I am proposing today that in view of the excessive delays of the committee in reporting out a bill, despite the valiant efforts of the committee leadership and the generous cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff, time has come, indeed it is past, when the Secretary should proceed with plans for a wheat referendum.

The law states that falling the adoption of new legislation, the Secretary is required to hold a referendum of wheat producers not later than August 1 regarding their choices for a program for next year's wheat crop. Time is getting late. The last wheat referendum in which the farmers overwhelmingly defeated a quota-certificate system, was held May 21, 1963—more than 2 months ahead of statutory deadline. The law requires the referendum to be held at any time before August 1.

With the farmers in the wheat producing areas of the Southwestern States normally planting their wheat in mid-August or early September, the date of the referendum is already late. I am certain it has been delayed by the Secretary in the hope that new legislation would be approved, making the referendum unnecessary.

Further delay would be an injustice to farmers and to Congress. It would take the pressure for new farm legislation off the House Committee on Agriculture. What the committee needs is more pressure—not less.

Farmers are entitled to know well in advance what program will be in effect. A further delay in the referendum would deny them proper notice.

From the standpoint of the Congress, delay will serve only to give the House Committee on Agriculture an excuse for more wheel spinning and possibly delay adjournment of this session of Congress. Legislation on farm programs is one of the main obstacles to adjournment. Appropriation bills have been moving on schedule. For weeks the appropriation bill for agriculture has been ready, except for changes the legislative committee product may require.

In past years, the rush toward adjournment has often been used as the excuse to overcome objections and win quick approval of controversial farm bills. A delay in the wheat referendum would play into the hands of those who would use such tactics, and I for one want the House to have ample time to study and consider improvements on whatever the Committee on Agriculture produces.

On the other hand, several members of the committee are not pleased with the alternatives, which under present law, would be presented in the August referendum. They want a different program for wheat farmers, one which would have the effect of setting aside the referendum.

The committee has been considering farm program legislation for nearly 16 months—nearly twice a normal gestation

period. The imminence of a wheat referendum hopefully will induce labor pains in the committee and give birth to a healthy offspring.

I talked yesterday with Secretary Hardin and urged him to delay no longer in setting the date of the wheat referendum in light of the most recent failure of the committee to reach agreement. By this means, I announce my intention to oppose any legislative efforts to delay the wheat referendum. I understand several Senators are considering such a move.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE COMMENTS ON ALLEGATIONS OF INADEQUATE INSPECTION OF IMPORTED MEATS

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently charges that the current procedures for inspection of imported meats are inadequate. As chairman of the Select Committee on the House Restaurant and a restaurateur of many years experience, I was naturally deeply concerned by allegations that the inspection regulations for imported meats are not comparable to those applicable to our domestically produced meats. Some of these assertions flatly stated that imported meats were allowed to enter the country containing all sorts of impurities.

I was under the impression that inspection regulations for imported meats were fully comparable to those applicable to our domestic product and provided an equal assurance to the consumer of a wholesome product. In light of the recent allegations to the contrary, I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture requesting his comments on these allegations of inadequate inspection of imported meats.

I am pleased to have the facts in his reply and insert it in the RECORD at this point as a matter of interest to all Members of Congress:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Washington, D.C., May 22, 1970.

HON. JOHN KLUCZYNSKI,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: Thank you for your letter of May 5 about certain items in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning imported meats.

We believe there are some points raised in the articles that should be clarified.

The eligibility of foreign countries to export meat to the United States is contingent on their ability to demonstrate that they have an organized inspection program that produces results equal to that of the Federal program in this country. The actual inspection is carried out by nationals of the exporting country. Visits by Department experts are made to insure that such inspections are being done properly and that product to be exported to the United States meets the standards. Further, officials of the foreign program are required to make supervisory visits to each export plant at least once monthly and report on performance in meeting U.S. standards.

Our review officers visit each exporting plant at least once a year, and in many cases more frequently. When they find that the required inspection and sanitation standards are not being applied in foreign plants, the eligibility of such plants to export to us is removed.

Inspectional staffing of foreign plants compares very favorably with our domestic plants. In calendar year 1969, there were almost 7,500 foreign inspectors assigned to the 1,141 plants eligible to export meat to the United States. On the home front, we had about 4,600 inspectors in the approximately 3,200 domestic plants operating under Federal meat inspection.

In addition, all imported meats are inspected lot-by-lot as they arrive at the port of entry. To provide uniformity of inspection as it is applied to both programs, our import inspection is structured to the examination of randomly selected, statistically sound sampling plans on the same basis as similar domestic products. Such sampling methods are recognized as valid for many food items and other types of products.

The sampling plans were drawn to give a high confidence level that a lot of meat must be well within the proper quality level before it is passed for consumption. In our judgment, the emphasis in the articles on possible fecal contamination is not realistic.

The table of defects and their classification were established by studying samples of domestic boneless meat produced under clean, sanitary conditions in U.S. plants. Our inspectors tabulated and seized each defect found. At the conclusion of the study, our statistical staff analyzed the data and provided us with acceptable quality levels based upon best commercial practice in this country.

Our inspection system, the same for imported and domestic meat, is designed to give an analysis of the type and number of defects found in the sample that will be a dependable indicator on which to base rejection or acceptance. Shipments that fail to qualify are refused entry.

We should also point out that the United States is the only meat importing country maintaining this level of strict surveillance by personal review over foreign producing establishments. The United States also exports a large amount of meat byproducts to many foreign countries. The sale of these meat byproducts helps to maintain and stabilize meat prices and the livestock market in this country.

Sincerely,

RICHARD LYNG,
Assistant Secretary.

HONORABLE LESLIE ARENDS CELEBRATES 27TH YEAR AS MINORITY WHIP

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his 27th year as minority whip, I commend and congratulate the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS for his dedicated service in the House of Representatives and to his constituents.

While we sit across the aisle, I consider LES a personal and special friend with whom I have had the opportunity and pleasure of serving as a delegate to the NATO Assembly.

My warmest good wishes upon the achievement of this milestone are extended to my good friend and his charming wife.

ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES—THE PRODUCT OF PEOPLE POWER

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to receive a copy of a prize-winning essay written by a high school student in Purdin, Mo.

The essay was submitted to the Rural Electric Cooperative's Youth to Washington Contest by Jeff McKenzie, who will be touring Washington with the other winners from June 12 to 20.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Jeff's outstanding essay follows:

ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES—THE PRODUCT OF PEOPLE POWER

One of the first things I remember learning from my parents was about God, and Faith in Jesus Christ. They taught me that anything is possible if one only believe and the Lord is willing. They stressed to me that my goals may look insurmountable at times but if I would get a good education sparked with a little good old-fashioned horse sense I would achieve my goals. I must have the courage to accept disappointment and if I first don't succeed to keep trying. This must be how the Product of People Power came about by the visions and dreams of the generations past put to work.

I love to hear my parents talk of times past and how they lived before they had electricity. It seems so long ago to me that my Dad was farming with horses, milking cows, raising hogs and sheep with no modern facilities. My Mom washed the lamp flues of kerosene lamps every morning because they were always smoked. Milk, butter, and cheese were stored in a celler because there were no refrigerators. There was the everlasting cleaning, as she called it, because of the wood-burning stove. She really believed in the adage "Cleanliness is next to Godliness". This is so vividly clear to them and only history to me. Electric Cooperatives and the Product of People Power has changed that way of life. The development of rural electric power and its contribution to my home would have been unbelievable a few years ago.

At first it was doubted if electricity would ever pay its way. Some electric companies would have extended service to farmers who were willing to pay for the lines and the construction. It was so costly that it was too much for the average farmer to spend, and if they did the power companies would retain the title to the lines. During President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Administration the giant step was taken, and the federal government decided to lend a hand. After this the farmer who had been dreaming of improvements went into action on upgrading America's rural economy. The difference in working standards between the rural and city dweller has been erased by electric power in the quiet revolution. As Abraham Lincoln once said, "It is right and proper for the government to help the people to help themselves". This is the Rural Electrification Administration program of today.

Main Street impact of the rural electrification movement has been felt all over the country. New appliance stores and equipment dealers appeared in towns to meet the growing rural demands for electrical equipment.

Non-profit cooperatives were organized and owned by the rural people using the electrical services. Rural Electrification Administration is the banker for Rural Electric Cooperatives. Missouri's co-ops starting from nothing have built more than 90,000 miles

of power lines. Central Station Electric Service includes both the farm and non-farm population (under 1,500 people) which is an important factor by itself.

Time has proven the service to be sound and practical. Ninety-eight percent of rural America has electricity today.

President John F. Kennedy, during his administration, and congress voted to help export the idea of rural electrification to the newly developing nations of the world. This makes the R.E.A. global in scope.

Benjamin Franklin and his kite have a special significance to the world in the first expressway for electricity. The farmer, urban family, modern housing, hospitals, education and industries are just a few of the benefactors. Electric power is used to enrich, sustain, and protect our economy and our culture.

I'm looking forward to telling the next generation about the space program. The marvel of going to the moon will just be history to them. They will take it for granted as I have the power across the land. I can only try to visualize how we shall be living in the future. If we had a Rip Van Winkle to awaken now he wouldn't think of going back to sleep in this challenging world of ours with our democratic free enterprize system.

We should cast our eyes to the horizon and never stop reaching for improvement. We're not taking away from the beauty and wonder of nature, we're just adding to nature. The Product of People Power is our world today. It is a contributing factor for women in living to raise their children to adulthood, and to grow old gracefully and in comfort. Men accomplish much more than feeding the world. They make it a greater and better place to live. Children have a chance to grow up and make the new world of tomorrow.

What will the Engineers of tomorrow build? To stand still would be to stagnate. It will be so much more fun to work for improvement than student revolts, draft card burnings or hippie movements. America has so much to offer and I for one am going to forge full speed ahead and not waste the opportunity she offers. The Lord willing tomorrow will be a better day and closer to peace.

THE 1970 SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC., PROPOSALS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Smaller Business Association of New England has again distinguished itself on behalf of small business by its outstanding congressional presentation given to both the House and Senate Select Committee on Small Business and the New England congressional delegation on Wednesday, May 20.

I consider it a great privilege to have the opportunity to work with SBANE, which is the only regional association for small business in the country. Its continuous quality educational efforts and responsible legislative proposals are important contributions for all those concerned about the vital role of small business. SBANE, founded in 1938 as a private nonprofit, nonpartisan organization has offered its proposals to the Congress in an annual visit for many years.

The 1970 proposals focus on three critical areas for congressional concern; a small business surtax exemption, assistance in pollution control, and the strengthening of the Small Business Administration. Other subjects included are patents, pension plans, procurement, transportation, and labor.

The Washington presentation team was headed by SBANE President Richard G. Lee, president of Lee Packaging Machinery Corp., Needham, Mass. Mr. Douglas S. Dillman, vice president, Horn Packaging & Paper Co., Cambridge, Mass., gave the presentation, which included an outstanding graphic display, to the Small Business Committee.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the activities of this association which provides so many excellent services to our region. I feel that these 1970 proposals are truly worthy of national interest.

The presentation follows:

THE 1970 SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC., PROPOSALS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

(Presented by Richard G. Lee)

INTRODUCTION

Before presenting our 1970 Proposals for Congressional Action, I thank you for providing this opportunity to offer some constructive suggestions and commentary which we believe vital to a healthy small business environment.

For a better insight into the Association and its purposes, I refer to some of the highlights of the SBANE Fact Sheet as it appeared in the February 3, 1970 Congressional Record.

SBANE is a private, non-profit Association of over 800 New England small companies representing manufacturers, retailers, banks, wholesale distributors, lawyers, accountants, and other service firms of every description.

SBANE's services include substantial efforts in the areas of educational-informational programs to encourage self-improvement in executive management.

The SBANE magazine, *New England Business*, features articles circulated to some 1,700 small business subscribers providing an excellent medium for management-educational subjects.

SBANE's "Live-In" Seminar on the campus of the Harvard Business School, has for the last several years had as its Educational Director, Dean Frank L. Tucker, who served on President Nixon's Task Force on Improving the Prospects of Small Business.

The Annual Meeting and Small Business Conference, Breakfast Club, Trade Development Programs, Group Insurance, Unemployment Cost Control Program and Business Counseling are just some of the many additional programs we offer our growing membership.

SBANE is the only regional Association for small business in the country. Although there are national small business associations, their services are almost exclusively legislative. They do not offer the extensive educational programs or membership liaison which our regional Association does.

SBANE's legislative programs, instead of simply pointing to the problems affecting small business, aim at keeping the Congress aware of the legislative needs that can be effected by you, our lawmakers. SBANE makes specific proposals on behalf of the nation's small businessmen—a highlight of our legislative program is today's Washington Presentation. SBANE also appears at various committee hearings and provides the membership with timely Flash Bulletins cov-

ering important issues and bills under consideration.

When inserting the SBANE Fact Sheet in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressman F. Bradford Morse, a recent Breakfast Club speaker, stated that since its incorporation in 1938, "SBANE has served with distinction a great number of New England small businesses, and, indirectly, their national counterparts. I personally have had many opportunities to work with SBANE and have come to depend upon it as a valuable and responsible source of small business information. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to SBANE's recently published 'Fact Sheet' which provides an idea of the breadth of its activities."

Senator Alan Bible, Chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, speaking on the floor of the Senate in February on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of that Committee stated, "... and certainly the most dynamic, live-wire and capable regional association is the Smaller Business Association of New England, headquartered in Boston, Mass. These organizations, their individual members and their staffs assist tremendously in the mutual efforts to help the small businessman with his myriad of problems."

Today's visual presentation, at the suggestion of many in the Congress, will be limited to cover three main subject areas rather than a general over-view of the broad spectrum of issues of concern to small business. We trust this more concentrated approach will be more effective in highlighting in greater depth the three areas where your efforts, in our opinion, are needed the most—Tax Reform, Pollution and the Small Business Administration. Presenting proposals on these subjects is the Chairman of the SBANE Washington Presentation Committee and Past President of the Association, Douglas S. Dillman, Vice President, Horn Packaging & Paper Company, Cambridge.

TAXATION

Committee Chairman: Richard M. Glennon, Partner, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company, Boston, Massachusetts.

Limited increase in surtax exemption to \$50,000

One of the three major problems confronting small business is its need for capi-

tal to sustain its operations and to provide for growth. This need is recognized by all who concern themselves with small business. The means for satisfying this need are twofold; infusions of capital from the outside and the retention of internally generated resources. The report of the President's Task Force on Improving the Prospects of Small Business recommends, among other things, the application of tax incentives to aid in accomplishing desired results. The report recommends that those suppliers of credit and equity capital to small business be provided with favorable tax treatment on the income from their loans and that a preferential rate for capital gains on investments in small enterprises be provided. Further the report recommends the establishment of a ten-year carryover period for net operating losses during the first ten years of business existence and a deduction from taxable income for an addition to a "small business risk reserve." SBANE endorses these proposals. However, we also recommend that the exemption from surtax be increased for small businesses as a means of directly building up working capital.

Since 1938 corporations have paid a tax at a normal rate on the first \$25,000 of income and at a surtax rate on the income in excess of \$25,000. The difference in tax rate on the first \$25,000 has since come to be known as the surtax exemption. The exemption has remained the same for 32 years and in view of the elimination by the Tax Reform Act of 1969 of multiple surtax exemptions, we believe this to be an appropriate time for a limited increase in the exemption to \$50,000.

The simplest means of effecting an increase in the surtax exemption would be to make it applicable to all corporations; however, the following schedule indicates that to do so would result in a reduction in the revenue of approximately 368.9 million dollars. This estimate, as are all of the succeeding estimates, is based upon statistics taken from 1965 corporation income tax returns which were the latest data available to SBANE. We do not believe that a reduction in corporate income taxes of such a substantial amount is appropriate at this time as a matter of fiscal policy. In addition, over \$258 million of the tax reduction would inure to the benefit of corporations having taxable income in excess of \$50,000.

TAX EFFECT OF UNLIMITED INCREASE IN SURTAX EXEMPTION TO \$50,000—UNCONTROLLED CORPORATIONS HAVING TAXABLE INCOME BY INCOME CATEGORIES

Number of corporations.....	43,735	20,913	9,187	73,825
Taxable income.....	\$26-50,000,000	50-100,000,000	100-150,000,000	Total
Tax savings (millions).....	\$110.8	135.9	122.2	368.9
Tax savings as percent of total tax savings paid by group.....	24.9	24.6	(1)	
Tax savings as percent of total tax savings by all.....	30.03	36.84	33.13	100.00
Average tax savings per corporation.....	\$2,533	6,500	6,500	
Tax savings as percent of total corporation tax revenues collected in 1965.....				1.42
Tax savings as percent of total taxes collected in 1965.....				0.31

1 Figures not meaningful due to limitations of data

Since we believe that the increased exemption should apply only to smaller corporations, it becomes necessary to define what a smaller corporation is for this purpose. There are several criteria for distinguishing between smaller and larger businesses, such as gross assets, net worth, and gross sales. However, after a considerable amount of study, it would appear that to restrict the benefit of the increased surtax exemption using one of these standards would result in its inequitable application in many cases. Thus, we believe that a standard that is based on the tax itself would be most direct and equitable.

Accordingly, SBANE proposes an increase in the surtax exemption as follows:

1. Corporations having taxable income

of \$50,000 or less would have a surtax exemption of \$50,000.

2. Corporations having taxable income of more than \$50,000 but less than \$100,000 would have a surtax exemption of \$50,000 reduced by 50% of each dollar of taxable income in excess of \$50,000.

3. Corporations having taxable income in excess of \$100,000 would have a surtax exemption of \$25,000.

Only a single surtax exemption would be available to members of a controlled group of corporations consistent with the provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

The application of this change in the surtax exemption to corporations having varying levels of income, is set forth below.

Taxable income.....	\$40,000
Surtax exemption.....	40,000
Tax: 22% × \$40,000.....	8,800
<hr/>	
Taxable income.....	80,000
<hr/>	
Surtax exemption:	
Basic exemption.....	50,000
Less 50% (80,000—50,000).....	15,000
Total.....	35,000
<hr/>	
Income subject to surtax.....	45,000
Tax:	
22% × \$35,000.....	7,700
48% × 45,000.....	21,600
Total.....	29,300
<hr/>	
Taxable income.....	120,000
Surtax exemption.....	25,000
<hr/>	
Income subject to surtax.....	95,000
Tax:	
22% × \$25,000.....	5,500
48% × 95,000.....	45,600
Total.....	51,100

The following table sets forth the tax rates presently in effect and after application of the proposed limited surtax exemption to corporate taxable income at various levels from \$20,000 to \$100,000.

Taxable income	Present rates		New rates		Tax savings
	Tax ¹	Effective rate (percent)	Tax ¹	Effective rate (percent)	
\$20,000.....	4,400	22.0	4,400	22.0	0
25,000.....	5,500	22.0	5,500	22.0	0
30,000.....	7,900	26.3	6,600	22.0	1,300
35,000.....	10,300	29.4	7,700	22.0	2,600
40,000.....	12,700	31.8	8,800	22.0	3,900
45,000.....	15,100	33.6	9,900	22.0	5,200
50,000.....	17,500	35.0	11,000	22.0	6,500
55,000.....	19,900	36.2	14,050	25.5	5,850
65,000.....	24,700	38.0	20,150	31.0	4,550
75,000.....	29,500	39.3	26,250	35.0	3,250
85,000.....	34,300	40.4	32,350	38.1	1,950
95,000.....	39,100	41.2	38,450	40.5	650
100,000.....	41,500	41.5	41,500	41.5	0

¹ Excludes surcharge.

If this proposal were to be adopted we project (again using 1965 statistics) that the total reduction of revenues would approximate \$196 million annually after the six year phase-in period that we recommend. This would approximate three-quarters of 1% of the total taxes collected in 1965 from corporations.

Of the total saving, 56.5% or \$110.8 million would be realized by corporations having taxable income of \$50,000 or less and the remaining benefit would be realized by corporations having between \$50,000 and \$100,000 of taxable income. The following table sets forth the reduction in tax under the limited increase in surtax exemption.

TAX EFFECT OF LIMITED INCREASE IN SURTAX EXEMPTION TO \$50,000—UNCONTROLLED CORPORATIONS HAVING TAXABLE INCOME BY INCOME CATEGORIES

Number of uncontrolled corporations.....	43,735	20,913	64,648
Taxable income.....	\$26-50 million	50-100 million	Total
<hr/>			
Tax savings (millions).....	\$110.8	85.2	196.0
Tax savings as percent of total tax paid by group.....	24.9	15.4	
Tax savings as percent of total tax savings by all.....	56.5	43.5	100.0
Average tax savings per corporation.....	\$2,533	4,074	

Number of uncontrolled corporations.....	43,735	20,913	64,648
Taxable income.....	\$26-50 million	50-100 million	Total

Tax savings as percent of total corporate taxes collected in 1965.....	0.75
Tax savings as percent of total taxes collected in 1965.....	.17

We recommend that Congress consider phasing in the limited increase in surtax exemption over the period of time that the multiple surtax exemption is being phased out under the Tax Reform Act of 1969. Benefits of multiple surtax exemptions will be gradually reduced beginning in 1970 and will be completely removed by the end of 1975. We believe that the increase in revenue achieved by such phase-out should be considered in reaching a decision whether the limited increase in surtax exemption should be adopted.

SBANE's interest in the Small Business Administration dates back many years to the preceding agencies such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Smaller War Plants Corporation which were charged with some of the same responsibilities prior to the creation of the Small Business Administration in 1953.

SBANE's role in shaping the SBA Act is well known to the Congress and it is only natural that the Association should continuously scrutinize the functions and operations of the SBA and offer both deserved praise and constructive comment.

INTERVIEW OF FORMER ADMINISTRATORS

To provide a more complete assessment of this agency and its problems, members of the Association have interviewed several former Administrators. Nearly every previous Administrator for the past two decades was interviewed for his evaluations of the agency as its roles and areas of concentration have varied.

This project was initially undertaken in an attempt to determine the cause of the excessive turnover of Administrators especially during the past 10 years. We thought that maybe a pattern could be determined as to why there had been as many as nine Administrators in the last 11 years. We had expressed alarm last year that this short term of leadership made it difficult for the agency to maintain continuity of direction and purpose.

During interviews with these past Administrators, it became evident that there was no single reason for their departure from the SBA except for more attractive offers in related fields of interest. Although job stability in the position of the Administrator was our initial reason for the interviews, they all had additional comments about the functioning of this Agency which we will share with you.

First, they mentioned the apparent shifting of the loan policy from a merit basis to one more socially motivated without the usual standard, business-like requirements especially with minority loans. Behind this concern over the SBA's loan procedures lies this question: What will happen to the SBA should facts reveal a high percentage of minority loan failures? The Congress has always held the SBA in high regard and provided good support. However, since the SBA is lending public money, what will happen to the future of the agency should the Congress react if it feels that SBA loans were instead grants or subsidies? It is the feeling of many that safeguards should be developed that will prevent the devastating effects of a possible over-reaction to the SBA on its financial programs.

For this reason, this Association recommends that minority loans be handled through a Special Management-Finance Group within the SBA with its own funding programs. In addition, we believe that the Office of Minority Business Enterprise, established within the Department of Commerce last year to promote and expand business ownership by minority groups, should be the complete responsibility of the SBA. Further, that the SBA should be properly manned to carry out these responsibilities rather than the past policy of manning new programs by shifting personnel into unfamiliar areas at the expense of other important programs.

MINORITY ENTERPRISE STUDIES

Much has been said and written about minority entrepreneurship or compensatory capitalism. This Association has studied the report of Sam Harris Associates that evaluated the SBA and its role in minority economic development from August, 1968 to February, 1969. We were very impressed with this report and its recommendations, and we urge they be given careful thought and consideration.

We also recommend that the committee obtain a copy of a very interesting thesis by W. Bruce Springer, entitled, "The Prospects for Black Business Development." This recent Harvard graduate wrote this thesis after studying a vast number of census reports, studies and books on the subject of black business development.

It is interesting to note some of the similarities of the Harris Report and Springer's thesis.

The first is that SBA's past emphasis has been quantitative rather than qualitative. It would seem that the agency was more interested in the "numbers game" and promoting the establishment of "Mom and Pop" stores rather than emphasizing the growth and development of more stable, promising companies. Both studies also point up the need for more management and technical assistance in developing companies and recommend that the SBA put more emphasis on non-retail businesses, such as services, manufacturing, wholesaling and construction. Both Springer and Harris also recommend more attention be paid to the Local Development Company or "502" loan programs in the black community. We would recommend that, rather than devoting so much emphasis on starting marginal businesses, the SBA develop programs to upgrade existing operations.

SBANE agrees with Springer's recommendation that SBA should scrap its goal of 20,000 minority loans a year and replace it with programs that have qualitative dimensions: for example, \$40,000,000 in minority loans a year, at least one-fifth of which is to be granted in loans of \$100,000 or more as compared to the average minority loan during the first five months of 1969 which was \$19,829.42.

The Harris report stated that 45% of the Minority Entrepreneurship Program (MEP) team members, who felt the effect of Project Own would be insignificant, gave the reason that the "size and volume of loans granted is too small".

We would also recommend that the SBA develop comprehensive data, on the distribution of its loans by size and type of business and, in addition, follow the progress of the companies carefully to determine a pattern and level of progress with which to guide future loan commitments.

Both the Springer and Harris studies represent exhaustive, intelligent appraisals of the SBA involvement in Project Own. The Association believes strongly that the SBA should be the agency to foster entrepreneurship and realizes the great challenges it faces. If the agency is to merely serve as a transfer

of resources to marginal companies in the ghetto, then it is wasteful. In our opinion, programs should be developed to provide financial and technical assistance to develop larger, non-retail business firms for minority entrepreneurs and not the present emphasis on number of loans rather than number of dollars loaned.

Many recent studies have revealed the lack of sufficient management assistance followup to recipients of SGA loans. Many small businesses have failed after receiving financial assistance and then being left alone to face the many problems that confront beginning business during its formative years. The problem is further aggravated by lack of sufficient manpower to carry out the SBA's mounting responsibilities. To some the SBA is almost exclusively a lending institution. We believe this is wrong. The original Act calls for technical and management assistance programs, among others. We believe the only way this important function can be accomplished is by making the necessary manpower provisions.

MANPOWER REDISTRIBUTION

We would, therefore, recommend that the manpower distribution of the SBA should be reduced in the Washington office in favor of more representatives in the field, particularly in management assistance. When a small business has a problem or needs assistance, he does not have the manpower or time to travel about to seek solutions. The SBA would be much more effective if it had more qualified management assistance representatives in the field to offer help to small businesses.

As of January 1, 1970, some 23% of the total SBA manning was in Washington. (Total 4,032—Washington 929—Field 3,103). Many states have but one or two specialists in procurement, management assistance and financial assistance available. A serious workload burden presently exists in many states particularly in the rural states.

With some 5,000,000 small businesses throughout the country, it is obvious that Washington is not "where the action is". Not only should the manpower be distributed but the Administrator's major emphasis should be on visitations into the field to highlight SBA programs through an extensive program of public information.

POLLUTION

Over 100 years ago a famous New England philosopher, Henry David Thoreau, sounded a warning of our environmental crisis by stating that machines "insult nature." In the ensuing decades man pushed westward industrializing and developing new technologies to meet society's demand for greater consumption and affluence. Now the frontiers are gone and man must truly pay the price of progress by improving the environment and quality of life or he faces extinction.

Business and the government should share the responsibility of improving our environment. For many small businesses cost of pollution control through capital expenditures will be substantial—it may even be insurmountable. Corrective deadlines will be difficult to meet especially in industries where the state of art in pollution control lacks sufficient technology.

What concerns small business most are the methods by which the government requirement will be carried out in directly dealing with the problem. Such government characteristics as overlapping responsibilities, excessive bureaucracy, impersonal, haphazard and unbending interpretation of government regulations and a lack of comprehension of the economic effects of control devices are matters of serious concern to small business everywhere.

One United States Senator has advocated what may be the best approach to alleviate these problems. Senator Edmund Muskie has

submitted legislation to create an Environmental Control Administration, "an independent agency charged with the responsibility for developing and implementing Federal environmental quality of standards, supporting basic research on problems of environmental quality, stimulating and supporting basic research, control techniques and providing technical assistance to State, interstate and local agencies which would reflect the national commitment we need if we are to avoid ecological disaster."

To determine the effect of our environmental quality programs on small business, SBANE recently surveyed its membership. Response was large, immediate and representative. It reflects the intense interest that small business has in this subject. The results of the survey are as follows:

28% indicated they are facing a pollution problem, or were not sure if they were causing pollution.

30% indicated they had no knowledge of federal or state requirements.

62% indicated that the Small Business Administration should give loans correcting pollution a priority.

59% felt that the Small Business Administration should create a separately funded loan program for pollution equipment and abatement.

Our survey indicates that many small businesses either already have or are in the process of solving their contribution to the problem. Some of those that have not yet begun to take corrective measures are hampered by a lack of technology in their particular problem area, or have not yet solved the problem of how to finance their pollution problem. It should be noted that not only will the private capital expenditure produce no financial return, but it will also increase operating costs on a continuing basis.

Based on SBANE's survey and frequent discussion of small business pollution problems, we strongly recommend the following programs to enable small business to meet the environmental crisis.

1. That the Small Business Committees hold hearings to determine the economic effects of environmental control on small business.
2. That the SBA loan program be specifically adjusted to give loans at special rates for pollution control and be placed equal to disaster loans on the loan priority list. Similar to Senator McIntyre's Bill, S. 3528.
3. That the SBA through its Technology Utilization Program, establish Field Specialists to assist small businesses in pollution control counselling.
4. The creation of tax incentives to spur business to correct pollution problems.

LABOR

Committee Chairman: Benjamin E. Gordon, Attorney, Gordon & Leiter, Boston, Massachusetts.

1. Injunctive relief against unlawful types of picketing and strikes

SBANE recommends legislation to amend the Norris-La Guardia Act so as to permit injunctive relief in the exceptional cases involving the kinds of union picketing and strikes which are illegal because:

- a. They involve violence or seizure of property; or
- b. They are in violation of a non-strike pledge in a collective bargaining agreement.

The Norris-La Guardia Act was passed in 1932 at a time when unions were weak and ineffective, a condition due in great part to wide-spread and perhaps indiscriminate use of the labor injunction particularly in the early years of this century. Forbidding the use of the injunction in a labor dispute appeared, at the time, a necessary measure to effectuate the salutary national policy of ensuring full freedom of self-organization and designation of representatives of one's own choosing. Since that time, however, the un-

derlying condition has changed and the cure may be seen to have gone far beyond the malady. The organized labor movement no longer needs special privileges and immunities, such as this immunity from effective legal remedy in cases of unlawful conduct, in order to grow and survive. The strong, established international labor union is no longer at a disadvantage vis-a-vis the business enterprise. Though there may perhaps be a "standoff" with the major corporation, the small businessman is at an acute disadvantage vis-a-vis the large union representing his employees. The small businessman who lives up to his legal responsibility to deal with a union of his employees' choosing finds the same union disregarding its own legal responsibilities with the knowledge that its special immunity prevents effective relief even in cases where it openly engages in violence or a breach of contract.

An awareness of the change in the underlying conditions, in our system of law should dictate a change in the legislation governing those conditions. Yet the Norris-La Guardia Act has not been amended since 1932. It still contains, in Section 8, the blanket prohibition against immediate injunctive relief by the Federal Courts regardless of the legality of the strike or picketing activity.

At present, injunctive relief is not available to the employer, no matter the degree of violence with which he is confronted, before he has gone through the process of arbitration, even if there is no "dispute" that can be resolved by arbitration and even though this would involve so much time as to force capitulation because of the effect of unlawful violent activities. Many of our Courts, State and Federal, have decried this condition, but have deemed themselves bound by the Anti-Injunction Act that permits of no exception. Therefore, we urge that the Norris-La Guardia Act be amended to authorize the Federal Courts to grant injunctions in the exceptional cases of Union conduct involving violence, mass picketing, interference with peaceful ingress to or egress from private property, and actual seizure of private property.

Similarly, the Courts have considered themselves bound by Norris-La Guardia prohibition even in cases of admitted breach by a union of its no-strike pledge in its contract. Even our Supreme Court has recently indicated the unfairness of, and its frustration with, being bound by this unyielding law. At present, the only relief available is a damage suit in the courts or before arbitrators which, again, can involve such an amount of time, with the customary procedural delays, as to force capitulation to the unlawful union acts. Therefore, we propose, as a second exception to its blanket ban, that the Norris-La Guardia Act be amended to authorize the Federal Courts to grant injunctive relief against a union strike in defiance of a contractual no-strike pledge.

Our two proposed exceptions will do no more than ensure the preservation of peace, of law and order during the peaceful resolution of a dispute, in the first instance, and, in the second, ensure that unions abide by the terms of their agreements just as all others must do.

2. Require secret ballot election for union recognition

The Congress, in enacting the National Labor Relations Act, as amended in 1947, while wisely preserving the guarantee to employees to designate representatives of their own choosing for collective bargaining, also wisely established the secret ballot election as the vehicle for making that choice. Since then, the National Labor Relations Board has disregarded the Congressional intent, as well as our democratic processes, by ordering employers to recognize unions as the bargaining representative of their em-

ployees where they either were not given the opportunity to vote in such an election or even where an election was conducted in which the union was rejected.

The obligation thus imposed, by the NLRB theory, is based upon employee signatures on union authorization cards. These are usually secured at the time of initial employee contact by the union, and have often been shown to have been secured by coercion, fraud and misrepresentation. Thus, they have been viewed by many as altogether unreliable indicia and not reflective of the true desires of the employees. Despite the criticism by many Federal Courts of this device for establishing a union's representative status without a successful secret ballot election, the U.S. Supreme Court in June, 1969, in the case of *NLRB v. Gissell Packing Co.*, approved of it.

Thus, this year, with the Supreme Court having upheld the NLRB theory, legislation is necessary so that the Congress can ensure adherence to its expressed intention and re-establish the use of secret ballot elections for choice of bargaining representation in every case. Therefore, SBANE supports such legislation as was offered by Rep. Fisher in the 1st Session of this Congress, H.R. 12917, which would amend the National Labor Relations Act to require bargaining only with unions whose representative status has been established by a secret ballot election among the employees.

3. Prohibit involuntary union membership

While we favor the principle of voluntary union membership, we are opposed to that of compulsory membership. We see no justification for forcing and requiring any employee to join, and pay dues to, any labor union against his will in order to obtain or keep a job. The declared purpose of our labor laws is to preserve and protect the individual employee's freedom of choice. Compulsory membership in a private organization not only violates this principle but is foreign to a democratic system which should preserve individual liberties and the rights of the minority as well as the majority.

The issue is dramatized this year because of the Senate's action in December, 1969 in defeating Senator Fannin's amendment to the tax-reform bill which would have removed the tax-exempt status of organizations that use membership dues or other charges for political purposes. Thus, in effect, there has been legislative approval of the practice of labor organizations, in which membership is compulsory, to use compulsory membership dues in support of political activity which they favor, but which may not be favored by their members. As a result, today there is required not only union membership but also the obligation to support political causes favored by the organization leadership. To us, this heightens the need for legislative reform on the compulsory membership question.

In 20 states, compulsory union membership has been declared illegal by legislative action pursuant to Section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. But a uniform, national policy is the only fair way for all. Therefore, we urge that the Act be amended to permit only voluntary union membership.

To the argument of the leadership of the organized labor movement's power structure that anything short of compulsory union membership will weaken and destroy the labor movement, we can only rejoin by quoting Justice Louis D. Brandeis who said:

"The union attains success when it reaches the ideal condition, and the ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionist. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the union as the union checks oppression by the employer."

PATENTS

Committee Chairman: Robert T. Dunn, Patent Attorney, Bedford, Massachusetts.

A U.S. Department of Commerce study published in 1967 reported that some \$100 billion had been spent in the past 20 years on research and development, a large share, by big business with the facilities and manpower. Despite this enormous investment, over 50% of the technical innovations in the U.S. are the creation of individual inventors and small business. For this reason during the past three years, this Association has given careful study to the recommendations of former President Johnson's Commission on Patent Reform and legislation that has been filed in the Congress as a result of this study.

We would urge your opposition to any legislation that would curb this individual and small business incentive to invent and innovate.

1. Favor "first to invent" over "first to file"

Of particular interest to small business is the proposal to change the system of priority from "first to invent" to "first to file" or various modified "first to file" rules that have been submitted to the Congress.

SBANE opposes legislation that would change the present system under which patents are issued to the first inventor.

The average cost of a patent application to an inventor is from \$500-\$1,500 and higher in complex cases. These changes in the patent laws would impose a serious financial burden on small business and the private inventor who often lacks the funds to file patent applications that have not demonstrated commercial utility. These inventors must conserve their funds to develop inventions for which there is substantial expectation of commercial use and value. Large businesses, however, can afford to file and prosecute patent applications on all likely inventions without knowing their commercial value.

The present cost to the Patent Office in conducting first invention contests and interferences is about \$350,000 with a staff of 20 employees. This low expenditure of manpower and money to insure the patent goes to the first inventor is a good indication of the efficiency, economy and reasonableness of the present system. Furthermore, interferences are won by the inventor second to file as often as they are won by the inventor first to file. The proposed changes would encourage half-baked applications that would lead to more expensive contests and a greatly increased workload on the Patent Office.

These proposed changes would preclude an inventor from contesting the priority of an invention merely because he failed to file a patent application within a prescribed period before another who claims the same invention.

We ask that you resist any changes in the patent laws from the present first to invent system that has successfully protected and encouraged American inventiveness for so many years.

The two bills in Congress, S.2756 and S.1569, propose changes in the patent system. SBANE in general, favors these bills because they both preserve the "first to invent" priority system. However, certain parts in these bills are disapproved by SBANE as follows:

A. SBANE disapproves of an arbitrary limitation on the date of invention which can be accorded to a party in a priority contest.

B. SBANE disapproves of the requirement that the applicant pays expenses in the Court of Appeals if the Patent Office takes an appeal.

C. SBANE disapproves of the publication of applications without the consent of the applicant.

D. SBANE disapproves of more than one re-examination after a patent has issued.

E. SBANE disapproves of the re-examination of patents after issuance with request to public use and prior inventorship.

2. U.S. Trademarks

A bill in the Congress, S. 766, The McClellan-Scott Bill, amends the Trademark Act of 1946. It broadens and puts more teeth in the Trademark Act. The bill is broadened to protect not just registered trademarks, but to protect against "unfair competition" which is generally defined in four categories: (1) that which is likely to cause confusion or deception as to the origin of products or services, (2) that which falsely represents goods or misrepresents other's goods, (3) that which wrongfully discloses or misappropriates trade secrets and, (4) that which otherwise misrepresents or misappropriates.

The Bill is strengthened by allowing recovery of profits, damages, court costs and attorneys' fees and permits the court to take possession of all violating paraphernalia.

SBANE favors the changes proposed by this bill because of the broadened protection against unfair competition and the increased recovery. The latter makes litigation less burdensome from an economic standpoint and so benefits small business. SBANE is generally opposed to any trademark legislation which would permit rights in a trademark to be gained even though the mark has not been used. Consequently, SBANE is opposed to S. 1568 which would afford registration rights to trademarks where only "intent to use" has been expressed.

3. U.S. Government relations to patents

A. Inventions Infringed by Government Contractors (H.R. 2898—90th Congress)

It has been proposed by the American Bar Association and H.R. 2898, that Federal agencies adopt as a policy that the government procure a patent license from the owner of any patent which will be infringed by a government procurement and that the government pay the owner a royalty no greater than the lowest commercial rate for the license. H.R. 2898 proposes that the government royalty be added to the bid of all unlicensed bidders. The ABA proposes that invalidity or non-infringement of the patent can be shown by the non-licensed bidders, whereas, H.R. 2898 proposes that the government decide these matters.

Small business may gain more than it loses from the general proposition of pre-procurement licenses. Small business usually bids only on government procurements for which it has particular competence, which usually means some patents. H.R. 2898 will put such a small business in a better bidding position.

NASA has practiced on a limited scale "Instant Licensing" which is similar to pre-procurement licensing for over a year. It has been reasonably successful and does get the work done.

B. NASA and AEC Contracts

The contractor with these agencies gets no title to any invention conceived or first reduced to practice in performance on the contract. The contractor can petition the agency for a waiver of title (subject to a government license) and succeeds by showing the contractor's ability to promote the invention for the public's benefit. Big business can do this, but small businesses frequently cannot.

SBANE proposes that small business not be obliged to show the capacity to promote the invention, but only show a willingness to license others to promote the invention, in order to qualify for a waiver of title.

C. Armed Forces Contracts

The contractor with these agencies gets title subject to government license according to ASFR provisions. Clearly, these inventions are not the subject for "Instant Licensing" on pre-procurement licenses provided for in H.R. 2698.

SBANE proposes that exceptions be made to the ASPR provisions with respect to particularly significant inventions made by the contractor. SBANE proposes that the contractor in such cases need not give a royalty free license to the government; but enable the contractor to give a license for minimum royalty similar to the pre-procurement license proposed in H.R. 2898. Thus, the contractor would be rewarded for his significant invention even though he would not be able to compete with larger businesses in the implementation of the invention for government use.

PENSION PLANS

Committee Chairman: Norman R. Minor, Actuary, Johnson & Higgins, Boston, Massachusetts.

Last year SBANE discussed the concepts of Vesting, Portability, Reinsurance and Minimum Funding that have been contained in proposed Pension legislation. The Association is opposed to concepts such as these which will tend to limit or prohibit small businesses from establishing pension plans. Legislation is still being filed which contains the four objectionable elements.

This year rather than repeat the arguments of last year, we will take just one of these elements: vesting, and demonstrate why we oppose such legislation.

Prior to the early 1940's, pensions were usually paid on an out-of-pocket basis, similar to salary. The unfortunate thing was that the retirement benefit was dependent on the employer's cash flow, even after retirement. But whatever pension was paid had to be paid in that way, because of the inflexible federal tax law of the day. So, as a result, employers paid as little pension as possible, and competed for employees on the basis of wages.

Then, in the early 1940's, two changes affecting pensions were legislated by the Congress: wage controls and deferred taxes. The problem was solved; private pensions were reborn. Employers, no longer free to compete for all-too-scarce labor on the basis of wages, used the pension as a weapon in their fight for workers. Unpredictable costs no longer presented a problem, since the employer could pre-fund the cost of the pensions, and get immediate tax relief. This was indeed a fine solution to a vexing problem. Employees got higher pensions; employers got their labor force; Uncle Sam agreed to wait for his taxes.

How many people saw in that solution the seeds of today's problem? From that time, pensions took on an aspect of "wages", both from the point of view of the employee, the employer and the Internal Revenue Service.

So what's the problem? Pensions are wages; wages belong to employees. Thus the concepts of vesting and portability are sound ideas.

But wait—

First, the employee is not taxed on the money put into a qualified plan when it is put in; and

Second, neither employer nor employee pays taxes on the investment earnings during the prefunding period.

These two points are not true of wages received and invested.

So maybe pensions aren't "exactly" wages. So what are they?

What are pensions?

We feel that if everyone really understood what a pension is, the question of pension legislation could be dealt with quite effectively.

But, pensions are a mumbo-jumbo of actuarial jargon quite obviously beyond human interpretation.

Suppose an employer says: "I will give you \$100 this minute." How much money does he need? That's easy, \$100.

Now suppose he agrees to give you \$100 one year from now. How much money does he set aside now to guarantee you the \$100?

You don't know—but if he said: "How much money should I set aside if I will be earning 5% on the amount," you would know the answer, since $\$100 \div 1.05 = \95.24 . Which means, in effect, that if he sets aside \$95.24, it will grow, with interest at 5% to \$100 at the end of the year. Then he will give you the \$100.

In the first instance, the employer needs \$100; in the second instance \$95.24. In the second case there is a condition attached; this being that the \$100 is not paid until a year has elapsed.

Suppose our employer offers to pay you \$100 in one year if you are still alive? Similar to the second illustration, he says that—

(1) He will earn 5% on the amount;

(2) The probability that you will die before one year has elapsed is 2%.

Now how much money should he set aside: If you said \$93.33 you're correct again, since $(100 \div 1.05) \times .98 = \93.33 . This is to say: one must first "discount" for interest, then multiply by the probability that you will be alive to receive the \$100.

Now the employer says: "I will give you \$100 one year from now if you do not quit your job in the meanwhile." What amount should he set aside? Here, we are faced with still another concept. The amount set aside will grow with interest at 5%; it will be paid if you are alive (probability: 98%) and have not quit your job. Similar to the above, we know that there is a 7% chance that you'll quit your job before the end of the year. The amount to be set aside is $(100 \div 1.05) \times .98 \times .93 = \86.80 . (That is, \$100, discounted at 5% interest, then multiplied by the probabilities that you will be alive and in the same employ at year-end, equals the required amount.)

As before, we have determined the value, or wage-equivalence, at the beginning of the year of a benefit paid at the end of the year. (When talking money, time is of the essence.)

To re-cap: An employer says: "I'll pay you \$100 one year from now if you satisfy certain conditions and here's the value now of that promise. You agree, and since you won't get the \$100 until and unless all conditions are satisfied, you will not pay taxes on it until that time." And I.R.S. says: "Fine. I'll wait patiently for my taxes until you get your \$100."

Notice that as we attached more conditions, we reduced the "price". Similarly, if the price were fixed, addition of "conditions" would increase the benefit.

Based on the wage-equivalent value of the \$100, we set the benefit level, according to what value the employee has to the employer.

Suppose now some third party steps into the picture after the employer has made his promise to you, and set aside \$86.80, and says that he insists the agreement be changed so as to provide that you will get a payment if you're simply alive at year-end. Now what happens?

To begin with, that third party has no right to interfere in a legally valid contracted agreement between two private parties. Our right to contract in private is constitutionally protected.

Yes, but suppose we forgot that archaic idea for a while.

Well, you say, something's got to give. Either the employer must come up with more money, or I have to settle for less than the \$100.

But \$86.80 is your value to the employer, as both agreed; so you'll have to be content with \$93.00. ($\$86.80 \times 1.05 \div .98$; or, simply, the value of the \$86.80 at year end, with "benefit of interest and survivorship", as the Actuaries say.)

Well, you say, I'm sure glad our rights to contract in private are protected by the Constitution. This third party could sure mess up our arrangement.

Now it is granted that we have not presented a polished actuarial treatise in our example. We have been crude in our approach to such actuarial niceties as multiple-decrement theory, gain and loss, theory of a group valuation, etc., etc. (We have even assumed that 2% of a person could die in a year.) But the point is made very clearly.

We have demonstrated that pensions are a form of wages. But they are not wages in the sense of cash salary. When benefits are pre-funded, there is no instant right to the benefit. A condition must first be satisfied. The fact that there is no immediate taxable income to the employee certainly supports this argument. The pre-funding is simply an orderly way of "smoothing" the cost of the pension. It is also a way to ensure that persons may elect to retire in a given year and not have to be concerned about the employer's cash flow situation and whether or not there is money for their pensions.

Probably the clearest appreciation of the wage-equivalent theory of pensions arises in the case of the so-called "Taft-Hartley" plans. In each of these cases a committee, representing in equal voting strength the employee and the employer, decides how best to spend a sum of money over which the committee has no control. The money comes as a result of a collective bargaining agreement between Union and Management. It is the only source of funds. Employee and employer consider the benefits available in terms of a fixed budget. There are retirement benefits, death benefits, termination benefits, disability benefits, etc., etc. Each has a price tag. Benefits and benefit levels have to be juggled until a plan fits the budget. If we have just a retirement benefit, the pension level is so much; if we want a death benefit, the pension level must be lower; if we want a death benefit and a termination benefit, the pension level is still lower. Once we put a benefit package together that fits the budget, there's no money to add more benefits. If the committee has decided to omit a termination benefit in favor of a higher pension, that's that. You can't have your cake, etc.

This is similar to an individual who considers the purchase of life insurance. He looks at "Term" insurance, which provides a benefit only at death during the term and sees he can afford \$10,000 of coverage. He looks at "Endowment" insurance which provides a benefit if he dies during the period or if he survives the period, and sees that, for the same money, he can afford \$3,000 of coverage. After considering the relative advantages he elects to buy the Term coverage. Then, to his dismay, he is still alive at the end of the term and so gets no benefit. Has he been "gypped?" Of course not. He bought a conditional benefit. Had he satisfied the condition his money would've been returned "One hundred-fold". He didn't, and should not expect to get a refund. Should the Congress legislate such a refund? We think not.

Insurance companies also sell "life" annuities, whereby a person pays, say \$1,000, and gets an annuity for life. Should the Congress legislate a refund if his life happens to end after one monthly payment of \$10. Of course not.

These examples suggest that a contingency, or a condition, has a price-tag. The tougher the conditions: the greater the price. This has always been the case. To legislate otherwise is to destroy the basis of the insurance industry.

Conclusion

We have taken just one of the many recurring elements of proposed pension legislation and discussed it, seeking its real mean-

ing. We have shown that Vesting, so often purported to be a "protection" of the employee, is nothing more than a termination benefit, and, like the other benefits, has a price tag.

We have taken this tack, not only to demonstrate the fallacy in the treatment of Vesting in proposed legislation, but to suggest an approach for considering all elements of pension legislation.

SBANE is vitally interested in the Congress's passing legislation that will encourage the growth of private pensions and so alleviate the burden on the public pension system, and thus ease the tax burdens of the country.

SBANE suggests that poor pension legislation will force companies to discard the private pension, and go back to competing for employees on the basis of salary, thus adding to the problem of inflation, as well as forcing Social Security benefits, and taxes, up.

It is the feeling of SBANE that as the company prospers, so does the employee. Thus we believe that the views presented to the Congress over the years are equally compatible with both employee and company interests.

This mutuality of interest is amply demonstrated by the fact that the SBANE 1970 Pension Committee, chaired by an Actuary, included representatives of both labor and industry.

SBANE suggests that the private pension, so vital to this country's well-being, be accorded the type of examination suggested in this Presentation before legislation regarding it is passed.

PROCUREMENT

Committee Chairman: Donald F. Barry, President; Container Services, Inc., Lowell, Mass.

In 1961 President Kennedy notified the Department of Defense of his alarm over the declining small business percentage of total procurement—it was then at 16%. The results of this Presidential concern resulted in a steady increase in total procurement percentage to a peak of 21.8% in fiscal year 1966. At present, due to several adverse factors, the small business percentage is now back to 16%.

Small business percent of total procurement [In percent]

Fiscal year:	
1966.....	21.8
1967.....	20.6
1968.....	18
1969.....	17.8
July-Nov. 1970.....	16.3

Of serious consequences to small business is also the fact that the percentage of small business set asides of total government procurement has declined by 30% in the last five years from 6.3% in 1965 to 4.1% in fiscal year 1970.

Set asides percent of total procurement [In percent]

Fiscal year:	
1965.....	6.3
1966.....	5
1967.....	4.7
1968.....	4.4
1969.....	4.5
July-Nov. 1970.....	4.1

Based on the experience of many SBANE members in government procurement, we offer the following recommendations to stop this alarming trend in the serious small business decline in procurement.

1. SBANE recommends mandatory set asides

When the Federal Government places enormous contracts requiring large financing, production and engineering capabilities, it has an adverse effect on small business

participation. When voluntary programs do not produce desired results, incentive and/or mandatory programs must be installed.

The concept of weapons systems management through total package procurement restricts small business participation on many items that normally they could produce. The program vests the contractors with maximum authority to manage the total package, eliminating the possibility of the government contracting direct with small business for the many thousands of parts and components required not only to introduce but to sustain a system in the defense inventory.

At the present time other than a voluntary small business subcontracting program, there is no way for the Department of Defense Small Business Specialists or the Small Business Administration to require participation in a definite subcontracting program.

Despite the efforts of the DOD Small Business Specialists and the Small Business Administration in coaxing and pleading with larger businesses to participate, we feel that a voluntary subcontracting program will not provide what is intended by Congress. A review of the record of the performance of the 100 largest government contractors will substantiate the fact that there are some dedicated large firms with good programs but many making only a minimal effort with a great amount of rhetoric.

For many years, SBANE has advocated a change in the weighted guidelines to provide incentive to large business for subcontracting to small business. This has been supported by Congress, small business, large business and most recently, by the President's Task Force on Small Business. We ask Congress to initiate legislation requiring a change in the weighted guidelines.

SBANE also would like to see a subcontract set aside program established in connection with the total package procurement program to be negotiated prior to the award of the prime contract. At the present time, the DOD Small Business Specialists and the Small Business Administration are powerless in efforts to channel work to small contractors.

A contractual obligation to subcontract is necessary if it is hoped to give the small businessman an opportunity to complete and participate in the total package procurement program.

2. SBANE recommends that DOD small business specialists be transferred to the SBA

After careful study of the present DOD Small Business Specialists' role in overseeing procurements for small business, this Association believes that an independent champion responsible to the SBA is needed. We believe the Small Business Specialists should be transferred from DOD to the SBA to provide them with a freer rein in their surveillance of procurements. SBANE realizes the helpfulness of the Small Business Specialists but realizes no man can equitably serve two masters, i.e. the DOD and SBA, and recommends a transfer to the Small Business Administration, so that their prime responsibility will be to help small business.

3. Direct subcontract appeals

SBANE has long advocated the need of the small subcontractor to have access to the contracting officer in the event of a contract dispute. In a report prepared for the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, by Professor Harold C. Petrowitz, dated July 28, 1966, the compelling logic for a "disputes clause" are well-presented:

"The federal boards have steadfastly refused to decide direct subcontractor appeals of any kind giving as a reason the specious argument that the subcontractor is not in privity of contract with the government. It is noted that the privity argument presents

no obstacle when the government desires to enforce certain contract policies such as minimum wage requirements, examination of records, contract termination regulations to name a few. It seems clear that as far as government contracts and subcontracts are concerned, the privity concept has become outworn tradition."

4. Procurement Study Commission lacks small business representation

This Association regrets that the newly established Procurement Commission does not contain a member from the small business community. The Commission contains representatives of Congress, government agencies and larger businesses. We call your attention to the minority views of the House Committee on Government Operations which stated, "Unless the appointment of Non-Congressional members of the proposed Commission is to be made with the greatest degree of care and circumspection, a bias could well develop in favor of contractors, or in favor of Government Procurement Agencies, or in favor of large businesses over small businesses, (emphasis added) or in favor of the status quo, or in favor of Government in house capabilities over private enterprise, or in favor of almost any special interest over the taxpayers' interests."

We are looking forward with much interest to the report of this extremely important study Commission.

TRANSPORTATION

Committee Chairman: Gordon H. Fay, Associate, Systems Analysis & Research Corporation, Cambridge, Mass.

1. Need for Small Claims Courts.
2. Support H.R. 8138, S. 1653.
3. Position Against Carrier Concealed Loss and Damage Claim Rules.

Members of SBANE and other shippers and receivers of freight throughout the United States are vitally concerned about fair and reasonable settlements from transportation companies for merchandise lost or damaged during shipment. There are two areas of immediate concern where Congress can significantly improve small business's ability to receive prompt and equitable payment on loss and damage claims.

The first area of concern is fair consideration by transportation companies of smaller loss and damage claims. The second involves rules recently promulgated by the carriers which limit their liability for concealed loss and damage.

Settlement of freight loss and damage claims by carriers is not subject to ICC jurisdiction except for certain rules providing for time limits on acknowledgement and decisions on claims. There is no remedy for disputes except through the courts. The problem for small businesses is that most claims are less than \$1,000 not justifying long and costly court proceedings. As a result, carriers pass off many valid claims by just saying "No" because they have learned that small business has neither the technical knowledge nor financial resources to fight. Larger companies with professional traffic managers can fight and have established a record for winning, so carriers handle their claims with more consideration.

Small businesses need a means to require carriers to give fair, impartial and timely consideration to small claims. SBANE urges that Congress take action by, (1) creating a small claims court system within the Federal courts, and (2) passing H.R. 8138 which permits the recovery of reasonable attorneys' fees in cases of successful action for recovery of damages sustained in the transportation of property. (This bill passed the Senate as S. 1653.)

The first action, the establishment of a loss and damage small claims court, is neces-

sary because state and local small claims courts are inadequate to meet the needs. Two immediate problems arise with the local courts. First, as many claims involve interstate shipments by carriers domiciled in jurisdiction other than the claimant, the question of what court has jurisdiction can be an obstacle to seeking relief under present small claims procedures. Second, the maximum amount of claims which will be heard in small claims courts varies by state, but in general the maximum is \$200. Establishment of a Federal small loss and damage claims court would provide uniform maximum claim standards (recommended level is \$2,000) and would solve the jurisdictional problem by providing that the claimant's residence would govern.

The second action, passage of H.R. 8138, is a direct attack at the heart of the whole loss and damage claim problem which is the reluctance of carriers to honor valid claims. Requiring carriers to pay reasonable attorneys' fees to successful claimants should stimulate them to make reasonable settlements before the claimant brings court action. Small business does not usually bring suits against carriers because of high attorneys' fees and court costs which can easily exceed the value of the claim.

Carriers are aware of this and use this financial barrier to protect themselves when offering inadequate settlements of valid claims. H.R. 8138 removes this artificial protection and provides small business with a significant weapon in the fight to receive fair treatment.

The second major area of concern to SBANE involves rules promulgated in August 1969 by motor carriers, railroads and freight forwarders, concerning the settlement of concealed loss and damage claims. These claims cover items which were received by the consignee in apparently good condition, but upon subsequent inspection (opening of cartons, for example) the shipment was found to be damaged.

The new motor carrier rules have the effect of limiting the carrier's liability for concealed loss and damage claims and set forth numerous restrictions on the filing of such claims. Briefly, the rules state that the motor carriers will pro-rate the payment of claims among the carriers handling the shipment, taking into consideration intervening public or private warehouse handling. While appearing to be a fair method of allocating the liability over those who might have caused the loss or damage, the rule has the effect of reducing carrier liability and thereby lowering the amount which a shipper or consignee might otherwise recover. The key is the inclusion of warehouses in the pro-rate because the carriers can not collect from warehouses for their "share" and the shipper has little recourse to them under the law.

The following is an example of how the rule works. Suppose a shipment valued at \$1,000 is made by common motor carrier from Cleveland to a warehouse in Columbus. After storage it is shipped via another common motor carrier to Boston, thence via a third to Portland, Me. for final delivery. The consignee inspects the package and signs the bill of lading indicating receipt of an undamaged shipment. Upon opening the package a week later, the consignee finds the contents damaged beyond repair and then files a \$1,000 concealed loss and damage claim with the delivering motor carrier. The carrier accepts the claim as valid and pays the consignee \$750 because under the rule the warehouse is responsible for $\frac{1}{4}$ or \$250 of the claim. The warehouseman would decline payment of the claim in absence of clear proof of negligence on the basis that his only obligation is to handle materials as if it were his own. The consignee is out \$250 unless he can collect from the shipper on the basis

that he was the one who chose to warehouse the product.

The railroad and freight forwarder rules are even more restrictive than those imposed by the motor carriers. On concealed loss and damage, the railroads and freight forwarders set the maximum payment at 50% of the "proven net monetary loss." This means that a consignee must fully and carefully inspect every item, including opening every package, in a rail shipment at the time of delivery if he wants to recover the full value of any loss or damage. As a practical matter, such an inspection is difficult without destroying packaging to the point of making resale, storage or transportation to another location difficult. Imagine the housewife's reluctance to buy goods in opened packages which are labeled "do not accept if seal is broken!"

Aware of the concern about the rule, the Association of American Railroads (AAR) cancelled the rule effective February 1, 1970. However, the AAR advised that individual railroads may still apply the principle of the rule so that the shippers and consignees are still in the burdensome position of having to take unreasonable steps to protect themselves from the reduced liability under concealed loss and damage procedures. The freight forwarder rules are still in effect.

Clearly, the new rules put a burden on the shipper and consignee to which they have little recourse. These rules were not submitted to nor approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC). As a result of increasing shipper pressure, the ICC in December 1969 established Docket No. 35198 to investigate ICC jurisdiction over concealed loss and damage claim rules and practices of regulated carriers. On February 9, 1970 the ICC established Ex Parte No. 263, "Rules, Regulations, and Practices of Regulated Carriers with Respect to the Processing of Loss and Damage Claims." This proceeding is consolidated with Docket No. 35198 and has been established to review not only concealed loss and damage rules, but also to investigate charges by shippers and receivers of deliberate and unreasonable delay by carriers in the payment of claims where the carrier has already admitted liability.

It is the position of numerous shipper groups that the ICC does have jurisdiction and should investigate the lawfulness of the rules. SBANE urges Congress to be aware of the outcome of Ex Parte 263 and to be prepared to take action on legislation to protect shippers from carrier action which unduly limits their liability.

DEDICATION OF GREATER MIAMI JEWISH FEDERATION BUILDING

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 8, 1970, the Greater Miami Jewish Federation will dedicate its new building in downtown Miami. This building will house an organization which, for 32 years, has been identified with the Jewish concern for the welfare of all mankind.

Representing the fourth largest Jewish community in the United States, the Greater Miami Jewish Federation has provided direct aid to over 3 million persons, resettling more than 1.5 million in Israel, the United States, and other

free lands. The federation evolved from strictly a fundraising organization to a community-service facility of broad scope, becoming the most important outlet for total Jewish philanthropic participation.

I believe it is fitting that I call the accomplishments of this organization to the attention of my colleagues, and that we wish its members continued success in their new building.

THE NEED FOR RESPONSIVENESS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past month coupled with the extraordinary reactions of the American public to those events have pointed out the profound need for the institutions of this Nation to make a very real effort to adjust to the times.

A constituent of mine, Mr. John E. Manning, of Richmond, Calif., recently wrote me describing his own views regarding this most vital and important subject.

I would like to share his words with the Members of the Congress:

RICHMOND, CALIF.,
May 17, 1970.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALDIE: May I congratulate you on your perceptiveness and courage in attempting to reorganize the leadership of the majority party in the House of Representatives. Whatever it may have cost you in the political gamesmanship of the House, it will repay you in the esteem not only of your constituency, among whom I am proud to number myself, but among the growing number of persons who know that the time for fun and games has long since passed. If it did not pass with the assassination of President Kennedy or his brother, Senator Robert Kennedy, it did with the assassination of the Reverend Martin Luther King.

This Nation is pledged to high purposes: "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" in the words of the Declaration of Independence; "... to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity..." Where do we stand in achieving those high purposes now?

We are told—or is it "they," the college students; "they," the minorities; or all the other "they's"—to renounce violence and work within the system. But what of the President, who in the name of bringing an earlier end to the war in Vietnam, circumvents the system to increase the violence in Southeast Asia by sending American troops into Cambodia? This is the same President who searches for a "strict constructionist" to serve on the Supreme Court. How would a strict constructionist construe the provision of Section 8 of the Constitution: "The Congress shall have power . . . to declare war."? If in the name of shortening the war, of bringing our troops home, the making of war on another nation should have been undertaken, should not this decision have been a matter for the Congress to decide?

And yet, how much has Congress forfeited the power, perhaps the desire, to exercise the power with which it was originally entrusted by the Constitution in favor of playing games, of emphasizing form rather than substance, of dallying in the luxuries the office affords rather than pursuing the responsibilities with which the office is endowed? Congressmen visit every part of the world in pursuit of often exotic and ephemeral information and the answers to elusive problems when the most important unsolved problems this nation faces are here at home. When matters of great debate are before the Congress, the floors of its houses are nearly empty. Why should the nation listen when what is said is not worth the time of its Congressmen?

The answer, I know, is that the real work of the Congress is done in committee. But what of the high incidence of absenteeism at committee meetings and the inability of committees to hold a meeting because they lack a quorum or the presence of a chairman because they or he are junketing somewhere, or either or both are piqued by some inconsequential occurrence? And what when representatives of state government, even when headed by the Governor, appear to present testimony before a Congressional committee of which their Congressman is a member, he makes a courtesy appearance if at all?

Not only do we have laws made and shaped by Congressional staff with often, I am afraid, little understanding of the Congressmen who passed on them; but then we have their interpretation and often their distortion entrusted to the bureaucrats. What do we make of the situation in which middle bureaucrats distort the finding of scientists in the Food and Drug Administration in the transmission of those findings to the top administrators who are entrusted with guarding the nation's health? If I believed this were an unusual incident, I would not be greatly concerned; but I have heard informed opinion that makes me believe it is not.

What we come down to, I guess, is, "Who is minding the store?" Who is making the decisions? Who is running the country?

It is my understanding of the Constitution and what I have learned about it by my study and reading that the founding fathers intended that the members of Congress—the representatives of the people—should make the laws and establish the policy by which the affairs of the people should be conducted. It is hard in the light of current events to believe that such is the present condition of this country. What some of the young militants may be saying is that they are in contempt of our nation's government because its most representative body, the Congress, evidences contempt for itself.

There is talk of bringing the system to a halt, of overthrowing the establishment, but is there a system to halt or an establishment to overturn? Aren't we in the position we are with respect to the environment, our cities, our racial antagonisms, the violence of our young and of our military precisely because there is no system, no establishment to order these matters? There should be; there must be. The drifting must end and a reordering of priorities must be undertaken.

When this nation puts its mind and will to work, it can accomplish great things. I cannot believe that a nation that can put a man on the moon cannot bring its men home from Vietnam and Cambodia where they never should have been and then proceed to end poverty and racial hatred and intolerance in this country. I hope you will do all within the power of your office to forward these matters.

I write to you, Mr. Waldie, because you are the closest representative I have in the Federal government and because you have

shown courage in trying to make the House of Representatives more responsive to the people's will. But I shall send copies of this letter to President Nixon, Senator Cranston and Senator Murphy for I would that they be as responsive as yourself to the needs of this nation.

Thank you for your patience in hearing me out.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. MANNING.

THE 1971 BUDGET "SCOREKEEPING"
REPORT—AS OF MAY 21, 1970

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures prepares periodic "budget scorekeeping reports" showing how various actions of the Congress affect the President's budget estimates. The latest of these reports is cumulative to May 21, 1970, and shows the impact of actions by the Congress during the current session on the budget estimates submitted in February for both fiscal years 1970 and 1971 as they have been revised and amended to that date by the President.

In briefest summary, the report discloses that as of May 21, Congress, in all its final actions affecting the fiscal 1971 budget:

First. Has added about \$383 million above the budget in new budget obligational authority, and

Second. Has added about \$420 million to the budget estimate of outlays expenditures.

This most recent scorekeeping report on the 1971 budget has been mailed to all Members of the Congress. It is the only generally available source showing how congressional actions on each appropriation bill and each legislative bill directly affects the finances of the Federal Government. The report brings together all facets of the Federal budget; that is, appropriations, spending authorizations in basic legislation other than appropriation bills, the status of revenue proposals, the estimated cost of proposed legislation, and it shows what the actions or inactions of the Congress on these many proposals do to the financial outlook for the Federal Government.

This report is entirely factual and objective. It is based upon the best information the committee staff has been able to obtain from various sources.

CONGRESS ACTS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY, NOT
EXPENDITURES

Except for overall spending ceilings, Congress, for the most part, acts upon budget requests in terms of new budget—obligational—authority, mostly in the form of appropriations. Appropriations provide obligational authority which may be paid out—expenditures—over a period of several years. It is not difficult to keep track of what Congress does to various appropriation requests in terms of new budget obligational authority. Ex-

cept for a few indefinite type appropriations, congressional actions on appropriation requests are in precise terms and can be readily tabulated and accounted for.

However, the budget is generally thought of and expressed in terms of projected budget outlays or expenditures. Converting the effects of congressional actions on appropriations providing obligating authority, which may be spent over a period of years, into the effects of such actions on estimated outlays or expenditures in a particular budget year is far from an exact science; precise translation is not possible. The best that can be provided are approximations or estimations of how various congressional actions affect the outlay or expenditure budget for a given year.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to a good understanding of the figures to emphasize this difference between what the Congress does to the budget in making an appropriation and the effect of such action on what the Congress does to the budget in terms of outlays or expenditures. A reduction in appropriations is an equivalent saving in expenditures but all of that saving—in terms of budget outlays—may not be realized in the first year but rather over a period of several years. This is a source of some confusion each year when reporting on what the Congress has done in acting upon various legislative and appropriation requests in the President's budget.

This report by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures is an attempt to provide the Congress with a reasonable translation of the effects of various Congressional actions on budget authority or appropriation requests into the effects of such actions on the outlay or expenditure budget which people generally think of as the Federal budget.

The scorekeeping report is about 24 pages of largely statistical data related to the budget and requires some study for a full understanding of a necessarily complex subject.

SCOREKEEPING REPORT—BILL BY BILL

Supporting table No. 1 is the table that shows, bill by bill, what the Congress is doing to change the outgo side of the President's budget. I am inserting this table in the RECORD.

By referring to the various subtotal lines on the table, the cumulative change from the budget estimates can be readily determined.

This table is in several parts.

APPROPRIATION BILLS

The first part of the table shows the effects of actions taken—to May 21—in this session on appropriation bills.

The report indicates that the net effect of House actions on appropriation bills to May 21 have resulted in increasing 1971 appropriations of budget authority by about \$228 million and increasing estimated outlays over the President's budget estimates by about \$159 million. The outlay figure includes the effect in fiscal 1971 of the Labor-HEW-OEO appropriation bill for fiscal 1970 passed at this session—the budget for fiscal 1971

submitted in February did not reflect final congressional action on this appropriation bill, but did reflect final congressional action on all other appropriation bills for fiscal 1970, except, of course, the current supplemental.

BACKDOOR BUDGET AUTHORITY

The second part of this table shows changes in the budget made in the form of new budget authority through the so-called backdoor appropriations process. To May 21, the House has voted \$224 million in budget authority over the President's budget requests. Since only contract authority is involved, no change is shown for outlays. The figures shown in parentheses are for actions taken during the last session on bills still pending before the Congress.

LEGISLATIVE BILLS MANDATING SPENDING

The third part of this table reflects estimates for budget increases or decreases which result from congressional action on legislation containing mandatory spending authorizations such as pay or pension increases for which spending does not wait until an appropriation is made as is the case for most legislation authorizing new or expanded programs.

The net effect of House actions to May 21 for such legislative items is a decrease in 1971 budget authority of \$89 million and a decrease in 1971 budget outlays of about \$6 million—largely as a result of a later effective date than proposed in the budget for the family assistance program legislation. This does not reflect enacted or pending Federal or postal pay increases which were proposed by the President as increases to his own February budget and therefore not accounted for as congressional increases in the budget.

A similar tabulation, giving the details of congressional actions affecting fiscal 1970 estimates, is included at the bottom of this table.

OVERALL CONGRESSIONAL EFFECT

Translating these actions as of May 21 on the fiscal 1971 budget, it will be seen that all bills—appropriation and legislative—enacted as of this time— which increase or decrease the President's budget—have added about \$383 million in new budget obligational authority and about \$420 million in budget outlays to the budget totals.

ACTION ON REVENUE SIDE OF BUDGET

The surplus or deficit in a budget is the difference between outlays and receipts. Thus, to determine what Congress has done to the deficit so far one must point to the increase in estimated outlays as a congressional increase in the deficit, unless that increase is offset by an increase in taxes also voted by the Congress. The report also keeps track of revenue proposals and congressional action thereon—table 3 of the report.

There have been some revenue increases voted by the Congress amounting to about \$146 million more than the budget anticipated.

SURPLUS-DEFICIT SITUATION

The increase in the projected 1971 deficit chargeable to the Congress to date is the difference between the \$420 million increase in outlays offset by a \$146 million increase in revenues, or about \$274 million.

In his statement of May 19, 1970, the President revised his February budget estimates for fiscal 1971 to reflect a projected deficit for the year of about \$1.3 billion—a change of \$2.6 billion from his February projection of a \$1.3 billion surplus. This latest projection included some actual and anticipated congressional actions. These surplus and deficit estimates are on the unified budget concept. They do not reflect changes in the national debt.

For Federal funds—funds not earmarked for social security and such pur-

poses—the deficit is now projected at more than \$10 billion. This more nearly reflects the true increase in the Federal debt expected for fiscal 1971.

The February budget included about \$5.4 billion for proposals which offset the projected deficit. These were the new revenue proposals, postal rate increases, legislative proposals resulting in negative budget outlays and the President's projected program terminations, restructuring and reductions—most of which require legislative action to achieve them. Had the budget not reflected estimates for these things the deficit, on a unified budget basis, would presumably have been projected at \$4.1 billion instead of a surplus of \$1.3 billion.

On the basis of the May 19 reestimates announced by the President, proposals which offset the projected deficit had increased from \$5.4 billion to \$8.9 billion, including the speed up in estate and gift tax collections, the leaded gasoline tax and some additional postal revenue increases not in the February budget estimates. Eliminating these offsetting proposals from the May 19 budget estimates would increase the projected deficit for 1971 to \$10.5 billion from the President's stated \$1.3 billion.

Going through the same type of calculations for just the Federal funds part of the budget, the May 19 projected deficit for these funds was \$10 billion. Adding the various offsets would increase this deficit in Federal funds to about \$18.4 billion.

Carrying the matter a little further and adding the \$3.2 billion loss in projected budget revenue recently estimated by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, these possible deficits for 1971 could be as high as \$13.7 billion on the unified budget basis and \$21.6 for the Federal funds portion of the budget.

The table referred to follows:

SUPPORTING TABLES

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1.—EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE CURRENT SESSION ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF MAY 21, 1970)

[In thousands of dollars]

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House (1)	Senate (2)	Enacted (3)	House (4)	Senate (5)	Enacted (6)
Fiscal year 1971:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the 1971 budget):						
Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, and related agencies, 1970 (H.R. 15931, Public Law 91-204)				+248,000	+248,000	+248,000
Education (H.R. 16916) ²	+319,590	+700,597		+215,000	+367,000	
Legislative Branch (H.R. 16915)	-9,394			-8,750		
Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Offices (H.R. 16900)	-73,053			-65,000		
Second Supplemental, 1970 (H.R. 17399)				-19,700		
Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 17548)	+173,389			-114,650		
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies (H.R. 17575)	-136,949			-50,000		
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 17619)	-731			-3,350		
Transportation and related agencies (H.R. 17755)	+44,635			+43,000		
Subtotal, appropriation bills	+228,217	+700,597		+158,550	+615,000	+248,000
Legislative bills with "backdoor" spending authorizations (changes from the 1971 budget): ³						
Navajo Road (S. 404)		(+5,000)				
Land and water conservation (S. 2315)	+30,000	(+30,000)				
Unemployment trust fund (H.R. 14705)	+194,000	+194,000	+194,000			
Outdoor advertising controls (S. 1442)		(+15,000)				
Federal-aid highways (H.R. 14741)	(+26,000)					
NSLI trust fund for veterans home loans (H.R. 9476)				(+1,000,000)		
Subtotal, "backdoor"	+224,000	+194,000	+194,000			

Footnotes at end of table.

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House (1)	Senate (2)	Enacted (3)	House (4)	Senate (5)	Enacted (6)
Legislative bills with mandatory spending authorizations (changes from the 1971 budget):						
Additional district judges (S. 952)	-2,370	+1,473	††-727	-2,370	+1,473	††-727
Court leave for Federal employees (H.R. 12979)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)		(N.A.)	(N.A.)	
Uniform relocation assistance (S. 1)		(N.A.)			(N.A.)	
Employee health benefits (H.R. 16968)	†+140,000			†+140,000		
Defense: overseas mailing privileges (H.R. 8434)	(+8,900)			(+8,900)		
Military lawyers retention (H.R. 4296)	(+7,000)			(+7,000)		
Family separation allowance—residence (H.R. 110)	(-17,000)			(-17,000)		
Family separation allowance—POW (H.R. 9486)	(N.A.)			(N.A.)		
Air evacuation subsistence (H.R. 9654)	(+50)			(+50)		
Dependents' health care (H.R. 8413)	+255			+255		
Reserve retirement—Berlin-Vietnam (H.R. 3813)	(N.A.)			(N.A.)		
Reserve retirement—aviation midshipmen (H.R. 11265)	(N.A.)			(N.A.)		
Legislative bills with mandatory spending authorizations (changes from the 1971 budget):						
Public Health Service retirement (S. 2452, Public Law 91-253)	+259	+259	+259	+259	+259	+259
Family assistance (H.R. 16311)	-450,000			-350,000		
Federal lands for parks (reduces offsetting receipts) (S.1708)		(N.A.)			(N.A.)	
Foreign Service retirement (Public Law 91-201)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)
Veterans' hospital care for 70-year-olds (H.R. 693)	(+7,000)	(+7,000)	(†)	(+7,000)	(+7,000)	(†)
Veterans non-service-connected benefits (H.R. 372)	(+8,538)			(+8,538)		
Veterans education assistance (Public Law 91-219) ⁴	†+185,500	†+185,500	+185,500	†+169,000	†+169,000	+169,000
Veterans additional \$5,000 insurance (S. 1479)	+45,000	(+45,000)	(†)	+45,000	(+45,000)	(†)
Veterans compensation increase (S. 3348)		+114,370			+114,370	
Redefine "child"—(dependency compensation) (H.R. 10106)		+6,900	††+3,552		+6,900	††+3,552
Railroad retirement (H.R. 15733)	-7,700			-7,700		
Subtotal, mandatory	-89,056	+308,502	+188,584	-5,556	+292,002	+172,084
Subtotal, legislative bills	+134,944	+502,502	+382,584	-5,556	+292,002	+172,084
Total, fiscal year 1971 ⁴	+363,161	+1,203,099	+382,584	+152,994	+907,002	+420,084
Fiscal year 1970:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the revised 1970 budget):						
Foreign Assistance (Public Law 91-194)	1-150	1-150	-150	1-100	1-100	-100
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies (H.R. 15931, Public Law 91-204)	†+567,000	†+567,000	+567,000	†+335,000	†+335,000	+335,000
Second Supplemental, 1970 (H.R. 17399)	-153,957			-121,300		
Subtotal, appropriation bills	+412,893	+566,850	+566,850	+213,600	+334,900	+334,900
Legislative bills with spending authorizations (changes from the revised 1970 budget):						
Food for needy children (Public Law 91-207)				†+30,000	†+30,000	+30,000
Veterans education assistance (Public Law 91-219)	†+107,400	†+107,400	+107,400	†+94,000	†+94,000	+94,000
Airports and airways development (Public Law 91-258)			+840,000			(N.A.)
Subtotal, legislative bills	+107,400	+107,400	+947,400	+124,000	+124,000	+124,000
Total, fiscal year 1970	+520,293	+674,250	+1,514,250	+337,600	+458,900	+458,900

¹ Reflects conference or final action for comparability.
² \$425 million budget authority (\$212,000,000 outlays) for impacted area school aid, carried in budget as "proposed legislation," is regarded as budget appropriation request for score-keeping purposes although no formal amendment has been transmitted.
³ "Backdoor" refers to budget authority and outlays provided in basic legislation not requiring further appropriation action.

⁴ Congressional increase of \$185,500,000 subsequently included in budget amendment (H. Doc. 91-312).
[†] Excludes actions taken in previous session, shown in parentheses above.
^{††} Subject to or in conference.
^{†††} Committee action.
^{††††} Pending signature.
 N.A.—Not available.

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, I mailed questionnaires to each of the more than 140,000 homes in my congressional district, the 15th of Michigan, to give my constituents an opportunity to express their views on some of the many complex issues facing our Nation today.

This was the sixth consecutive year that I have conducted a questionnaire survey. The response, as usual, was very gratifying. The number of replies was so great it has taken volunteer workers in my district office nearly 2 months to tabulate the results.

I would like to note that the first set of questions on Vietnam were similar to questions asked in a national Gallup poll, also conducted in March. In giving the tabulations on these replies, I have also included the national sample results for

the same question. It should be kept in mind that both polls were taken well over a month before President Nixon's decision for direct military involvement in Cambodia. The questionnaire follows:

1. VIETNAM

The War in Vietnam continues to be one of our nation's most perplexing problems. Which of the following four plans do you think the United States should follow:

[In percent]

	15th District	National
A. Withdraw all troops from Vietnam immediately	22	21
B. Withdraw all troops by the end of 1970	35	25
C. Withdraw all troops, but take as many years to do this as are needed to turn the war over to the South Vietnamese	36	38
D. Send more troops to Vietnam and step up the fighting	7	7

NOTE—The Gallup poll totals also included 9% no opinion.

President Nixon has proposed a plan to Vietnamize the war. If this plan does not succeed, because of the inability of the South

Vietnamese to effectively carry on the combat, what, in your opinion, should be done?

Percent

- A. Continue steady U.S. troop withdrawal. 60
- B. Increase U.S. troops. 3
- C. Make all-out effort for military victory. 25
- D. Other. 12

2. MILITARY SPENDING

Military spending has now reached an annual rate of nearly \$80 billion. Opponents claim that this spending should be drastically reduced, and the money shifted to help solve crucial domestic problems. Proponents say that continued high military spending is vital to the security of our nation? Which of the following most closely represents your view?

Percent

- A. Military spending should be maintained at the present level. 29
- B. Military spending should be substantially reduced. 65
- C. Military spending should be increased. 6

3. BUDGET PRIORITIES

If the Vietnam war ends, and budget pressures cease, which of the following should be given top priority by the President and Congress?

(The following categories are listed in order of the number of votes they received.)

1. Air and Water Pollution.
2. Crime Prevention and Control.
3. Poverty and Hunger.
4. Aid to Education.
5. Reduce Taxes.
6. Health Research.
7. Space Research.
8. Defense, including the ABM.
9. Foreign Aid.
10. Other (Common suggestions were drug control, stop inflation, reduce the national debt, consumer protection and population control).

4. AID TO EDUCATION

Congress recently added more than \$1 billion to President Nixon's recommended budget for education, which included aid for hardpressed local school districts to operate elementary and high schools. President Nixon vetoed the increase. Which of the following most closely represents your views:

	Percent
A. Federal aid to education should be increased	50
B. Federal aid to education should be maintained at about the same level	25
C. Federal aid to education should be decreased, and more of the operating costs should be raised by increasing taxes:	
(1) In the local school districts	9.5
(2) At the state level	15.5

5. THE DRAFT

Which of the following proposals most closely fits your views in regard to draft policies under the Selective Service System?

	Percent
A. Continue the present lottery system with student deferments	23
B. Continue the lottery system, but do away with student deferments	29
C. Eliminate the draft, and substitute professional, all-volunteer Armed Forces	41
D. Others	7

6. VOTING AGE

Would you favor lowering the minimum voting age to 18?

	Percent
No	54
Yes	46

What do you believe to be the best age to begin voting?

(These figures represent a breakdown of the 54% who opposed lowering the voting age to 18.)

	Percent
Age 19	4
Age 20	8
Age 21	88

7. NATIONAL PROBLEMS

List in order of importance the three most important problems facing our nation today. (The following are listed in order of the number of times they were mentioned)

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| (1) Crime | (7) Education |
| (2) Pollution | (8) Civil disorder |
| (3) Viet Nam | (9) Overpopulation |
| (4) Poverty & hunger | (10) Racial problems |
| (5) Taxes | (11) Drug abuse |
| (6) Inflation | (12) Health |

TRIBUTE TO HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 2, 1970

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been an honor and a pleasure to have served under the

leadership of the House Republican whip. Throughout my tenure of service in this body, the Honorable LESLIE ARENDS has continually displayed qualities of leadership and legislative expertise that have seldom been matched. A wise and temperate leader, he has earned the respect of all of the Members of the House of Representatives, regardless of their political persuasion.

Serving as one of LES ARENDS regional whips, I have quickly come to recognize the welcome effect of this man's honesty and diligence. For 27 years he has labored long and hard for effective legislation, never sacrificing integrity for victory and always preserving friendship, no matter how close the contest.

It has often been said that the true mark of excellence and quality is the ability to endure the passing of years without the loss of brilliance and character. This certainly is that case with the distinguished gentleman from the 17th District of Illinois. He has served his people and the Congress for 18 terms. There are only four others serving in this House who have dedicated themselves to public service as a Representative longer. As a knowledgeable member of the Armed Services Committee, and senior Republican member of that committee, the House Republican whip has, without fail, been in the forefront of the vigorous and successful efforts to provide our country with a strong foreign policy and a credible national defense. Ever willing to listen to differing views, LES ARENDS has always approached any legislation and every problem with a studied and firm resolve to do that which is best for his country and his party.

Yet beyond his capabilities as a legislator, we have come to know LES ARENDS as a man of good will and good humor. A gentleman and a trusted compatriot, LES ARENDS is and will continue to be a credit to this body and to the people he so ably represents.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we all join together to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS.

DIMINISHING INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most persistent ills facing all Americans today is inflation. We face it every day when we shop at the grocery store, when we buy clothes, and when we try to get an auto loan or purchase a house.

But if you look at the statistics—the so-called economic indicators—one can see that the inflationary pressures which built up so strongly during the mid-1960's and into 1970's are now beginning to recede. This has been reflected in the continued decline—albeit small, but nonetheless a drop—in interest rates and the easing of general financial market conditions.

Note well that while the administration is advising us that the anti-inflation program is working, that the policies are on track, we have also heard from private economists saying the very same thing.

Only a few days ago, one of the Nation's leading brokerage house economists, Albert Cox, chief economist at Lionel D. Edie & Co., a division of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, told the American Management Association that the United States has set a proper economic course.

More recently, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, a European-based economic group, forecast an upturn in the U.S. economy in the second half of this year.

Thus, while the struggle against inflation occupies a major part of everyone's attention—and the administration's efforts—I believe the necessary pain of adjustment we now feel will soon subside.

Although we are still in the midst of an absolutely necessary transition period, I believe the next major economic turn will be an upward movement—and that means the beginning of less pain—and diminished inflationary pressures.

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR SOCIETY SUPPORTS ROTC

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of the resolution adopted by the Congressional Medal of Honor Society reaffirming their belief in the concepts of the ROTC program in this country.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States is composed of individuals who have sworn to defend our country against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and

Whereas its members are citizens concerned with the future leadership of our armed services, the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States in a regular business meeting in its biennial convention at Houston, Texas,

Resolved, That it reaffirms its belief in the concept of civilian control of the armed forces; be it

Resolved further, that the members of the society believe that it is in the best interest of our country that Army, Navy and Air Force ROTC programs and academic instruction be retained on civilian campuses; and be it

Resolved further, that, inasmuch as the society's interest in ROTC transcends the political and the philosophical, the members of the society believe that through obtaining a major portion of the officers from civilian oriented institutions of higher learning, the armed services and the Nation will continue to benefit from the leadership introduced from this source.

Approved and passed this 10th day of October 1969

ARTHUR ANDERSEN & CO. RAPS
PLANNED CHANGES IN MERGER
ACCOUNTING

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Wall Street Journal raises some very serious questions, particularly for those of us who sit on the Commerce Committee. The article is headed "Arthur Andersen & Co. Raps Planned Changes in Merger Accounting."

The changes alluded to are those being considered by the accounting principles board of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. These changes are attacked by the prominent accounting firm of Arthur Andersen & Co., according to the article, as so questionable that their implementation would make it inevitable that the courts would enforce some correction.

In addition to the brief cited in this article, other material concerning these changes has alluded to the significant economic impact which could follow from the board's action. It has been claimed that the great majority of mergers would not qualify under the board's criteria, that the effects of this accounting decision will reach far beyond the accounting profession and deep into our entire economic structure. Changes with such great effect would appear to properly be in the legislative province. They are matters with which the Commerce Committee has particular concern. Serious questions arise when positions of such magnitude and impact are formulated by Government agencies or by groups in the private sector and not by Congress.

I include the Wall Street Journal article in the RECORD at this point:

ARTHUR ANDERSEN & CO. RAPS PLANNED
CHANGES IN MERGER ACCOUNTING—ATTACK
CIRCULATED BY FIRM SEES PRINCIPLES
BOARD'S PROPOSALS HURTING INVESTORS,
PROFESSION

NEW YORK.—The fight over pooling of interests escalated as Arthur Andersen & Co., one of the nation's largest accounting firms, circulated a stinging denunciation of the stricter merger rules proposed by the Accounting Principles Board, the profession's top rulemaking body.

The Chicago firm charged that the draft proposals before the board, if adopted, "would cause great injury and damage to public investors" and lead to chaos in the preparation of business financial statements. "Attempts at enforcement," the Andersen firm predicted, "would result in eventual disaster for the accounting profession."

Arthur Andersen said the principles board's proposals are "so questionable" that their implementation would make it "inevitable that . . . (the) courts would enforce some corrections." Some corporations have threatened legal action against an accounting firm that would hold them to the proposals if they become final.

The Andersen firm's comments came in a printed 23-page brief hearing tomorrow's date but already sent to members of the principles board and to the Securities and Exchange Commission. A copy was obtained from sources outside the firm, but last eve-

ning the firm said it was mailing copies to the press.

The substance of the Chicago firm's views came as no great surprise, but the vehemence of its language was probably unsurpassed among the more than 300 letters of comment the principles board has received on its "exposure draft" on merger accounting. Leonard Spacek, head of Arthur Andersen & Co., has been outspokenly critical of the principles board's proposals.

STUDY MADE IN 1968

In addition, the Chicago firm was responsible for a 1968 research study that recommended a ban in pooling of interests but otherwise differed sharply from the merger proposals currently before the principles board. In its current brief, Arthur Andersen essentially reiterates the study's recommendations.

Leonard M. Savole, executive vice president of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and considered an advocate of the exposure draft, last night declined to comment in detail on the Andersen firm's criticisms. Mr. Savole said the draft was admittedly tentative, but "we think it represents a reasonable solution to a difficult problem."

In a pooling of interests, two merged companies are treated as though they always had been combined. The two combine their current financial results and restate past results to reflect the merger. The acquiring company carries its newly acquired assets at the values given them on the old company's books, no matter how unrealistic. The acquiring company isn't required to amortize—deduct from future earnings—any excess it paid for a concern over the book value of its assets.

The board's exposure draft would limit poolings of interests to mergers effected by an exchange of common stock for common stock. Also, among other restrictions, no company entering a pooling could be more than three times the size of its merger partners.

If a merger failed to qualify as a pooling, it would be accounted for as a "purchase." The acquiring concern would enter the acquired assets on its books at their fair value at the time of merger. The difference between the total value of identifiable acquired assets and the overall cost of the acquisition would be termed "goodwill." This goodwill would have to be charged against future earnings over 40 years or less.

TREATMENT OF GOODWILL

The Andersen firm strongly agrees that acquired assets be given their fair value, but it strongly advocates that any resulting goodwill immediately be charged off against the acquiring company's surplus, rather than against its future earnings. It contends that regarding goodwill as an asset to be written off would exaggerate the combined company's assets. This "could be as disastrous" as accounting practices that "contributed to the financial collapse of 1929," the Andersen brief said.

It also argued that charging goodwill against earnings was arbitrary and would misrepresent a company's post-merger earnings. It attacked the proposed three-to-one size test as discriminatory and arbitrary.

The Andersen recommendations included no size test. They also said the same accounting should be followed regardless of whether a company paid cash, stock or debt issues for another company.

The 18-member principles board made public its exposure draft in early March and invited public comment to be submitted by tomorrow. The board is scheduled to consider the draft at its meeting next month. A two-thirds vote is required to adopt the draft as a formal opinion binding on the nation's accountants.

SIGNIFICANT LABOR LAW
DECISION

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has handed down a significant decision which allows an injunction against some strikes that are in violation of a no-strike agreement. The Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 has been to encourage peaceful settlement of disputes through arbitration, collective bargaining and no-strike, no-lockout contract agreements. Yet the Court's decision in the Sinclair case in 1962 prohibited injunctions in the Federal courts against strikes that were in violation of no-strike contracts. There has clearly been a discrepancy between the intent of Congress and the Sinclair ruling.

An editorial published in today's Washington Post is in my view an excellent analysis of the Supreme Court's decision.

The editorial follows:

THE SUPREME COURT: NO-STRIKE CONTRACTS

The Supreme Court's decision that some strikes in violation of a no-strike agreement may be enjoined in the federal courts is an important step in modernization of labor law. The 1962 decision in the *Sinclair* case, which outlawed anti-strike injunctions in the federal courts even though the labor contract in question contained a no-strike clause and provided for binding arbitration of grievance disputes, had long been under challenge. The court, quite properly in our view, acknowledged its error and in effect made the dissenting opinion of 1962 the law of the land.

The problem before the court on both occasions was one of reconciling the Norris-LaGuardia Act forbidding the use of injunctions to suppress the activities of organized labor and the Taft-Hartley Act regulating labor-management relations. In 1962 the court, with Justice Black as spokesman, took a very literal view of the Norris-LaGuardia provision denying federal courts jurisdiction "to issue any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction in any case involving or growing out of any labor dispute . . ." Congress did not specifically modify this language when it passed the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, but it adopted a comprehensive labor-management policy and left the job of reconciliation to the courts. We agree with Justice Brennan's comment that this task involves "more than concentration upon isolated words." The thrust of Taft-Hartley and later statutes is to encourage arbitration and the peaceful resolution of industrial disputes. That policy was being undercut by the 1962 decision allowing unions to strike in violation of their own voluntary agreements, with immunity from any effective restraint. In those circumstances, the reasonable course for the court was to modify its own view of the law—a view that seemed out of harmony with congressional intent.

The result is not less desirable because it was made possible in part by changes of personnel on the court. Only one member who participated in both decisions changed his mind, and Justice Stewart gracefully acknowledged the switch by quoting Justice Frankfurter: "Wisdom too often never comes, and so one ought not to reject it merely because it comes late."

Justice Black, in dissent, wrapped himself in the robes of strict constructionism and lectured the majority on the evils of legis-

lating from the bench. It was a very strange doctrine that he evolved, however, to perpetuate his own view of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. When the law has once been settled by the Supreme Court, he said, any change in that interpretation "is no different in effect from a judicial alteration of language that Congress itself placed in the statute."

Noting that Congress had not acted on the bills which sought to overturn his 1962 opinion, he assumed that this was equivalent to an expression of the congressional will. Why should the court take upon itself the responsibility for enactment of the amendment that Congress refused to adopt? But this is clearly a distortion of what happened. Congress never really came to grips with the problem growing out of the Sinclair decision and a subsequent one making it possible for strikers to shift injunction cases out of state courts (where Norris-LaGuardia did not reach) into federal courts. It would certainly be far-fetched to assume that its silence was equivalent to enactment of a policy.

Instead of encroaching on the legislative function of Congress, the Supreme Court did nothing more in this case than to correct its own error. We surmise that the current reconciliation of the two statutes will be far more acceptable to a majority in Congress than was the previous ruling. In any event, the present court has an obligation to interpret statutes in accord with its own view of the intent of Congress with due deference to precedents that are still worthy of respect.

PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE INJUSTICE OF STATE OR LOCAL INCOME TAXES ON OUT-OF-STATE RESIDENTS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposal which is intended to alleviate the highly inequitable and grossly unfair situation whereby a State or one of its political subdivisions imposes a tax on the income of an individual, legally residing in another State, who happens to commute to work at a Federal installation within the taxing jurisdiction of such State or political subdivision. This penalty has long plagued New Jersey residents who commute to work at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, many of whom travel by boat and never set foot upon soil under the jurisdiction of the city of Philadelphia. A comparable situation exists in the district of my colleague, the Honorable RICHARD WHITE of Texas, in that a substantial number of his constituents commute across the Texas State line to work at the White Sands Missile Range and are forced to pay the New Mexico State income tax. Another factor which makes these situations very similar is the fact that neither the State of New Jersey nor the State of Texas levy a State income tax against which reciprocal tax credits might be allowed.

The intent of the proposal is to prohibit a State or one of its political subdivisions from taxing the incomes of out-of-State residents who work on a

Federal installation in the taxing State, "unless such State or political subdivision thereof provides to such person material and proportionate benefits and protection." It is integrally related to a measure that I first introduced in the 90th Congress, and again in the present Congress, which takes a broad approach to the problem inasmuch as it would prohibit any State or political subdivision thereof from levying taxes on the income of any person who is not a resident of such State. The proposal now before us, however, takes a more limited approach in that it would apply only to those cases where an out-of-State resident works at a Federal installation which is situated within a taxing jurisdiction comprising the State or one of its political subdivisions.

In my estimation, it is this situation which highlights the injustice and inequity of taxes on the incomes of out-of-State residents. First, from the vantage point of having representation where one is required to pay taxes, those who commute to work to a Federal installation from another State have as much a right as residents who pay a tax on income at an equal rate to be represented in the councils of government which determine how their taxes are to be spent. Second, and more significantly, is the fact that those who work at a Federal installation and live in another State realize the least amount of benefits from the taxes paid to the surrounding State or adjacent municipality. Although the courts have, to my knowledge, never voided taxes of this nature on the grounds of discrimination by class or equal protection, there are ample precedents for taxing jurisdictions levying a lesser rate of income tax on residents, and these taxes, too, have been upheld by the courts. This strengthens my belief that a legislative policy should be adopted so as to protect that class of out-of-State resident citizens paying a State or local income tax in a foreign state, disproportionate to the benefits received, who have no other representation in this matter than we in Congress.

I respectfully urge the Members on the House Judiciary Committee to give their earnest attention to this subject on behalf of the thousands of individuals around the country who seek relief from this injustice. I encourage the sponsorship of the Members who would like to demonstrate their support for this proposal.

As the text of the measure is brief, I include it at this point in my remarks:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 106 of title 4, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(c) No State or political subdivision thereof may levy or collect any income tax on income received from transactions occurring or services performed within a Federal area by any person who does not reside within such Federal area or within the State wherein such Federal area is located and who commutes to such employment, unless such State or political subdivision thereof provides to such person material and proportionate benefits and protection.

VIEWS OF A FORMER HAWK

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, much of the heavy mail I have received on the subject of the President's decision to place American troops inside Cambodia, has come from informed and concerned citizens who have been supporters of the war effort in Vietnam.

While not all have changed their opinion, many have done so, and have gone to some length to describe to me their reasons for doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a letter from Mr. D. C. Bryan of Orinda, Calif., which I consider to be representative of those who have changed their opinion:

MAY 11, 1970.

Representative JEROME WALDIE,
U.S. House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALDIE: As a registered voter and a most concerned citizen, who since 1961 has read over two dozen books on the Indochinese war, and who as recently as 1968 was a hawk. Having spent three months in Southeast Asia traveling among the people to learn of their cultural and political aspirations, having witnessed the Detroit riots of 1967, the Shinjuku station riots in Tokyo of 1968 and finally, the Berkeley student riots of 1967-70. Having been General Manager of a manufacturing division of a \$60 million Corporation, and most recently, at age 42, having gone back to U.C. Berkeley to get a Ph.D. in business in order to share my experience in the "real world" with the younger people. I feel that the time has come when this member of the silent majority must speak out in opposition to the United States foreign policy in all of Indochina. I therefore would like to outline my position on the following points.

We are not involved in a legally declared war—we are acting upon precedents (i.e. Gulf of Tonkin resolution). Therefore, abandoning South Vietnam for the U.S. will not constitute "losing a war". As a matter of fact, militarily we have probably won the conflict. However, politically we have not and cannot get the peasants or the urban younger people of our side, South Vietnamese, to wholeheartedly fight their war for political independence.

There will be, as a result of our pull out, wholesale slaughter of South Vietnamese who actively supported our presence, and some of whom profited handsomely. I would say about 100 thousand will die, or about the same number as our firebombing of Tokyo and Dresden, "nucing" Hiroshima and Nagasaki killed in 1945. If we remain, even with a "reduced profile," for another five years will not an equal number die? Or to put it another way, why, after sixteen years of U.S. presence, military and economic, do the people of that country appear to be no more and probably somewhat less politically motivated to fight the V.C.? I wonder further, if a referendum were held in "our Vietnam" with a choice between: our continued military presence, with *absolutely* no opportunity for personal profit vs. a complete U.S. withdrawal by the end of 1970, I think the people in this hypothetical vote would choose the latter. Remove the opportunity for personal profit from our establishment in their country and we would be as loved as the French were in May of 1954.

2. Cambodia is an extension of what was

outlined above, and while it may be another example of winning militarily it does not address itself to the political problems of South Vietnam or the realities of the political climate in this country. President Nixon, for whom I have twice voted, in his speech did much to insult the intelligence of the U.S. public. His comment that we cannot afford to "lose the war," and the implication that one more sweep will make it possible to disengage with honor, sounded too much like Hitler's winning all the way to Stalingrad, or Tojo's winning all the way to Midway!

3. What is the attitude of the student as seen through eyes of a member of the establishment? For sixteen months I have witnessed and experienced how a very small group of less than three hundred highly vocal activists and anarchists can force confrontations with the establishment. These confrontations inevitably lead to death and martyrs. This is precisely what the activists need and want! Today our government is giving the activist a cause filled with emotional and idealistic content. Whether or not the campuses return to academic pursuits this spring, America will never be the same!

The younger people believe, whether or not true, that they forced the President of the United States to hold a press conference at which he announced that in less than 96 hours he would have troops moving back out of our Cambodian operation. I feel that now they will move much more actively against the draft and our military establishment. I personally have lived through a remarkable change in attitude towards military service—in 1944 I volunteered at age 17; in 1950, while at M.I.T., I was among students whose only thought was how to beat the draft; in 1970 ROTC programs have been closed down on several campuses. My concern is that if in the future this country is involved in a so called "good war" the vast majority of the educated younger people will not serve, because they will have been thoroughly indoctrinated by the youth of today, that four establishmentarian Presidents led the American people into an ever increasing, immoral and totally irrelevant war to preserve an ever increasing and somewhat immoral gross national product. In this I see a clear and present danger to the viability of America's foreign policy as it tries to avoid war III, because it may be reduced to one of two choices: appeasement or a nuclear holocaust, with no options in between.

Let us get out of Southeast Asia; if the Philippines, New Zealand, Australia, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Burma, and India, don't consider the contest worth their treasure and blood why should we!

The students of this country are today a force with which the establishment must reckon. There are areas of accommodation that must be explored, recognizing that they will "demand" more than they hope to get or even want, and that they truly have lost confidence in the establishment's ability to lead this nation towards a better life for all Americans, not merely for some Americans. I am working on this and I hope that you will join me in pursuit of a United States

Thanks for your help.

DUNCAN C. BRYON.

ORINDA, CALIF.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 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?

THE WAR AND MR. NIXON

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the President's address last evening on our war in Indochina was a great, and even bitter, disappointment.

It has been a long and dismal journey from Candidate Nixon who had a "plan" to end the war, to President Nixon who told us last night that our latest expansion into Cambodia was "the most successful" operation of the entire war.

That superlative is a pitifully hollow consolation in a war marked with great military promises and even greater disappointments. The President indicated once again that he measures progress in Indochina by military standards. Nowhere last night did he indicate an awareness that Vietnamese and Cambodians populate the areas we occupy and invade, that the Indochina war is about who shall govern these ancient lands, or that the United States recognizes and accepts a limit to the possibilities of military power.

"The most successful" military operation in a singularly unsuccessful war means exactly nothing, as the President surely must soon recognize. One fears that his other explanations last evening about similar progress in his war policies are similarly fatuous.

For example, the President told us that withdrawals of American troops would now "resume." When were withdrawals suspended?

The President announced that while all American military personnel will be withdrawn from Cambodia by June 30, bombing of Cambodian targets will continue when the President finds it necessary.

Before the crossing of the Cambodian border, we presumably did not maintain a policy of bombing enemy troops and materials in that country. Now we do. That is not escalation of the war.

The President also announced in April a withdrawal of 150,000 American troops from Vietnam within a year. Last night he said that one-third of that number would leave Vietnam by October 15—a point almost 6 months through that year. This means that the rate of withdrawal from October to April 1971, must be twice as fast as the rate from April to October—a sobering prospect. This withdrawal policy produces increasingly long odds against an early end to our role in Indochina.

The President still fails to accept, or to understand, the basic contention of

his opponents who want a withdrawal of American troops without regard to actions taken or not taken by either Hanoi or Saigon. This is the gulf separating the President from his critics. His speech last night shows, to my great regret, his failure to understand this criticism which is based on 5 years of watching military men propose military solutions which would give us military victory. Presidents come and go but the mirage of a military victory in Vietnam remains.

The final reflection that comes to me after considering the President's speech was the lack of vigor and fervor which marked his presentation. After nearly 17 months in office, President Nixon seems burdened, much as his predecessor was burdened, by the weight of this impossible war. Hopes that President Nixon did have a plan for peace have all but vanished. We are left, once again, to wait for the passage of time to change men and perhaps, policy.

TRAINING FOR REVOLUTION

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following item appeared in a recent publication entitled "In a Nutshell" published in Chicago, Ill.:

TRAINING FOR REVOLUTION

Information filtering out of Cuba shows that American troublemakers and revolutionaries are being trained there and then returned here "to do their thing." A copyrighted story in the *Detroit News* stated that it had information "that most of the 500 young Americans now in Cuba, ostensibly as cane cutters, are in fact learning revolutionary warfare in a camp 30 miles east of Havana . . ." *Verde Olivo*, Castro's military journal, published a statement by Julie Nichaman (one of the alleged cane cutters) saying that American youths in Cuba "have a new determination to bring back to our brothers and sisters a dedication to destroy the imperialist monster from within just as the rest of the people of the world are destroying it from without."

Ralph Featherstone and William Payne, black terrorists who were killed in Maryland when a bomb they were transporting exploded, had been trained in Cuba. Cathleen Wilkerson and Kathy Boudin who disappeared from a house in New York which was being used as a bomb factory after the house blew up and three terrorists were killed, had been in Cuba. Three of the seven defendants in the "Chicago 7 conspiracy trial" had been in Cuba. These are just a few of many. This is all further evidence of the terrible mistake our country made in permitting the Communist takeover of Cuba.

In relation to the trouble this country is having domestically, vis-a-vis violence, it is significant.

What we are witnessing today in many respects are the bitter fruit of the trees grown from seeds of hatred deliberately planted years ago in the minds and hearts of some of our young people. Some day, the Lord willing, justice will be done by fixing the responsibility of those in America who did this.

**"THERMAL POLLUTION" THEORY
UNDER CHALLENGE**

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread congressional interest in so-called thermal pollution, more accurately referred to as thermal effect, I would like to call to the attention of this body an article from the Washington Evening Star of May 29 by Peter Bernstein.

The article reports on a study conducted by Daniel Merriman, a Yale University biologist, on the effects of the heated effluent from the Haddam Neck nuclear power plant in Connecticut on fish and plants in the river.

After 5 years of study—2 years prior to operation of the reactor and 3 years since—Mr. Merriman reports:

The level of heating we are encountering may even turn out to have beneficial long-range results.

The article states that this work lays open to question the entire concept of thermal pollution damage to fish and plants.

Mr. Merriman points out that while there is an upper limit to the amount of heat that can be introduced into such waters, the present State and Federal regulations regarding thermal effects appear to be unnecessarily harsh.

The article follows:

**STUDY OF RIVER CHALLENGES "THERMAL
POLLUTION" THEORY**

(By Peter Bernstein)

New research claiming that fish and plants thrive in rivers warmed by electric power plants is challenging the government's whole concept of "thermal pollution."

Until now, officials at the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration have maintained that an increase in temperature of only a few degrees could kill a variety of marine plants and animals.

As a result, new federal regulations have curbed the number of nuclear power plants on rivers and lakes. And electric utilities have blamed this, in turn, as contributing to present power shortages.

Research by Yale biologist Daniel Merriman amounts to a direct attack on current government concepts and promises to provoke more controversy over the siting of large power plants.

RIVER STUDIED

Writing in the May issue of Scientific American, Merriman says under certain environmental conditions "thermal pollution" as it is currently understood may be a fallacy.

His attack is based on what he calls a "short-term evaluation" of a portion of the Connecticut River he has studied almost daily for the last 5 years. The study focused on the impact of heated water from the Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Co.'s nuclear plant at Haddam Neck. The plant is 15 miles upriver from Long Island Sound.

Merriman claims the atomic plant, which opened 3 years ago, "has so far had no drastic biological consequences" on the river. "The levels of heating we are encountering may turn out to have beneficial long-range results."

Merriman points out that on several oc-

casions the temperature near the point where the heated water was discharged rose 10 degrees above the river's normal temperature. This is more than twice as high as the federal limit of 4 degrees.

Recently, federal water quality officials recommended that four states bordering Lake Michigan set a standard for thermal pollution that would severely restrict the construction of power plants on the lake's banks.

Their proposed standard would require that the temperature of discharged water not exceed the lake's natural temperature by more than 1 degree. The states—Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana and Michigan—have questioned whether the proposal is necessary.

"Clearly there is an upper limit to the amount of heat that can be introduced into such waters without harmful results," Merriman says. But he indicates a rise of 10 degrees should be allowed.

Among the fish unharmed by the plant's discharge of almost 370,000 gallons of water per minute were shad, herring, striped bass, pickerel, sunfish, and catfish, his report says.

**TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN W.
McCORMACK**

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to join with my colleagues in paying personal tribute to the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, present Speaker of the House of Representatives, who has announced his intention to retire from the House of Representatives at the end of this term.

In the over a fifth of a century during which I have served under his unselfish, capable, industrious, fair, and effective leadership, I have come to know and genuinely appreciate all of his contributions of service which he has given to his colleagues in the Congress, officials of the executive department with whom he has worked, and the peoples of the Nation and the world, generally. His political sagacity, understanding, and leadership are so well known that a colleague and coworker need not call these qualifications and attainments to the attention of his fellows. They are now and have been taken and accepted as a matter of unquestioned fact and are written indelibly in the history of our Nation.

A man inherently noble in spirit can be nothing else than noble in his relations with his fellow man. JOHN McCORMACK possesses such nobility. In the years of our work and acquaintanceship, an inherent gentleness of personality, fervor for the causes in which he has honestly believed, and love for his fellow man have been the most appealing traits of his personality to me.

Throughout the years, he has been firm when firmness was needed. He has been constructively critical when criticism was in order. He has been patient when patience could be effective. He has been understanding at all times. Nobility? Yes. What more can people desire in a fellow citizen and in a recognized leader? With all of this responsibility and lead-

ership, there has been a desire to serve his fellow man with complete honesty and sincere humility.

I sincerely wish for him and his beloved companion, Mrs. McCormack, many years of happiness and a continuing feeling of work well done.

**QUESTIONS ON VIETNAM: VIII.
CONSEQUENCES OF CAMBODIAN
INVASION**

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the recent invasion of Cambodia by ground troops of the United States and South Vietnam has added greatly to the complications of the Indochina situation. Now we are involved in a war which is not just a Vietnam war but a full Indochina war with Laos and Cambodia added to the area of conflict. The President has opened a Pandora's box of trouble with the Cambodian invasion. In the following two questions, prepared by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars at Cornell University, the consequences of the Cambodian invasion and the source of the information for the President's decision are discussed:

QUESTIONS ON VIETNAM

7. What are the consequences of the invasion of Cambodia?

By invading Cambodia, the United States has expanded the battleground. Although President Nixon has promised that all American forces will be withdrawn from Cambodia by the end of June, he has not yet said that they will not be sent back at a later date. Our ally, General Thieu, however, has made it clear that for the next six months—through the American elections of November as he so candidly put it—the South Vietnamese army will have the responsibility of sustaining the government of General Lon Nol, training his army, and providing it with military support in at least the eastern half of Cambodia.

The invasion has had highly adverse results. It provides no significant military benefits; it widens the war and undermines Vietnamization; it upsets the political balance within Cambodia; it weakens the American position in the whole of Southeast Asia; and it damages prospects of a negotiated settlement.

American attacks on enemy border bases in Cambodia can have no lasting effect on the security of South Vietnam's Western frontier. Although substantial supplies of food and military equipment have been captured and destroyed, COSVN (enemy headquarters) has not been captured and few enemy troops have been killed or even committed to battle. Nothing prevents the enemy from returning to the border areas once American and South Vietnamese troops have departed. The small inexperienced Cambodian army will be no more capable of controlling the frontier enclaves in the future than it has been in the past. The enemy troops which have moved back from the border districts deep into central Cambodia place Phnom Penh and General Lon Nol's government in greater jeopardy making it ever more dependent on outside assistance.

If it is true that Vietnamization cannot succeed without denying eastern Cambodian districts to the enemy, then the Administra-

tion must occupy these areas with South Vietnamese and/or American troops and make a major and continuing commitment to shore up the Lon Nol government. The scope of the war has been greatly expanded without any significant change in the balance of forces.

While the defense of South Vietnam remains critically dependent on American military forces, South Vietnamese troops have been expanded into Eastern Cambodia, thus far a 50% increase in its area of responsibility. The number of Vietnamese troops available to relieve Americans is reduced and the prospects of bringing American soldiers home have diminished.

8. Doesn't the President have access to more information on Vietnam than we do?

Yes, the President does have access to information from government agencies, as well as information from academic specialists, newspapers and journals available to the public. However, availability of information does not necessarily make for its thorough digestion and does not ensure that the judgments made on the basis of it are sound—as it is generally agreed was the case in President Johnson's decision to send U.S. forces to Vietnam in 1965.

Moreover, in making his decision to invade Cambodia, President Nixon did not consult with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, or with his special assistant for National Security Affairs. (See the full coverage concerning this in the New York Times and Washington Post.) In fact, the Department of State was not informed in advance by U.S. officials in Saigon concerning the Cambodian decision because of fear of its opposition. Although the President was free to call upon many sources of advice, it is clear that at least in the Cambodian decision he did not do so.

Furthermore, the constitution of the U.S. clearly stipulates an important role for the Senate to "advise and consent" on foreign policy. Not only was the Senate Foreign Relations Committee not consulted on the Cambodian decision, they received the impression from the (perhaps uninformed) Secretary of State that there would be no move into Cambodia.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is regretted that a number of our newsmen have been lost while covering the war in Southeast Asia. We can hope and pray for their safety and their early return to freedom and their families.

I am assuming that all were unarmed; that none were engaged in any military or belligerent activity; and that none can be considered a war criminal as the Communists are designating our military nationals who are their prisoners of war. None were antagonistic or unfair to the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong.

I am also assuming that our newsmen who have been captured will be treated with particular care and extraordinary consideration both because they cannot be considered unfriendly belligerents and because the Communists are not likely to want to incur the wrath of public opinion by any mistreatment. For this, we and their families, can be enormously grateful.

Our military prisoners of war have been almost forgotten by the news media. Their plight has been neglected. Only the families of the POW's and MIA's have been able to stir a little attention. The national news media is able to focus enormous attention upon other small groups and causes. The national media is able to mold public opinion—even world public opinion—on many issues. I am hopeful that the reporting of the circumstances, conditions, treatment, and developments concerning our captured newsmen will also, even if incidentally, focus attention and concern upon the plight of our captured servicemen.

STATEMENT OF THE STUDENT COUNCIL AT MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, during this period when our attention is focused on the college and university campuses around the Nation, I feel I should share with the Members of this House a statement issued a day or two ago by the Executive Committee of the Student Council at Morehead State University, in Morehead, Ky.

The statement follows:

Representative CARL D. PERKINS,
Washington, D.C.:

The Morehead State University Student Council requests that the following statement be read to the House of Representatives.

The executive committee of the Morehead State University Student Council meeting today unanimously passed the following statement to be presented to the total university community with copies to be forwarded to the President of the United States, all members of the Congress of the United States and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky: "We recognize the perplexing questions and staggering problems with which America is faced at home and abroad.

We are disturbed by the armed conflict which is taking place in Vietnam and the escalation of the war in Southeast Asia by the entry into Cambodia.

We are saddened and indignant over the violence to which participants have resorted on the campuses of colleges and universities resulting in martial law and the loss of lives of students at Kent State University.

We are concerned with the division which has occurred among the various elements of the American public over the manner in which our domestic and foreign affairs are being handled.

The citizens of the Morehead State University community have engaged in peaceful dissent and have used reasonable means to express this dissent during the past week.

We believe it is now time for the students, faculty, administration and staff of Morehead State University to focus their attention during the remaining weeks of this semester to the educative process in the classroom and laboratory so that each may complete his task successfully.

We further propose that the attention and efforts of all of us be directed to the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government with a strong petition that the President and Congress act with haste and wisdom in bringing the war in Southeast Asia to a speedy end.

Furthermore, we ask the university community at Morehead to address itself to those campus problems and their solutions which will guarantee continued academic freedom, personal rights and human relations. And finally, we call upon everyone at Morehead State University to concern himself during the remaining weeks with teaching and learning in the hope that we may set a pattern for the citizens of all academic communities of America to follow.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION,
MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSITY.

THE PRESIDENT WAS RIGHT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that some of the results sweeping into Cambodia are being recognized, it is well to ponder the fundamental validity of the President's decision.

In an article which appeared in the Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News, Friday, May 15, by one of the most penetrating observers of the international scene, Mr. Dumitru Danielopol of the Copley Press, very thoughtfully analyzes the President's decision and I insert that column in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Elgin (Ill.) Daily Courier-News,
May 15, 1970]

THE PRESIDENT WAS RIGHT

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

GENEVA.—There can be no doubt that President Nixon's decision to send American troops into Cambodia to prevent a Communist takeover is the most important he has made as President.

It was the right decision.

It was the only alternative the Communists left him.

He came into the White House to open a new era in the cold war of negotiations rather than confrontation. President Nixon honestly believed that the Communists were ready to negotiate.

To show his desire for peace the President reduced the bombing by 20 per cent, withdrew a number of GIs and promised to withdraw a large contingent in the months to follow. He was ready to negotiate all issues except the future of South Vietnam to be determined by the people of South Vietnam themselves.

The Reds took these conciliatory moves as signs of weakness and despite Presidential warnings, showed intransigence and belligerence and escalated the war into Cambodia.

But the warnings were not just a face saving device. The President meant what he said and acted. He sent in the GIs to prevent the country from falling to the Reds.

As was to be expected his decision raised the same cries of horror and despair as one has heard for years now from "peace at any price-nicks" inside and outside Congress.

The same Senators, J. William Fulbright, Edward Kennedy, Charles Goodell, George McGovern, Eugene McCarthy and Jacob Javits are wringing their hands, though over these years they have come with no other solution to the war in Vietnam other than what amounts to complete surrender.

The New York Times editorials were also true to expectations. They deplored the President's decision and accused him of breaking campaign pledges.

"This is not the 'new' Nixon," says the New York Times, "it is more like the old Nixon who as vice-president in 1954 said the

United States would have to send troops into Indochina if there were no other way to prevent its fall to the Communists."

It could add to that. It is more like Nixon, the Vice-President who urged President Eisenhower to help the Hungarian fighters in 1956; like the Richard Nixon who when asked by President John F. Kennedy after the debacle of the Bay of Pigs, in 1961 what he would do about Cuba, answered: "I would find any legal excuse and go in."

History proved that in all three cases Mr. Nixon's judgment was right. Had we helped the French in 1954, we might never have had to fight another war in Indochina. In 1956 Khrushchev—desirous to avoid confrontation with the United States—waited a few days for U.S. reaction. When none came he sent in his tanks to crush the Hungarians.

Had President Eisenhower acted on his advice not only Hungary but the whole of Eastern Europe might be free by now.

As for Cuba, had President Kennedy acted on Mr. Nixon's advice and cleaned out Castro he wouldn't have had to face the possibility of a nuclear war during the Cuban missile crisis of 1963.

Responsible Americans and Swiss opinion considers the President's decision on Cambodia right. They deplore the fact that while North Vietnam was using Cambodia for sanctuary—liberal opinion never protested for the violation of its neutrality, while the moment the U.S. takes action to protect its flank—there are cries of shame and horror.

"Mr. Nixon," said a well known Swiss newsman, "acted as the wise, statesmanlike, and responsible President he is. Those who expected anything else have been mistaken in their evaluation of him."

CONGRESSMAN WHALEN CONGRATULATES REV. HARVEY C. HAHN UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM A CAREER OF SERVICE TO HIS FELLOW MAN

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of great personal pleasure that I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to a man whose life has been a constant dedication to love of his fellow man.

He is the Reverend Harvey C. Hahn, who will step down from his pulpit as the pastor of the Otterbein United Methodist Church, in Dayton, Ohio, and retire on June 15.

Dr. Hahn prepared for a career in business. The holder of a bachelors degree in business administration from Fenn College, in Cleveland, Ohio, he was working as the purchasing agent of a large retail store in Cleveland when he decided to enter the ministry.

Thus, in 1929, he entered Dayton's United Theological Seminary. In that same year, he was assigned as a student pastor to the Otterbein United Methodist Church and began his more than 40 years of service there.

During the four decades of Dr. Hahn's direction, the church has grown from 81 members to several hundred and is now housed in a million-dollar center of worship and community activity. Despite the impact of a massive urban renewal program, the new church remains in the old neighborhood where it first took root in 1853.

Dr. Hahn was a driving force in the success of that urban renewal project, called the East Dayton urban renewal program. It was one of the largest renewal projects undertaken up to that time. Dr. Hahn contributed to that momentum by making the courageous decision to construct his new church in the old community to set an example for both private and public enterprise in the East Dayton area.

Active in many areas, Dr. Hahn speaks on Dayton radio station WING nine times a week, is one of the 10 speakers for the General Motors Corp's. speakers bureau, is the Protestant chaplain for the city of Dayton Safety Department and the national chaplain for the Imperial Shrine of North America. Dr. Hahn also serves on the boards of the Leukemia Society of Greater Dayton, the Miami Valley Hospital, Boy Scouts of America, YMCA, Extermital Chemicals, Inc., United Theological Seminary, Boys Club of Dayton, East Dayton Community Council, East Dayton Businessmen's Association and the Dayton Society for the Blind. He is the chairman of the professional committee of the United Fund, former head of the Dayton Red Cross from 1946 to 1950, past president of the Miami Valley Hospital Board from 1959 to 1966, past president of the Mental Health Association, and currently president of the Montgomery County Mental Health and Retardation Board.

Dr. Hahn's citations and awards include honorary member Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Walter Winchell Award for work with the unfortunate and the underprivileged, the Silver Beaver Award in the Boy Scouts, doctor of divinity degree from Otterbein College, and 33d Degree Mason. He also was elected Dayton's Most Outstanding Citizen in 1955 by the 48 service clubs in the Greater Dayton area.

I have known Harvey Hahn personally and have been the better for it. He is the kind of man who leaves his mark on all he touches and serves as an inspiration to everyone who has had the good fortune to come into contact with him.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Dr. Hahn on his formal retirement and wish him many more years of deserved joy and happiness.

VIETNAM: ASSENT, DISSENT, AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comments of assent, dissent, and possible solutions about the situation in Vietnam, which may be of interest.

An editorial from the Florida Times-Union of May 29, 1970, reads as follows:

THERE IS ALSO A RIGHT OF ASSENT

Today many Jacksonville and area citizens will gather at noon at City Hall to accentuate the positive about America.

The occasion is an Americanism rally spon-

sored by—but not limited to—the Northeast Florida Building and Construction Trades Council and 32 other organizations.

It comes at a time when Americans are deeply troubled about the future of their land.

It comes at a time when America is trying to extricate itself with honor from one of the most, if not the most, unpopular wars in its history.

It comes at a time when criticism of America is voiced in hyperbolic terms in some quarters both within and without the nation. The faults are magnified beyond recognition in many instances and the virtues are scoffed at and sneered at.

It comes at a time when mob violence is being practiced by a tiny minority as an instrument designed to shape public policy.

We have constantly upheld the right of peaceful dissent from public policies and frequently engage in such ourselves. We just as vigorously uphold the right of peaceful assent and, again, we frequently engage in it ourselves.

Responsible dissent has always been a big factor in shaping public policy in America. The same way be said of responsible assent.

We would venture to guess that no person in attendance at today's rally would pretend that his or her nation is perfect. It is our belief, however, that there is no nation on this earth so committed to curing its imperfections and living up to its ideals.

Whether or not one believes that the original commitment of ground troops to Vietnam was a mistake—and this belief is by no means limited to those of liberal persuasion—the fact remains that American troops are there in force.

We believe that the conduct of a war must basically be decided by the President of the United States.

We supported the bombing halts called by President Lyndon Johnson and the policy of gradual withdrawal announced by President Nixon as well as the President's decision to send troops into Cambodia to mop up enemy sanctuaries.

It is not blind support but rather it stems from a belief that the President is as committed to peace as is any American and has the most knowledge of any individual about ways to achieve it with honor.

We believe that in order to carry out his program he not only needs substantial support from the American people but also needs to know that he has that support.

We are repeating on this page an editorial which appeared in last Sunday's Florida Times-Union and Journal to give those persons who support the President's actions an opportunity to let him know it through their signatures. So far 12,810 signatures have been received.

We endorse the idea behind today's rally because we believe it is time that the positive side of America was also expressed.

It isn't jingoism or chauvinism. It is rather an answer to handdogism.

If speakers and participants in the rally succeed in setting a tone of affirmation for—and commitment to—the ideal of a nation "with liberty and justice for all," it will be a success.

If it succeeds in persuading any of us to translate the American dream more fully into action in our own lives, it will be a solid plus for this area and the nation.

A news account of May 21, 1970, from the same newspaper reads as follows:

GIS—PRESENT AND PAST—PAID HOLIDAY

SALUTE BY ADMIRAL

(By Doug Sease)

"The civilians of this country determine national policy, not the men of the armed forces.

"The men and women in the services execute this policy and honor our commitments around the world."

With these words Rear Adm. Lawrence Heyworth Jr., commander of Fleet Air Jacksonville, urged Americans not to belittle servicemen for doing their jobs "in an outstanding, dedicated manner."

Heyworth, speaking at Memorial Day observances at the Memorial Flagpole in Evergreen Cemetery Saturday morning, told an audience of several hundred citizens, both young and old, that the continuance of freedom in the United States will be achieved only by means of patriotism and love of country.

Many people who gathered around the memorial were veterans of America's wars.

Many canes were in evidence, yet backs straightened and hands went to foreheads as the American flags were massed beneath the flagpole in a precise military manner by color guards from the services.

"Patriotism too often carries the connotation of just flag-waving," said Heyworth.

"But it's more—Much, more.

"It is the sum of one's outlook on life—a state of mind.

"It's backing your country and defending your country against all enemies.

"In the same breath," the admiral said, "it is not banning of dissent or persecuting those who do dissent peacefully and lawfully. But for the dissenters there should be an underlying sense of responsibility.

"Today we remember countless men who have given the supreme sacrifice—their lives—for this country. But showing support for our living men and women in uniform is also important on Memorial Day.

"They are the defenders of our freedom." Heyworth then posed two questions—

"What is freedom?

"Is it freedom from obligations and responsibilities?

"No!—for if the answer to the question is 'yes,' we are accepting anarchy or saying in effect 'We don't give a damn.'

"The question is—What do I do with my freedom? Freedom will act only through our actions," he said.

"Don't be afraid of patriotism and do not apologize for it.

"It's still alive and it is freedom's most potent protector," he concluded.

Mayor Hans Tanzler introduced Heyworth and took a few minutes to comment on the Patriotism Rally held Friday behind City Hall.

"As I looked out into that crowd Friday, I was reassured as to the direction our country is going," the mayor said.

He said on a recent trip to Washington, D.C., he took a half-day tour of Arlington Memorial Cemetery.

"It was an experience I'll never forget," said Tanzler. "Every American owes it to himself, his children and his fellow Americans to go through that cemetery.

"It's impossible to see the Iwo Jima Memorial and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and not realize that freedom isn't free. It has to be paid for, often in terms of the highest sacrifice a person can make—his life.

"If every student and dissident would go through there we wouldn't have the problems we have today," he said.

Following Adm. Heyworth's address a wreath ceremony was conducted and memorial floral arrangements were placed at the bottom of the flagpole, where the colors stood at half mast.

Then a squad of U.S. Marines fired a volley of shots and taps was played by the Comfair Jax Band from the Naval Air Station.

Ceremonies also were held Saturday morning by the West Jacksonville Branch of the Fleet Reserve Association in Memory Gardens Cemetery on Blanding Boulevard.

Robert Nolan, town manager of Orange Park, addressed the gathering.

By order of President Nixon, flags remained at half staff throughout the day in honor of American dead in all wars.

A news account from the May 30, 1970, edition of the Florida Times-Union reads as follows:

THREE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED PATRIOTS STAND UP TO BE COUNTED AMERICANS

It wasn't the Fourth of July, or Flag Day or even Memorial Day, but for several thousand Jacksonville citizens it was Patriotism Day.

Standing under dark and threatening clouds, with the increasing winds whipping the St. Johns River and snapping the colors in the city park lot, more than 3,500 Americans came to remember and salute their birthrights as Americans.

Held on Memorial Day Eve, the Stand Up for America rally was not a protest meeting; it was a meeting of assent, of approval.

It was a time for remembering the thrill of seeing the flag-trooped by and of listening to tunes which never fail to stir emotions.

It was a time for listening to words born of time and history and experience, as well as dreams and hopes and maybe even fears and dreads. Spirited words, not hollow words.

Mayor Hans G. Tanzler set the tone for the rally when he told the assembled crowd, "We've seen enough burning of buildings, and draft cards, but when they go so far as to burn the flag, friends, they ripped it with me."

Standing on the parking lot sidewalks or on the patches of grass and expanses of pavement, some of those who had come not only to remember the patriotic rallies of the past but to rekindle that stimulating feeling—love of country—carried placards and signs as they listened to the speakers on the bunting-swathed platform.

An elderly man with a large flag, wore a straw hat proclaiming, "God Bless Spiro Agnew."

A small sea of faces beamed from under vari-colored construction workers' "hard hats" in approval of speakers denouncing America's detractors as Communist, or Communist dupes.

Some held up placards proclaiming "America, Love It, or Leave It," and "Back Our Boys in Vietnam."

Keynote of the one-hour rally sponsored by the Building Construction Trades Council of northeast Florida was aimed at rallying support for President Nixon's Cambodian venture and for national unity in times of peril.

The featured speaker, U.S. Rep. William Chappell of Ocala drew shouts of approval when he shouted disdain for "Americans who spit on the flag and grind it in the ground."

"The President made a vital decision a few days ago (the Cambodian action) and he did what should have been done long ago," Chappell said.

"Too many people in America are not proud to hold the flag high," he said.

Loud shouts of "amen" greeted his next statement: "We are privileged to live in a country that has given more freedom to its people than any other."

"We've tied the hands of American soldiers too long. If we're willing to fight, we should be willing to win. I believe our President will bring our men out of Cambodia by June 30, as he promised, and return the others from Vietnam as soon as possible."

Campus dissenters drew special attention from Tanzler and Chappell.

"Any American who desecrates the flag should be deported, or ordered to walk through Arlington National Cemetery (Washington, D.C.) and pause before every grave," the mayor said.

"I can't understand why students slip out to Cuba and help Castro cut cane, and then slip back and brag about it," he said.

Referring to campus anti-war demonstrations, Tanzler said, "Who the devil are we to know better than our informed leaders that we shouldn't go into Cambodia?"

Noting that Nixon is a Republican and

himself a Democrat, Tanzler said, "I know we want peace, but if we must fight, let it not be on our shores, but in Indochina."

Praising most American youth for being level-headed, Chappell said, "Some of what I see on campuses is so far off base it scares me to think where they'd take this nation, if they could."

Chappell's charge that campus unrest involves some of America's "best known Communists" brought a loud shout from the audience to "throw them out."

"It's not enough to be a good American; you've got to be against communism," he said, and the crowd roared approval.

"Too many Americans are soft on communism and Americanism," Chappell concluded.

State Attorney T. Edward Austin, master of ceremonies, introduced the speakers.

The first, John Bowden, president of the sponsoring building trades council, said, "I get sorta choked up about Old Glory waving around and people singing the Star Spangled Banner.

"One thing that made America great is that when we get in trouble we forget our differences and back the president, whoever he is," Bowden said.

On May 13 I wrote the President as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know, I have attempted to support you fully in your efforts to end the war in South Vietnam. Although I originally felt we should press for a military victory, the time seems to have run out for that—primarily because of our reluctance to use the degree of force required. I am not wise or informed enough to know that this reluctance was not well founded, or is not now well founded; although it was not my original opinion that such reluctance was well founded. I believe major errors on our part are apparent: first, not to decide in advance what to do if we started winning the war and China then came in; second, our employing troops under politically-arrived-at guide lines that prevented victory.

Under the circumstances now prevailing, it is my opinion, and apparently yours, that all U.S. troops should be withdrawn as promptly as possible. I have apprehensions about what this may do in making less credible the chances for world peace, by making less credible our willingness to assist small nations resisting aggression. With this in view, I have some suggestions I would like to make which would minimize, or offset, this loss to our efforts for world peace.

My first suggestion is that you call upon the United Nations to hold free, U.N.-supervised, elections in South Vietnam, to determine if the people of South Vietnam wish to go forward with the war by themselves or to end the war by negotiations with the North Vietnamese. If the election goes for ending the war, then U.S. troops could be removed immediately. If the election goes the other way, then the total withdrawal of U.S. troops could be postponed for one year, but only for one year. If the U.N. fails to act within sixty days or acts unfavorably to holding an election, then the U.S. could nevertheless withdraw all U.S. troops by one year from the time limit of sixty days or rejection of the election plan, whichever is first.

My second suggestion is that (since we are inferentially downgrading the chances of our intervention in cases of future aggressions), we substitute in place of this war-deterrent an offer to help finance (but not to man) an international standing police force to act to put down aggression in future cases wherein the U.N. recommends inter-

vention. The troops should be drawn from volunteers from small nations throughout the world. This would not prevent our unilateral intervention but would diminish or eliminate the need for it. No U.S. sovereignty would be eliminated or impaired.

My third suggestion is that a separate agency be created in the Federal government to study the causes and preventions of war, a research agency solely, not an agency allowed to establish policy, but to get this needed research and information for the President, the State Department, and the Congress. There should also be a joint committee in Congress to secure congressional oversight in this field.

I hope these ideas may be worthy of your consideration. I know you will do what you feel is best for our beloved country and for mankind.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

A May 25, 1970, news release from Dr. Lois S. Gold of the political science department of the University of California reads as follows concerning a survey of communities in southern California:

A new plan for peace in Vietnam has received widespread support from people in the East Bay. While plans for a U.S. cease-fire have been researched by such groups as Clark Kerr and the late Walter Reuther's National Committee for a Political Settlement in Vietnam, cease-fire proposals have not been widely discussed, and little has been known of public opinions about them.

A randomly selected survey of over 1000 people residing throughout the cities and towns of the East Bay were asked their opinions about many different Vietnam peace proposals. A U.S. cease fire-U.N. supervised elections proposal, received majority support from all segments of the community: Republicans and Democrats, young and old, college educated and those with less than college education.

People were asked: "Here is a single proposal for ending the war that has 3 parts: (1) The U.S. would cease fire in South Vietnam. (2) The U.S. would then call for free elections, open to all parties, and supervised by the United Nations, and (3) The U.S. would then ask Hanoi also to cease fire and to join in declaring before the elections to accept the outcome and withdraw troops if requested. Do you approve or disapprove of this proposal?"

In all, 67% voiced approval of this plan, and only 16% voiced disapproval. 75% of the Democrats, 72% of the Independents, and 58% of the Republicans approved; 69% of the college-educated and 68% of those with high school education or less approved. Even among those who voted for Nixon in the last election, 58% said they approved of this plan. Similar widespread support for this proposal was found in a poll of San Francisco, reported in the press ten days ago.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Frank D. Pinckney, adjutant general of the State of South Carolina, has devoted a lifetime of dedicated and superb service to our country. Recently General Pinckney wrote a splendid and timely letter which I commend to the attention of the Congress and to the American people:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, MILITARY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,

Columbia, May 20, 1970.

HON. WILLIAM J. B. DORN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DORN: It is my purpose in this letter to provide you with a report on the South Carolina National Guard which you may find useful in your deliberations in the Congress.

In recent weeks, the National Guard has become the target of extensive criticism by the press, resulting from the Kent State deaths. I want to ensure you that the South Carolina National Guard has made a major contribution to the security of our State, and these guardsmen deserve the highest praise that can be given.

The Kent State episode was unfortunate; but I am highly insulted to hear such terms as "trigger-happy" and "poorly trained" used against Guardsmen. Let me give you some facts about South Carolina Guardsmen.

In support of civil authorities during civil disorders, the South Carolina National Guard was on State duty in 1968 for 17,640 mandays; in 1969 for 32,776 mandays; and thus far in 1970, over 9,000 mandays. Not one incident has marred these Guardsmen's record.

Since February 1968, the South Carolina Guard has been called to State duty 24 times to support civil police. Our Guard's performance has been a story of restraint in the face of extreme provocation and abuse, and of effective performance with minimum force.

Just last week, with over 700 South Carolina Guardsmen on duty at the University of South Carolina, it was necessary to use tear gas on two occasions to quell the disorder. Many of our Guardsmen were hit with thrown objects, and two received hospital treatment in one evening. Yet, they were without error in their performance; and finally they brought order to a rioting group of disorderly students.

Why can't the nation, and particularly the press, recognize that Guardsmen are human beings the same as the dissidents? Since 1968, 224,500 Guardsmen in our nation have been called to duty 191 times to back up civil authorities. Any criticism of their record has to come from uninformed persons.

The average Guardsman in South Carolina has received more than 40 hours of training in civil disturbance operations; but this is not his best asset. Our Guardsmen in general possess an awareness of the responsibilities of citizenship in a free society. We rely upon their understanding of the mood that is sweeping America and their determination that our freedom will not be destroyed. Their honest indoctrination largely accounts for their superb performance in tense circumstances, often where the tempers are heated and the aftermath highly emotional.

I urge your full and overt support of the National Guard of South Carolina and of the United States. They are doing their best to keep American strong.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK D. PINCKNEY,
Major General, SCARNG,
The Adjutant General.

SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH'S TIMELY WARNING

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all aware of the timely remarks made on the floor of the other body June

1, 1970, by the senior Senator from my State. These remarks were timely for two reasons: First, they were made on the 20th anniversary of the Senator's declaration of conscience, which I believe to be one of the most important speeches of our time; second, these remarks were made on Monday at a time when they are sorely needed.

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH was right 20 years ago, and she is right in her present judgment of the danger posed to our Nation by the forces of extremism. I would like to hereby bring to the attention of my colleagues two editorials, the first appearing in the New York Times of June 3, 1970, and the second appearing in the Washington Star of that date. I would also like to extend my personal appreciation to the Senator, for marking the 20th anniversary of her declaration of conscience in such a fitting manner.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1970]

Mrs. SMITH'S GOOD COUNSEL

As she did twenty years ago in her "declaration of conscience" against the right-wing excesses of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Senator Margaret Chase Smith is attempting to rally the country to moderation and good sense. One can only hope profoundly that it will not take four years this time for her counsel to be heeded.

The basic message of the Senator from Maine is that the deep pool of centrist opinion in the country, that essential guarantee against violent political upheavals, is being dangerously shaken. Primarily the threat this time is from the "radical left that advocates and practices violence and defiance of the law."

But beyond that present danger lurks the threat of repression, just beginning to show itself in a governmental defense that is "too extreme and unfair and too repetitive." One feeds on the other. But between the extremes of anarchy and repression, Mrs. Smith has no doubt that the American people, if they feel driven to choose, would take repression in the name of order.

Every present sign makes it plain that she is right. Nor do we doubt that once a national reaction set in against the nihilism and intolerance of the extreme radicals, now so visible in the streets and on television, decent distinctions would tend to disappear. Actually only a few make the campuses of the nation, in the Senator's words, "a rendezvous for obscenity, for trespass, for violence. . . ." But even now their activities are enough, in the eyes of some Americans, to discredit all students, all faculties, all intellectuals.

Many more students, minority groups and radicals—though far from a majority of any of them—are in truth guilty of "refusing to listen while demanding communication." Freedom of speech is scandalously often denied these days, even to people of national stature, by shouting them into silence or even by physically seizing microphones and platforms. And while very few stoop to such stupidity as desecrating the flag, it does not take many instances of such grossness to outrage the feelings of citizens for whom the flag is still a symbol deserving respect.

No one who wants to preserve that civilized discourse without which democracy is unworkable can take issue with Senator Smith's timely warning. We wish only that she had added some notice of the many young Americans today who do know and appreciate what she is talking about and who are working, in increasing numbers within the political system to promote, their views on the great issues of the day.

For they know, as she does, that with all its imperfections, the American Constitution

has given people the longest span of self-government, of rule subject to popular change, however gradual, in the whole history of the world. That is not something that any of us—left, right or center—should willingly see endangered by anyone else, no matter what his ideology or degree of self-righteousness.

[From the Washington Star, June 3, 1970]

A NEW DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE

Senator Margaret Chase Smith on Monday delivered the speech President Nixon should have given some time ago.

The frail but formidable lady from Maine, who 20 years before, to the day, had defied the late Senator Joseph McCarthy in her "declaration of conscience speech," put the blame for the disorders which today afflict our campuses and our cities exactly where it belongs.

Firmly but without rancor, she castigated "the political extreme left" and "militant intellectuals" for "refusing to listen while demanding communication," and for making American campuses "a rendezvous for obscenity, for trespass, for violence, for arson and for killing." At the same time, Mrs. Smith characterized the defense made by some administrative spokesmen as "too extreme and unfair and too repetitive," adding that it had "gone beyond the bounds of reasonableness and propriety and fanned, instead of drenching, the fires of division.

In the latter instance, Mrs. Smith, as is her wont, named no names. Could it be that she had in mind Vice President Agnew? The senator from Maine keeps her own counsel, but certain it is that the vice president's rhetorical excesses, while they may have been provoked by greater excesses from the left, have done nothing to fulfill the administration's promises, to "bring us together."

If Mrs. Smith is right—or even half-right—in her statement that the extremism of the political left is rapidly confronting the country with "the narrow choice between anarchy and repression," it is not good enough for President Nixon to leave it to Agnew to do his talking for him, or for his administration.

Any president, as presidents so frequently point out to us, is president of all the people. If we are in fact confronted with a national emergency—and Mrs. Smith concedes that "anarchy may seem nearer to many of us than it really is"—then the President owes it to the country to speak out, as Mrs. Smith put it Monday and 20 years ago, without "irresponsible words of bitterness and selfish political opportunism."

There is small hope that the extremists of the left will heed Mr. Nixon any more than they will respond to Mrs. Smith. But the nation—in Mrs. Smith's words, "the great center of our people, those who reject the violence and unreasonableness of both the extreme right and the extreme left"—is desperately in need of leadership.

The vice president, committed as he is to partisan fishing in the troubled waters of dissent, cannot provide that leadership. The President alone can provide it, and he ought to try to do so.

NELSEN BILL TO PROVIDE FOR ORDERLY TRADE IN TEXTILE ARTICLES, ARTICLES OF LEATHER FOOTWEAR AND MINK SKINS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which is similar

to that presently under consideration by the House Committee on Ways and Means. With one exception, my bill is identical to that originally offered by Chairman WILBUR MILLS. The chairman's bill (H.R. 16920) would primarily affect the imports of textiles and leather goods from foreign nations. It would stabilize the trade in these items to prevent the flood of incoming goods from destroying these industries. My bill would extend this important principle to the domestic mink industry. This is an industry that has suffered more than textiles or leather goods, and the prime victims have been small businessmen. There is, however, a parallel: A prosperous domestic industry hit by an unreasonable flood of imports.

The MILLS' bill would establish a base year for imports of leather and textiles at 1967-68. Because the remedy is so late in coming, I have selected the base year of 1959-60 for application to mink imports. The imports of that year would represent a level of 2,810,492 pelts a year, or a figure equal to 28 percent of domestic consumption last year.

I am in hopes that the Committee on Ways and Means will see fit to include these provisions on mink imports in any bill they recommend for enactment.

In recent weeks, Mr. Walter Taylor, a mink rancher from Connecticut, has visited with me concerning the development of this bill. Mr. Taylor has written a most eloquent summary of the situation faced by mink ranchers today, and I am including it in my remarks at this time:

MINK FARMING IN OR OUT

Mink ranchers have tamed the wild animal, improved it by selection, created new natural mink fur colors, and built markets for them to a maximum of over one hundred million dollars a year for mink pelts.

They have developed a significant business in feed and supplies and created jobs for agricultural workers.

Taking food products that are too low in quality or otherwise not suitable for human consumption,¹ mink farmers have transformed these into the world's most beautiful furs.

Mink ranching has been a veritable modern classic of the possibilities of free private enterprise. Most ranchers started small, many of them on a part time basis, and by hard work and intelligent managing and marketing built thousands of profitable, mostly family size, farms.

In the face of rising costs and lower pelt prices, mink raisers have increased operating efficiencies and cut cost at every possible point. They have also modernized and increased their advertising, but in spite of all this, the remaining ranchers are now faced with bankruptcy due to conditions beyond their control.

Up until 1967 there had been a continuous increase of imports. The domestic market was able to absorb these large numbers of mink pelts because of demand created by a fantastically successful advertising campaign conducted and paid for by United States mink ranchers. In this campaign they appealed directly to the consumer and developed a

¹ That is, fish racks, a residue from filleting, poultry heads and entrails, packing house by-products that have been condemned for human consumption, low-grade dairy and egg products and over-aged cottage cheese.

lucrative market for furrier's garments made from American raised mink sold by U.S. Fur Auctions.

Our ranchers have assessed themselves a percentage of the gross pelt sales at auction. In the past 25 years or so, the ranchers have spent more than twenty million dollars building a market for mink.

This campaign was so successful that mink became one of the most prominent status symbols. Mink became and still is today, one of women's most cherished possessions. A woman does not buy a mink garment for warmth. Nor does she buy it primarily for style. She buys it because it gives her a sense of beauty and softness and luxury and the feeling that she has the ultimate of all garments. She buys it for a state of mind. It gives her the feeling that she has the best and no one can top that. This, of course, is the exact opposite of commonness.

During most of the sixties the opinion that mink was the ultimate fur along with the great affluence of the American public made it possible to absorb increasing quantities of mink at profitable levels and the image of mink remained relatively untarnished.

But in 1966 and 1967, the inevitable happened, imports captured 54% of the U.S. market. Even the tremendous image and desirability that had been so carefully and expensively nurtured by the American ranchers could not withstand the terrible weight of eleven million pelts imported in two years.

This flood of imports broke the market in 1967, and the inevitable deterioration set in.

We had built such a tremendous image for mink that any mink was considered luxury and a touch of mink on any garment increased its salability. This almost universal opinion of mink made it possible for the U.S. market to absorb the millions of low end, poor quality imports that were dumped on the U.S. market year after year. It has been very distressing to observe the European market reports over the years stating that the lowest qualities were sold to United States dealers.

This exploitation of our market with low grade pelts has been dragging down the image of mink. I think it is obvious that without this flood of imports the American Mink Industry would have had many more years of profitable prices.

The Scandinavians entered our market after it had been built by the U.S. ranchers. The desire and the demand were there and the image of mink was impeccable. They did not have to build a market; it was already established and, of course, completely exposed to their assaults since there were no import controls of any kind.

To make matters worse, the Scandinavians did not see fit to chart a course that would uphold the image of mink and maintain this market. They proceeded immediately to sell their mink as a common commodity rather than as a luxury item. They sold by size and rough quality separations in large quantities and without selling limits.

This initially proved very profitable to them with the American market firmly established and bolstered by a desperate effort on the part of domestic rancher associations to sustain the market by limiting quantities on sales and setting auction price selling limits.

In fact our attempts to defend the market played right into their hands since their policy of tremendous quantities on early sales sold without limits moved their mink, but lowered the market and made our attempts to maintain a profitable market here extremely difficult.

² The time of winter fur growth on mink is determined by the shortening of the length of the day. Since the Scandinavian countries are farther north than the United States, they can pelt earlier.

Year after year, we attempted to raise the market level in our "prestige" sales following the low market levels set in Europe. We were surprisingly successful in this for many years but the weight of free imports was just too much for us and we failed in 1967 and the years since . . . this in spite of the superior quality of American raised mink!

Moreover, the Scandinavian approach has been primarily to concentrate on the first buyer, that is the dealers and brokers. Their very limited advertising in the fashion magazines has not, in my opinion, been of the proper quality to sustain the image of mink as a prestige and luxury item.

This Scandinavian approach to our market only made sense in a short term, quick profit, complete disregard for the future, policy. With this cynical approach to the mink market, is it any surprise that they now turn to newer fields such as Europe where they will undoubtedly repeat their destructive policies.

Both the fashion acceptance erosion and the U.S. business decline has acted to reduce mink pelt consumption in the United States. This decline in luxury purchases has not yet been reflected in Europe. Their general business has remained at a high level and 1969 was a banner year in the European fur business. Since the European fur market was very strong the Scandinavians found a ready sale at home for their pelts and consequently sold less to the United States.

The American mink ranching situation is deadly serious; in fact the industry now faces the possibility of extinction.

The number of ranchers has been reduced from 7200 in 1962 to 2400 in 1969.

Pelt prices have now reached disaster levels. After suffering the price break due to the flood of imports in 1967, the market is now further depressed by slowing business, restricted credit and a major decline in the stock market. Average gross auction price received for pelt sales from 1960 through 1966 was slightly over \$18.00 per pelt; in 1967, '68, and '69 the average was \$14.75, a drop of 18%. Preliminary figures for the first three months of 1970, show a gross average of \$12.75, a drop of 30.4% from the first quarter of 1969.

It is most important to realize that these gross sales prices do not represent net to the rancher. Sales costs must be deducted. For example, the gross average sales price for mutation pelts for the first three months of 1970 are reported to be \$11.41 per pelt. After the auction commission of 5 1/4%, Association deduction of 2 1/4% and \$1.75 per pelt tanning costs (56% were dressed), the true average net return to the rancher was \$9.53. These prices are definitely confiscatory. Almost every American mink rancher is operating at a loss at current market levels.

Mink ranchers receive their money when the pelts are sold after a year of costly operation. This means that they have to finance a whole year's operation in advance. The usual credit sources have been the auction companies, production credit and local banks. All of these sources have understandably been tightening up. Just recently another major blow was delivered to mink ranching's future when the New York Auction Company announced that they will not make their traditional livestock loans to ranchers this year. The seriousness of this is apparent when it is realized that their livestock loans have averaged between four and five million dollars a year.

Since final announcement of this credit policy was made just recently, affected ranchers had already invested five months' cost into a new crop. This refusal of credit will drive even more ranchers out of business and some will be forced to turn them loose or pelt their animals now when the pelts are worthless.

The low market has eaten up the mink rancher's working capital and these contin-

ually dropping prices along with the drying up of credit sources has set mink farming on a ruinous course.

In our experiences, from 1959 on, in trying to gain some relief from excessive imports we have consistently been rebuffed on the basis that we must demonstrate actual injury rather than prospective harm. It seems that a corpse must be shown to prove sickness. Well, we now have plenty of dead mink ranches to exhibit but still have no relief.

Unless substantial help is extended quickly, the American Mink Ranching Industry will go bankrupt and disappear from the American business scene.

Gentlemen, please don't permit it to be said that the mink ranching industry died because of the lack of protective legislation.

Mink Ranchers are vulnerable from almost every angle:

1. They gamble a whole year's investment before coming to market.

2. They are completely open to world competition without any import control or government price support.

3. They have no patent protection for their new genetic color inventions even though horticulturists can patent new plants.

4. There is inadequate protection against imported pelts being passed off as United States products.

5. Mink is a fashion item and mink is a luxury commodity and, therefore, extremely susceptible to changes in business conditions; under current conditions the mink ranching industry is in a depression.

6. Mink equipment and particularly housing of the animals is not adaptable to other uses. Across the country hundreds and hundreds of mink ranchers have their life savings invested in mink shelters, pens and nest boxes (one for each mink); and when they are forced to quit, there is no recovery value in this equipment. Lucky is the rancher who can realize five cents on each dollar invested!

WALTER TAYLOR.

FED-UP PROFESSOR

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, while in Charleston, S.C., I read a splendid and timely editorial in the News and Courier which I commend to my colleagues and to the people of our country who have supported and provided the greatest free educational system in the history of the world:

FED-UP PROFESSOR

It is decidedly encouraging, after a year of chaos on so many college campuses, to find a professor who describes himself as a "liberal" striking out against what he describes as "the tyranny of spoiled brats." Prof. K. Ross Toole, 49, father of seven children, is professor of history at the University of Montana at Missoula.

Universities in California, in the East and points in between sorely need more men of Prof. Toole's caliber. "I'm," he writes in an article in The Washington Post, "sick of the 'young generation,' hippies, Yuppies, militants and nonsense . . . 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 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."

This is strong stuff, to be sure, especially coming from a man who classifies himself as a "liberal." There are far too many so-called liberal professors on college campuses who not only sympathize with student rebels but support their lawless activities.

Prof. Toole says it is time to call a halt. It's time, he says, "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."

Since when, asks Prof. Toole, have children ruled this country? "By virtue of what right," he asks, "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?"

Prof. Toole does not spare himself or his colleagues. "We (professors and faculties in particular), in a paroxysm of selfabnegation 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."

What to do about it? Prof. Toole endorses a simple remedy. "Faculties," he says, "should stop playing chicken . . . demonstrators should be met not by police but with expulsions. The power to expel (strangely unused) has been the legitimate recourse of universities since 1209 . . . Expulsion is merely the assertion 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."

Prof. Toole also describes himself as "a square." If he is, there are plenty more people in this nation who share his views. It is too bad that most of them do not seem to be as articulate as the Missoula professor.

A parent of the sort of college student Prof. Toole says he is "sick of" has the power to exercise an alternative to the professor's proposed use of expulsion. The parent can simply tell his offspring that if he wants to go to college for the purpose of destroying and fomenting rebellion, he can pay his own way. It will be interesting to see how many parents will begin withdrawing financial support from children who insist on being campus militants. Parents, as well as faculties, should stop playing chicken.

A CITIZEN LOOKS AT THE WAR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the fantasy of the "silent majority" has been dissolved in the wake of the events of this past May. I have received a tremendous number of letters and wires on the subject of the war in Indochina and these letters, Mr. Speaker, demonstrate more than just a passing interest in the war.

An excellent example of an insightful and penetrating look at this conflict was sent to me by J. William Pezick of Berkeley, Calif.

I would like to place Mr. Pezick's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it.

The letter follows:

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
May 10, 1970.

Representative JEROME WALDIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing of my concern about current United States action in Cambodia, its by-products in domestic problems, and the Indo-Chinese war in general. Though I am not one of your constituents, I hope you will find the following observations about this matter of national concern to be relevant, and I beg you not to discard this letter at this point.

Wednesday morning there was a convocation of about 15,000 people—half or more of our University community—and opinion of those present clearly favored a long-term cessation of customary academic activities—I hesitate to say "strike" because of possible misleading connotations. The process discussed not intended as a holiday, or to be like a breath-holding temper tantrum, or a hunger strike, but as an arrangement which will allow full-time work on research and dissemination of information regarding the Indochinese situation and associated problems. I am writing to encourage the Congress to act so that this burden of research and promulgation need not be carried out only by those individuals financially least able to bear it.

I personally over a period of time have become convinced of presumptive arguments for and limited evidence of the following and suspect further investigation could reveal substantial corroboration:

1. Atrocities are commonplace, rather than the exception. This seems so in two senses: first, when official policy demands them. Khe Sanh seems a case in point, described by an official U.S. spokesman as "the first major ground action won by air power." The village area is described as having been turned into a "cratered desert" by more than 100,000 tons of bombs; the atomic device released over Hiroshima, a larger area, was only 20 kilotons. And in this instance the victory may be questioned further: the village may have been purposefully abandoned by the North Vietnamese as a sign of their sincere interest in peace talks. In general, defoliation, crop destruction, saturation bombing, and free-fire bombs would fall in this category.

The second category is that where "individual initiative" receives token or no punishment. I believe that assorted spontaneous public confessions following the My Lai disclosures are only a slight indication of common practice. I have heard various remarks made privately by individuals that while lining people up and shooting them in orderly fashion may not be standard operating procedure, the same less orderly killing by a group of individuals, having the same results on village populations, is common under some sort of better-safe-than-sorry principle. I have from a friend the story of a man who methodically would shoot any "gook" he saw wearing a G.I. shirt, on the presumption that the shirt was a battle souvenir, and the wearer—whether suspected enemy or just a scavenger—deserved immediate execution.

Worse are the accounts of our Saigon "allies," whether in joint action with American troops or old-fashioned political terror. I have from another friend stories of joint engagements, where captured suspects were "interrogated" by being pushed out of helicopters. Yesterday a local radio station broadcasted accounts of ten academic and religious persons arrested in late April by the Saigon government, tortured for a week, and then released recently. They told stories of

soapy water, drugs, truncheons, chair legs, lighted cigarettes, and electric devices being repeatedly applied to sensitive body areas. This was apparently confirmed by independent medical examination and by testimony of doctors employed by the government to treat them between periods of torture.

2. The costs of this war have been phenomenal, particularly when one considers what we—as a nation—could buy instead. Rough preliminary compilations of official figures by a committee in the Department of Economics at the University here indicate that \$100 billion has been spent on the Indochina war since 1960, twice the expected lifetime income of all the Vietnamese. One could argue it would have been cheaper to bribe them. Expenses for 1969, about \$25 billion, could more than fund the U.S. Guaranteed Annual Wage program at the recommended \$3,200 level.

In addition, neutral policy experts contend that defense expenditures are among the most inflationary types of expenditure, the effect being much more with respect to GNP than proportional to the amount of expenditure made: major sections of our economy are oligopoly; whether they collectively will more resemble in their behavior a free market or a monopoly depends upon the constraints the market exerts on them. Major defense contracts may weaken those constraints for a significant number of suppliers.

Furthermore, reduction of defense expenditures is conspicuous among policy measures designed to try to reduce inflation in that it has a strong effect on aggregate demand not soon countered by pressure for rising wages, since its effect is not necessarily to raise the cost of living, as is the case with most taxes.

I see no particular reason to believe that quick demobilization will cause recession. If high temporary unemployment is foreseen, veterans pensions comparable with current pay scales could be authorized. That disbursement domestically, without transportation and additional battle costs, would presumably still be much more economical than the current level of involvement.

I will not attempt to put a value on human losses.

3. I have heard legal experts' opinion that many of our actions in Indochina over the years, particularly the Cambodia invasion, are flagrantly illegal. I wonder whether practical consequences of this aspect of the situation may not far outdistance already grave abstract moral ones. If the U.S. chooses not to adhere to past agreements in this spectacular fashion, taking actions of a kind which nullify or reverse recent "diplomatic signals," and without consultation, one can only imagine the unusual danger involved when other great nations, jealous of their own vital interests, try to predict what the U.S. will do.

Even more, I am concerned by the private interests which benefit from the war and are close to the conduct of it and the excessive planning initiatives which appear to be taken in military circles. I am disturbed by reports of there having been two CIA CAS teams in Cambodia, one reassuring Sihanouk of U.S. support, the other working actively for Lon Nol. One has the impression of quasi-independent action by this arm of the executive, who appear to deal consistently in terms of support of something which can be labeled a government—regardless of popular commitment, when popular commitment is a necessary condition for success of the policy involved. I am concerned with the tradition over years and Administrations of increasing action in one area of Indochina following reduced action in another. I am concerned with reports that half the troop sanctuaries are in Vietnam rather than Cambodia, and that there was no build-up of enemy forces in the Cambodian area attacked, and that the Cambodian involvement was simply a *compromise*

with the military, who wanted to attack Sihanoukville, where Chinese and Russian advisers have been said to be arriving. I am frightened by reports such as those of regular low-level night-time flights over mainland China by pilots of Air America airlines—apparently under contract to the CIA with some financing from Chinese nationalist interests—as part of a long-term strategic plan for revolution on the mainland (interview with pilot, Dallas morning news, 4/13/70).

All this suggests to me a great widening of the war, perhaps beyond where increasing American involvement can be readily reversed; it suggests to me that the Executive branch may not be able—neglecting volition—to curb the war.

No matter how much the Congress may want to end the war, if they resolve to "support our troops already involved" under any circumstances, though a totally humane and correct notion on the face of it, I am confident the military are canny enough to plead the necessity of further troop commitments, perhaps in situations where by field or general staff initiative we are already so committed with already-available resources, that not to commit further resources is in the short run flatly irrational, though it may be in the long run disastrous.

I should like to emphasize the distrust I feel and others appear to feel for the Nixon administration. Nixon is overstating the obvious and at best glossing over the crucial. Everyone knows that Nixon would like to end the war in Indochina, but on what terms? or to reduce participation of U.S. ground troops, but with what alternatives? Even "Vietnamization" will not be full relief apparently: though fewer of our own troops will die, air search-and-destroy missions by private American contractors, supported by Vietnamese ground troops will continue U.S. participation in the same scorched earth—to say nothing of people—policy. Everyone knows Nixon would like to "get along" better with "dissenters," but is there any indication that he understands or will respect formulations of the problem other than his own?

His recent meeting with student representatives gives me no confidence. His telephone opinion survey on Cambodia (UP 5/9/70) where positive opinions were forwarded and negative opinions not accepted gives me no confidence.

I therefore urge you to support attempts for independent Congressional investigation of all aspects of the conduct and implications of the Indochinese war, and meanwhile to support all measures or control of the Executive's initiative, whether by limitations of funds, discussion of a formal declaration of war, censure—or impeachment, if nothing else will scare him. I hope that funds resolutions will not be worded in so open-ended a manner that the war can be further prolonged or extended unnecessarily, and another label attached to the action to make it superficially legitimate. Mr. Nixon has already demonstrated, to my mind, with his interpretation of the Constitution in the Cambodian matter and in the Carswell nomination, that he will seize any vague phrases he can find and make a bludgeon of them. One should be blinded by this time, with so much "light at the end of the tunnel." I think also that Mr. Nixon should be made aware of the errors in this sort of tactic, generally. It would be a piecemeal resolution to the problem if he were suddenly to reverse his Cambodian policy, the furor would die out, and then next month he chooses to embark on some new adventure in coercion, whether at home or abroad.

I believe the semi-secretive double-talk in which the decision to send troops into Cambodia was presented to the American public is largely responsible for the mass expression of confusion, frustration, and violence. Even many of those with ideas which may be considered radical do not and will not turn to

radical tactics, unless the issues are not given a fair hearing or any hearing, and unless these people are convinced the official position cannot be rationally defended. A quick voting down of "anti-war" resolutions, with perfunctory debate, would not be a fair hearing. The current strike at the University here is conspicuous for mass participation of people with moderate views who still have faith in the democratic system. If Congress will not permit full debate of these issues, I fear many incidents far, far worse than that at Kent State, and if such should occur under those circumstances, Congress will be as responsible as anyone else for them.

Sincerely yours,

J. WILLIAM PEZICK.

A LETTER FROM A FIGHTING MAN IN VIETNAM

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Sp/4 Peter J. Martinson, a resident of my congressional district who is presently serving his country in Vietnam, which I consider worthy of having the attention and careful consideration of all Americans who might attempt to evaluate the wisdom of the President's recent decision to send American soldiers into Cambodia.

The author of the following letter judges the President's decision from the position of one who is himself making the sacrifice involved in upholding the policy his Government has chosen to pursue. I commend his thoughts to all who are really concerned about our citizens in military service:

SAN FRANCISCO,
May 26, 1970.

Representative ODIN LANGEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANGEN: Sir, I am a serviceman serving in Vietnam. My home is in Fergus Falls, Minnesota. I follow current events as much as possible, and I would like to share with you some of my views on certain issues. I am sure that you like to hear from your constituents so that you are more aware of their views and feelings on particular issues.

First of all, I would like to commend you on the way you are representing us of Minnesota's Seventh District. I have been impressed by your conscientious, responsible representation. I trust that this kind of service and leadership will continue.

I am very pleased with President Nixon's leadership as Chief Executive. I am impressed by his prudence, his sense of responsibility and his far-sightedness. Also, I favor his "conservative" approach to government. I hope you will support President Nixon and his administration whenever your conscience and good judgment permit.

As far as this war in Indochina is concerned, I find myself agreeing with the President. Furthermore, I tend to agree with the principle that brought American troops to Vietnam. No country likes to send its young men off to war, but to ignore aggression in the present is to invite a larger, costlier confrontation later. History teaches us this.

Since we have made the investment here that we have, a gradual withdrawal is the only reasonable solution. A total, immediate withdrawal is unthinkable because it

would mean the useless forfeiture of billions of dollars, the effort of millions of men and, most tragic of all, the lives of over 40,000 Americans.

I can't help admiring President Nixon for his decision to strike against Communist sanctuaries inside Cambodia. I am moved that he would make such a difficult, unpopular decision to insure the safety of us Americans who remain in Vietnam.

The violence that has accompanied recent campus demonstrations disturbs me. All of us should have the right to express our views, but the lack of respect for law and order that some demonstrators show threaten to destroy our society. I am sure you too are concerned about the lack of respect for the law in our country and are doing what you can to promote respect for the law and peaceful channels for change.

Sir, there is one more thing I would like to bring to your attention. I have become aware of an inequity in the draft laws that I think ought to be corrected. This inequity has to do with the deferment and virtual exemption of ministerial students from any military service. Under the present arrangement anyone who declares his intention of entering the ministry is deferred from service throughout all his schooling and is never called into the service. I plan to enter the ministry after completing military service and more education, and I feel that ministers have as much of an obligation to serve as anyone else. The nature of ministers' work should not exempt them. Furthermore, ministers enjoy the benefits of our democracy and way of life and so should do their part to preserve and defend that democracy and way of life.

It has been my observation during nearly two years in the Army that the ministry of more chaplains would be an improvement. Many chaplains carry on a gallant ministry, but ungodliness abounds. I am sure that many a decent young man has been corrupted during his military service. If men trained in spiritual things were in the service, their influence would help counteract the unhealthy influence of ungodliness. So a correction of this provision of the draft law would not only be just, but it would also lead to the spiritual benefit of men in the Armed Forces.

I would favor a method of deferment for ministerial students similar to that applied to medical students. Defer ministerial students through their college and seminary training, unless they choose to enter the service earlier. Then call them into the service after completion of seminary training.

In closing, may I mention one more thing? I would like to follow the events in the Congress and your part in those events. Please send me your periodic newsletter.

Thank you, sir, for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Sp4 PETER MARTINSON,
64th Finance Section, APO San Francisco.

IS A LOW-INFLATION, HIGH-EMPLOYMENT ECONOMY POSSIBLE?

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, there is no more persistent nor pressing problem confronting Americans today than inflation. The May 1970 issue of *Fortune* contains a penetrating discussion of the subject by Gilbert Burck. The article follows:

HARD GOING FOR THE GAME PLAN

(By Gilbert Burck)

Not since the great depression has a U.S. Government found itself tackling a thornier economic problem. The nation seems stuck with both inflation and slump. Unemployment is rising along with prices, while the size of wage settlements seems to keep on increasing. This phenomenon, to be sure, was not a total surprise. Months ago Paul McCracken, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, warned the nation to expect the worst of both worlds for a while, and the council still regards the country's current troubles as a temporary episode in the unfolding of the Administration's "Game Plan" for subduing inflation. If all goes according to plan, inflation will gradually subside over the next two and half years, to a tolerable level of perhaps 2.5 percent while unemployment will steady at something between 4 and 4.5 percent.

But it now seems clear that the tides of inflation have been running stronger, and that the job ahead is a lot tougher, than most people thought. For one thing, the usual cures for inflation don't work as readily as they used to because of resistances or rigidities in our economic structure. Administered prices, construction codes, featherbedding, price supports, welfare payments, minimum-wage laws, and other rigidities do not usually cause inflation, but they tend to keep wages and prices from being flexible and so fortify inflation once it has gained strength.

At the same time, high unemployment has become socially and politically unacceptable. The authorities can no longer tame prices by resorting to harsh deflationary measures. This, in turn, has thrown an aura of implausibility over predictions of deflation and has tended to feed long- or medium-term inflationary expectations.

And yet the Administration must live with an economic reality: either the U.S. accepts the dire consequences of a high inflationary rate or it lives through the pain of slowing it down. Although high inflation would maximize employment, at least for a while, this would be offset by the fact that no fewer than 29 million retired and disabled Americans are living on more or less fixed incomes, and that millions of them would be severely strapped and even impoverished by high inflation. More important, the economy faces immense demands on its capacities that it cannot meet without a sound foundation for expansion. A high rate of inflation, because it creates innumerable distortions in the economy, simply could not provide the basis for strong, healthy growth. Sooner or later it would collapse or have to be throttled, at a cost and pain far exceeding the cost and pain of subduing it early.

THE TUG OF POLITICS

Subduing inflation without excessive unemployment, as the Game Plan hopes to do, will demand knowledge and skill—and lots of luck. Unfortunately, what economists still have to learn about inflation would fill more than one book. As Professor G. L. Bach of Stanford University confessed to a recent bankers' symposium, "The dynamics of the economy are more complex than most of us had ever dreamed. The system is full of interactions and feedbacks, all operating with different time lags." The past decade, moreover, demonstrates that economists are likely to find themselves hauled up by politics even if they understand perfectly how to contain inflation. Back in 1957-58, and again in 1960-61, the fiscal and monetary authorities of the Eisenhower Administration, determined to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar, bludgeoned down prices and in the process pushed unemployment up to more than 7 percent. This policy was tough on the country, but it provided an ideal set-

ting for the expansionist policies of the New Economics. For five booming years, while wholesale prices remained even and consumer prices rose gently, unemployment declined steadily, and by late 1965 was down almost to 4 percent. But then the costs of the Vietnam war began to mount, and prices suddenly began to rise steeply. During the next three years the combination of too little knowledge and too much politics, manifesting itself mainly in ill-timed fiscal and monetary policies, ended up with the hottest inflation since World War II. As people came to expect more inflation and tried to offset it, they added to its momentum. Early in 1969, when the Nixon Administration took over, consumer prices were rising at a rate of 5 percent, and the rate was plainly heading higher.

The Administration's Game Plan, logically enough, was based on avoiding the mistakes of its predecessors, such as the excessive deflation of 1957-58 and the excessive ease of 1967-68. Its chief architect was the eminent Arthur Burns, who had left Columbia University to become Nixon's economic preceptor. Burns's chief helper was Paul McCracken, who had learned a lot as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers under Eisenhower, and who had been recommended by Burns himself for the top job on the council. Now that Burns has ascended to the chairmanship of the Federal Reserve Board, McCracken is in command at the firing line. But they confer frequently, together with Secretary of the Treasury David Kennedy and Budget Director Robert Mayo, the other two members of the quadripart that is responsible for broad economic policy.

Like all honest practitioners of his art, McCracken is well aware that the more a man knows about economics, the more he has still to learn, and he is neither too proud nor too cocksure to ask questions. Recently he surprised and flattered a dozen of the country's leading corporate economists by inviting them to fare to Washington and discuss the outlook for capital spending. This unprecedented levee may sound like a smart piece of public relations, but it was not intentionally so. McCracken simply wanted to hear what experts in the outer world had to say.

McCracken is similarly modest about the Administration's strategy for subduing inflation. It was he who first appropriated the term Game Plan from football, a sport he greatly enjoys. The term is apt. A game plan is not a book of rules or a detailed guide, but a strategy that seems most logical in the light of all available but necessarily incomplete information about the forces in the contest. The Game Plan strategy started by accepting the fact that there had to be a trade-off between unemployment and inflation. Then as now there was a certain clamor for price and wage controls, but the plan rejected them because they would only obscure, not cure, the fiscal and credit excesses that had been causing the trouble. For similar reasons it also shunned jawboning, guidelines, and other suasive measures.

This left the Administration with only one course—to create the conditions under which natural economic forces could bring about disinflation. Monetary and fiscal policy would be used to slow or halt the economy's growth for a while: the Federal Reserve would tighten the money supply while the Treasury aimed for a budget surplus. As the economy's growth ground to a halt, sales would be harder to make and costs would increase; business would be unable to raise prices at will, and would even be forced to reduce them. Profits would be squeezed, and unemployment would rise. The combination would force business to reduce costs and to resist labor's inflationary wage demands. Once the rate of price increases began to fall, monetary and fiscal policy could be eased.

And provided the economy was not allowed to expand too fast, the rate of price increases, following a new momentum, would continue to decline. As McCracken explains it, the gap between potential and actual output would be sufficient "to generate the back pressures needed to counteract the momentum of inflation." To put it yet another way, there would be enough slack in the economy to keep the rate of price increases on its downward course.

THE DEPLORABLE BONER

So far, the plan has brought the economy's growth to a halt and indeed has slightly reduced real G.N.P. Sales have been sluggish, profits have fallen, short-term interest rates are down substantially, unemployment is around 4.5 percent, and the all-important rate of price increases has finally begun to decline. Now the hard part of the game begins: easing monetary and fiscal policy without inflaming demand and forcing prices to soar. McCracken is optimistic. By the end of the year, he reckons, the annual rate of price increase, as measured by the G.N.P. deflator, should be down to about 3.5 percent and, what is more, should be heading lower, even though the economy is expanding again.

Mostly for political reasons, the Administration made several policy mistakes that have not helped the Game Plan. Its spokesmen, anxious to avoid alarming the electorate, talked too much about the new policy's "gradualism" and played down the necessity for some increase in unemployment. A lot of businessmen accordingly did not believe the government meant what it said about subduing inflation. Last August, McCracken himself waxed a trifle too optimistic about the date when price rises would slow down. Congress pulled a deplorable boner in doubling the President's salary and increasing its own pay 40 percent not long before Nixon proposed to postpone civil-service and military pay rises from July 1, 1970, to the end of the year. Arthur Burns suggested that the President and Congressmen take a token cut, but nothing came of his idea. When the postmen struck and got raises, civil-service employees and military personnel were also handed their raises, not six months late, but six months early. In all, the wages of some five million people, equal to 7 percent of the nonfarm labor force, were raised 6 percent.

Moreover, politics got in the way of many specific measures that could have enabled economic forces to help keep prices down. One reason food costs are so high is that the Department of Agriculture, which all too often resembles a cartel operation dedicated primarily to pushing up prices, last year set grain acreages too low, and so production of both hogs and grain languished. Hendrik Houthakker, McCracken's colleague on the Council of Economic Advisers, argued for higher quotas on imported beef to increase domestic supply, but import quotas were actually reduced. President Nixon himself rejected his task force's recommendation that imported-oil quotas be abolished in favor of a tariff, and he topped that by asking Congress to restrict the flow of crude oil from Canada.

THE PRESIDENT'S FEAR

With the general concept and aims of the Game Plan, practically all economists, including former council members, are in remarkable agreement. Most criticism of the plan deals with the way it is being implemented. On the one hand, there are economists, bankers, commentators, and other advocates of sharp, quick deflation who argue that the Administration hasn't been harsh enough in retarding the economy. They shake their heads over the SEC-Commerce survey of last March that suggested business would increase its capital spending by more than 10 percent in 1970. They purse their

lips over climbing prices, forgetting that prices traditionally ease very late in a downturn. They deplore the Federal Reserve's intimations of a relaxed monetary policy. So they see the Administration "chickening out" on its resolution to conquer inflation.

On the other hand, there are those who fear a recession and the high unemployment that would accompany it; among them is Richard Nixon himself. And some economists and commentators regard the Federal Reserve's policy as practically guaranteeing a recession. One of them is Milton Friedman, the country's leading monetarist, who argues that a sharp reduction in the money supply is bound to hurt business some time later. The Federal Reserve's super-tight money policy, which kept the money supply practically constant from the summer of 1969 until early this year, he says, augurs for a deeper and longer slump than most people are counting on. This may tend to check price rises more than a gentle correction. Friedman concedes, but it may do the opposite. For the authorities may over-react in stimulating the economy, and so refuel and accelerate inflation.

Neither of the two points of view, as this is written, can be wholly discounted. As Arthur Burns told the Joint Economic Committee recently: "The Board cannot overlook the possibility that the present slowdown in economic activity, which is a healthy development, may yet be followed by a recession. . . . There is also the possibility, however, that the inflationary processes with which we are dealing may prove more stubborn than we realize. . . . For some time this year, our monetary and credit policies are therefore likely to tread a narrow path between too much restraint and too much ease. . . ."

Although prices, as already noted, are finally beginning to rise at a slower pace, the great worry is labor costs. It is true that 1970's wage settlements, which will doubtless surpass those of 1969, will be partly offset by rising productivity, which dropped during 1969 and should soon be regaining its normal rate of close to 3 percent. But some recent strike settlements have been grossly excessive. And the government's capitulation to civil-service and military personnel may generate a whole new round of wage demands. All this, combined with a new intractability, not to say belligerence, of labor's rank and file, is disturbing, and even alarming.

The part that organized labor plays in the inflationary process is a subject of considerable contention. Most economists agree that both business and labor often enjoy market power that enables them to keep the prices of their products and services at higher levels than they could in perfectly competitive markets. During the past twenty years or so it has been fashionable to pin the concrete medal on business. Dozens of papers and books show how prices are administered and how administered prices make for inflation. Others explain how innocent business practices like so-called target-return pricing (trying to set prices to bring a certain profit rate) are inflationary, or how rising prices and wages in one sector of the economy make for rising prices and wages in others.

LABOR'S INFLATIONARY EXPECTATIONS

The contribution of labor costs to inflation, by contrast, has often been overlooked or talked away. Some economists of the monetary school, anxious to account for everything in terms of the money supply, aver that a real cost- or labor-push inflation is rare, at least until the expansion of the money supply by the authorities has reduced the value of money and so added an inflationary component to wage demands. They thus tend to blame the wage boom on government. Labor monopoly, they say, affects

the pattern rather than the average level of wage rates.

Union leaders today, moreover, are brandishing timely and urgent reasons for their extreme demands. Wages have risen during the past five years, they admit, but the increase in living costs has practically offset their gains. The ones who signed three-year contracts when prices were considerably lower complain indignantly that those contracts shortchanged them. Now they are full of inflationary expectations, and commonly talk in terms of increases of around 10 percent a year, calculated not only to catch up with past price increases but to offset future ones.

These labor leaders, naturally enough, have exaggerated their case. During the past ten years, as the chart (not printed) shows, pay per hour (including fringe benefits) has increased 70 percent, more than twice as fast as consumer prices. During 1961-65 the increase was just about offset by the increase in productivity, so that unit labor costs (and wholesale prices) remained virtually steady. Between 1965 and 1970, however, pay per man-hour shot up steeply, a great deal faster than productivity.

Much of this increase, it is true, has recently gone into fringe benefits and taxes and has been partly offset by shorter hours, so that take-home pay has often shrunk. In addition, productivity gain in 1967 and 1969 was not up to par. The fact remains, however, that pay in the past five years has gone up faster than productivity and has been inflationary by definition. For this increase has raised production costs, which business has passed on (sometimes in extra-good measure) as price increases. And because the government, up till the end of 1968, was anxious to avoid the recession that customarily occurs when costs and prices are rising faster than aggregate demand, it used easy money to swell aggregate demand.

FLEXIBLE ONLY UPWARD

What can now be done about wage inflation? The Game Plan is based on the proposition, elaborately worked out from experience, that a small rise in unemployment will reduce the demand for labor, which has been very scarce at least in the skilled categories. Mostly because of this scarcity, and partly because of rising minimum wages, the wages of nonunion labor, which constitutes more than 75 percent of the nonfarm labor force, actually rose more last year than the wages of union labor. The reasoning now is that nonunion wages, which were so sensitive to the rising demand for labor, will be equally sensitive to a softening demand.

Union wages, by contrast, are not very sensitive to the state of the general labor market. Negotiating directly with management, unions have allowed the price of a man-hour to be flexible only one way, and that is upward. How much the price of labor moves upward, therefore, depends on how successfully business keeps it down. Union-wage inflation, in other words, can be braked only when business, confronted with tough markets and falling profits, resists extravagant union demands. At the same time, business must cut other costs and bring down the rate of its own price increases, if not prices themselves. It is a large order, but whatever can be said about business' sticky pricing practices, most prices have proved to be flexible and have responded to the supply-and-demand forces of the market. The fact that they did respond to the market is a major reason why the economy has managed successfully to climb out of four recessions since World War II. And it is because they still respond to the market that the Game Plan has a chance of being successful.

Suppose, to make the point a bit sharper, that business behaved in the fashion of organized labor. Suppose that the leaders

of the refrigerator industry journeyed to Miami, and there in congress assembled deplored the ravages of inflation on their financial condition. Suppose they agreed unanimously to "fight" inflation by increasing the price of their products 10 percent in 1970 and 8 percent both in 1971 and 1972. Suppose, for good measure, that these embattled industrialists then appointed a committee to deal with backsliders in their ranks, and instructed the committee to be alert to take such measures as picketing the backsliders, boycotting their suppliers, and hijacking their truck and rail shipments. Within two hours after their convention adjourned, there would begin such a public uproar as the nation has never seen. The planes and Metroliners to Washington would be bulging with nascent Naders, and no doubt Congress would convene in special session, as if for a declaration of war.

This is not to pin all the responsibility for inflation on labor unions. Inflation like pollution is everybody's fault and everybody's business. But a major reason inflation rages is that wages have been rising faster than total production. It is also a major reason why the Game Plan, or for that matter any plan that attempts to tame inflation, finds itself forced to reduce total demand by reducing production and throwing people out of work at just the time when common sense says production should be increased.

Abating the inflationary wage rise plainly means some harsh confrontations between business and labor. Unless business succeeds in keeping most of the rest of this year's settlements in the neighborhood of last year's increases, price-rise abatements will come harder than ever. Not only will the Game Plan have trouble in bringing annual price increases down to 3.5 percent by this year's end, it will need more time than it now counts on to reduce the 3.5 figure to a tolerable one.

LIVING WITH 3.5 PERCENT

And why isn't a rate of 3.5 percent tolerable? A lot of countries have survived and even flourished when their prices were rising several times as fast. The main reason the authorities can't quit at 3.5 percent is that such a rate would not suffice to extirpate inflationary expectations. Manufacturers would still tend to accumulate excessive inventories. Their cost-control programs and productivity would tend to languish. They would find it easy to succumb to unions' demands, which would themselves be inflated by expectations of higher prices. Businessmen, as they so often do when prices are rising, would find themselves with depreciation schedules insufficient to replace their capital. At the same time, because a new high rate of wage increases would justify more capital spending than a lower one, they would be compelled to spend more on new plant and equipment. And profits would probably suffer, for costs would generally rise at least as fast as prices. Since late 1965, as a matter of fact, profit margins have been declining.

Capital markets would be distorted. Expectations of more inflation would keep interest rates high, adding 3 percent or even more to the rate that bonds and loans would otherwise command. Lenders, hoping to offset their expectations of continuing if not accelerating inflation, would tend to demand ever higher rates. Soon or late, too much capital would tend to flow into real estate and equities, and to bid them up to eventually unsustainable prices.

Perhaps the most urgent reason why the U.S. could not tolerate a 3.5 percent rate of inflation is that such a rate would be likely to increase greatly the deficit in its balance of payments and cripple its options in foreign economic policy. Granted that inflation in Europe is worse than in the U.S., the fact is that the U.S., with its high labor costs, can compete in foreign markets only by keeping its rate of inflation considerably be-

low that of its foreign competitors. The U.S. would continue to import too much and export too little, and the protectionist movement would gain ammunition. The dollar would come under speculative attack; and the world monetary system, which is based on a fairly sound dollar, might approach another crisis.

RISKS AT THE GAP

And so the Game Plan aims to reduce the rate of inflation by the end of 1972 to a level much more tolerable than 3.5 percent. What are the chances for bringing the rate down to 2.5 percent or even 2 percent? By the end of 1970 the gap between potential and actual output should amount to 4 percent, and unemployment may exceed 5 percent. In 1971, McCracken hopes to begin narrowing the gap very gradually, even while reducing unemployment very gradually. But even a gradual narrowing of the gap has its hazards. When the economy is operating below potential, inflation automatically tends to moderate. Like a racing car that has stopped to cool an overheated engine, however, the economy can make up for lost time only by running faster than normal. As it speeds up, some prices may firm up. When trade and commerce heat up again, can prices and wages stay cool?

The last sizable disinflation, that of 1958-60, is edifying. Raymond Saulnier, who was Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers at that time, remarks that the present Administration is now trying to cure a worse inflation with a G.N.P. gap much narrower than it was then. "For twice as bad a disease," he says, "it's using half as much medicine." This is a slight exaggeration, but the point is well taken. In 1956-57 prices rose at 4 percent (as measured by the G.N.P. deflator), and the rate of pay increases ran between 6 and 6.5 percent. Thereupon the Administration went in for aggressive restraint. The Federal Reserve clamped down hard on the money supply, the government cut its spending, and by early 1958 prices were rising only at 1.6 percent. But President Eisenhower and Secretary of the Treasury Anderson, hot for a sound dollar, insisted on more restraint, and a \$12-billion budget deficit in 1959 was followed by a \$3-billion surplus in 1960. Thus in 1958 and 1961 the gap between actual and potential output, as shown in the chart on page 282, widened to no less than 10 percent. By late 1960 the rate of pay increases was down to less than 3 percent.

Inflation today is certainly stronger than in 1956-58. Consumer prices are rising at about 6 percent a year, and labor costs between 7 and 8 percent. Yet the gap between potential and actual output, to repeat, is expected to widen to no more than 4 percent by early 1971, and to narrow later on. As Saulnier himself has often noted, the Eisenhower Administration laded out the medicine in horse doctor's doses, often against his own express advice, and produced a real recession. The Game Plan is trying to avoid doing just that. But it is possible what with labor's aggressiveness and inflationary expectations, that the gap between potential and actual output may have to last longer than the plan anticipates. And the country may have to put up with more unemployment, and put up with it longer, than the projections call for.

IMPROVING THE TRADE-OFF

But assume that the day will come, on time or somewhat late, when the gap between potential and normal output is drawing to a close and inflation has been damped down to a rate of around 2.5 percent. If the economy is then constituted as it is now, experience has pretty well demonstrated, the Administration could not let unemployment fall much below 4.5 percent without risking a sharp rise in the rate of inflation. Only if the trade-off between employment and in-

flation is improved, in other words, can the Administration aim to reduce unemployment to a rate of 4 percent or even less.

Direct price and wage controls could improve the trade-off temporarily; or, to put it more precisely, they could provide a substitute for the trade-off and keep it from functioning. But if only because such controls would be impossible to administer fairly and efficiently, they would not work. And even if they should miraculously be made to work, they would merely conceal the trouble for a while. Significantly, none of the ex-members of the council are for direct controls.

What many of them are for, however, is "jawboning"—for setting up explicit or implicit price guidelines and persuading business and labor to follow them by pleading, threatening or arguing, according to the case at hand. Advocates and opponents of jawboning wield some impressive arguments but, at best, jawboning would be just a short-term expedient.

Probably the most practical way of fundamentally improving the trade-off soon is to soften and eventually destroy one rigidity whose destruction nobody can reasonably deplore. This rigidity is defined by the paradox that the country is for all practical purposes fully employed when 4 percent (or a little more) of its labor force is unemployed. For a large proportion of today's 3,700,000 U.S. unemployed cannot be easily employed. They live in the wrong place or lack the right skills or both. The nation's reserve of skilled unemployed labor amounts to less than 2.5 percent of the labor force, which constitutes a tight reserve in any country. Given a little increase in the demand for them, their price tends to rise. And any attempt by the government to reduce over-all unemployment below 4 percent by boosting final demand as the Johnson Administration did, ends up with too much demand and higher prices. The alternative is not hard to find, and it is indeed being put into effect. About two million people a year are now being trained under various programs. These programs will take time to pay off, but by 1972 the realistic rate of full employment should be higher than it is now.

Enlarging the labor force, however, is no substitute for expanding supply and keeping demand in line with it. It would be just as easy, if not easier, to start a roaring inflation when normal unemployment is 2 percent as when it is more than 4 percent. The great goal should be not merely to cure but to prevent inflation and inflation is the result not only of bad or timid monetary and fiscal policy, but of all the restrictions, codes, tariffs, price riggings and supports, quasi cartels, and other rigidities that infest the economy and hobble natural economic forces. If even some of these are extirpated, the preventive task of monetary and fiscal policy will be a lot easier.

A FIFTY-FIFTY CHANCE OF SUCCESS

The Game Plan may fail to reduce inflation very soon. Wage and price rises may yet refuse to abate despite growing unemployment, which would mean that the country's inflationary expectations, combined with the economy's rigidities, have been too strong for the plan's moderate strategy. The advocates of a sharp, quick deflation will revive the argument that the Administration hasn't been harsh enough, and the partisans of direct controls will press their case louder than ever. The plan may then have to be changed to accommodate tighter fiscal and monetary policy or a temporary wage and price freeze.

Success, however, is at least a fifty-fifty possibility. For success lends itself to wide definition. If by the end of 1972 inflation is down to 2 percent and unemployment stands around 4 percent, the Administration can claim a noble victory. But even a 4.5 percent unemployment rate, in an economy whose to-

tal employment will be increasing by 1,400,000 a year, is both politically and economically tolerable, given adequate welfare support. A combination of 2.5 percent or even 3 percent inflation with 4.5 percent unemployment would enable the Administration to take a lot of credit. Even so, the job of reconciling reasonable price stability with a reasonable unemployment level would still remain an urgent piece of unfinished business.

SOUTH VIETNAMESE TROOPS IN CAMBODIA INDEFINITELY, SANCTIONED BY LAIRD

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, despite President Nixon's original indication that South Vietnamese troops would withdraw from Cambodia with American troops, Saigon has stated firmly that they will stay, and Defense Secretary Laird has sanctioned that statement. The following editorial from the May 24 New York Times raises this issue and discusses hints of even more far-reaching activities in Southeast Asia:

VIETNAMEZING CAMBODIA

Saigon's announced determination to keep South Vietnamese troops in Cambodia indefinitely, which has now been publicly sanctioned by Defense Secretary Laird, is a direct challenge to the Administration's own professed efforts and those of Congress to re-establish limits to the Southeast Asian conflict.

It should be noted that the South Vietnamese are not speaking in terms merely of further operations against the border sanctuaries, as Secretary Laird indicated, but of a wider general effort against the Communists throughout Cambodia in support of the Lon Nol Government. South Vietnamese troops already have penetrated to within three miles of the Cambodian capital, they say, and are operating in other areas far beyond the 21-mile limit imposed on American forces.

If these operations are prolonged, there can be little doubt that they will provoke a strong reaction from the Communists and possibly also from Cambodians who are showing increasing signs of malaise over South Vietnamese activities within their borders. It is straining credibility to suggest that the South Vietnamese, who are not yet capable of defending their own country, can fight successfully alone in an alien environment where they must also confront the deep traditional antipathy of the native people.

Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky has boasted that South Vietnamese forces "have the capability of mounting military operations independently in Cambodia as well as in Vietnam." If this is so, there is no further excuse for continuing to maintain American forces in South Vietnam to fight Saigon's battles there. If it proves false, as is most likely, Americans have a right to ask what fresh demands will be made on the United States to help pull Saigon's chestnuts out of this foreign fire.

The Administration has failed so far to make clear its own intentions regarding future allied operations in Cambodia. President Nixon declared on May 8—and the White House reiterated last weekend—that it is expected "that the South Vietnamese would come out approximately at the same time that we do, because when we come out our logistical support and air support will also come out with them." Vice President Ky

has scornfully dismissed this "hypothesis" as "a silly argument of silly people." Secretary Laird and some other more recent Administration spokesmen seem to agree with him.

Even more disturbing are recent State Department hints that the United States Government is actively promoting a new defense alliance in Southeast Asia that would link South Vietnam and Thailand—and perhaps others—militarily with the shaky Lon Nol Government in Pnompenh, forging a new anti-Communist alliance across the southern half of Southeast Asia. Congress will certainly want to explore thoroughly the implications of such a far-reaching development and especially the role that the United States would be expected to play.

In the meantime, the Senate can help to restrain Saigon's reckless ambition by enacting the Cooper-Church amendment which prohibits, among other things, "paying the compensation or allowances of, or otherwise supporting directly or indirectly, any person in Cambodia who . . . engages in any combat activity in support of Cambodian forces."

PESSIMISM ON VIETNAMIZATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the President's optimism concerning the results of the expansion of the Vietnam war into Cambodia, reflected so clearly in his television speech last evening, is likely to prove misplaced. I believe that the President, for a number of reasons, will find it much more difficult to pull American troops out of Cambodia than he did to send them in, and that pulling them out will not be the end of our involvement with Cambodia, as the President apparently assumes. Furthermore, the prospect of continuing South Vietnamese military action in Cambodia, which the President alluded to, certainly raises serious questions about the prospects for success in the Vietnamization program on which the U.S. troop exit depends.

These and other significant problems that seem to me reasons for anything but optimism were outlined with great insight in an article in yesterday's New York Times by veteran Vietnam Reporter Terence Smith. Smith has just completed a 15-month assignment as New York Times bureau chief in Saigon. His article, "U.S. Aides in Saigon Question Policy," follows:

U.S. AIDES IN SAIGON QUESTION POLICY

(By Terence Smith)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 1.—There is widespread doubt among the most experienced American observers in South Vietnam that current United States policies will bring lasting peace.

Although 110,000 American troops have been withdrawn from Vietnam and enormous strides have been made in pacification in the last 18 months, the United States still faces vast problems in extricating itself.

At the root of the pessimistic outlook are serious and widely held doubts about the following:

The efficacy of the Vietnamization program, which has yet to face major challenges.

The wisdom of the extension of the war into Cambodia, which, despite the immediate

military gains it may achieve, seems likely to complicate American efforts to disengage and may eventually involve the United States—step by painful step—in the defense of yet another weak and uncertain government.

The effectiveness of the Saigon Government in dealing with increasingly serious economic and political problems in South Vietnam.

The nature of the progress achieved in the pacification program, which remains fragile and subject to the enemy's will.

Finally, there is a conviction that United States policies fail to come to grips with the central element in the Vietnam puzzle: the need for a negotiated political settlement that reflects the true balance of power among the Vietnamese people.

"We won't solve this war by cleaning out the base areas in Cambodia, or even by replacing American troops with South Vietnamese," an American who has spent five years in Vietnam said the other day.

"We have to go to the heart of the matter and find an acceptable way of distributing political power among the Vietnamese. That's what the fighting is all about, and it won't stop until we solve it."

The skepticism about American policy is shared in many quarters in Vietnam—by young dedicated Americans working at the province and district level, and by independent observers, including journalists and foreign diplomats. It is greatest among those whose jobs permit them to travel around Vietnam.

The attitude is also evident among educated, independent South Vietnamese, people outside the Government who are deeply concerned about the future of their country after the American disengagement.

A TRACE OF BITTERNESS

Through the remarks of all those people runs a common theme: No lasting peace is possible without a political solution.

"Vietnamization, by itself, won't produce any kind of peace in this country, just or otherwise," a 31-year-old major who works as a district adviser in the pacification program said recently with more than a trace of bitterness.

"Unless it is matched by some sort of political settlement, Vietnamization just means that the fighting will go on and on. But instead of Americans killing Vietnamese, you'll have Vietnamese killing Vietnamese."

Many people here, like the major, acknowledge that Vietnamization will eventually get American soldiers off the battlefield—though not necessarily out of the country—but they insist that it will not end the war or produce a just peace.

Behind that belief is the conviction that the enemy continues to have the necessary strength, spirit, manpower and determination to continue the struggle in South Vietnam—and Laos and Cambodia—for the foreseeable future. Few military men here dispute that assessment of the Communists' capability.

LOST IN FUROR

President Nixon's offer, in his address April 20, to discuss at the Paris peace talks "a fair political solution [reflecting] the existing relationship of political forces in South Vietnam" had barely begun to sink in when it was lost in the furor caused by the invasion of Cambodia 10 days later. It may have been, as one American here described it, "the first casualty of Nixon's decision to go into Cambodia."

The senior members of the American military command are visibly defensive about the Cambodian operation and the controversy it has caused. They insist that it was a militarily justifiable tactical operation that got caught up in larger strategic and political questions.

Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, commander of

United States forces in Vietnam, has indicated to friends that he feels that President Nixon drastically oversold the operation and enlarged its goals beyond realizable dimensions.

The general has said that the real purpose was to put a dent in the enemy's supply system and not, as Mr. Nixon suggested, to overrun and clean out the Communist headquarters.

The greatest peril in the Cambodian venture seems to lie in the period after June 30, when the Americans have withdrawn and the South Vietnamese are likely to continue their operations. The consensus here is that the President is going to find it far harder to get Americans out of Cambodia than it was to send them in.

CHOICE FOR AMERICANS

In the short run the Americans may be faced with the choice of either going to the aid of the South Vietnamese or watching them flounder if they come under heavy pressure. In the long run the United States could find itself committed by proxy, as a result of South Vietnamese pledges and actions, to the defense of the shaky Government headed by Premier Lon Nol, which displaced Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

If the South Vietnamese become overextended in Cambodia, the Americans are going to find it correspondingly difficult to carry out their withdrawals from Vietnam on schedule.

Apart from the complications of the Cambodian venture, Vietnamization faces other serious problems. So far a total of 110,000 Americans have been pulled out of Vietnam, leaving 429,000 behind. The real test will come in the next year, during which 150,000 more will have been withdrawn and the South Vietnamese are to take on the heavy fighting.

The first and most obvious danger is military. For the last four years the large American combat divisions have effectively manned the front lines. They have pursued the main North Vietnamese and Vietcong units relentlessly, gradually driving them from populated areas into the jungles and mountains along the Laotian and Cambodian borders.

As Vietnamization advances, the South Vietnamese divisions will take on the task while the remaining American units fall back into something approaching garrison duty. Their safety and that of an additional 250,000 or more Americans providing combat and logistical support will depend on the South Vietnamese.

HIGHER TOLL FORESEEN

Even conceding substantial improvement in the quality of the South Vietnamese armed forces, it is hard to imagine them coping with divisions of North Vietnamese regulars as effectively as the Americans did. The result may be significantly increased casualties—American as well as South Vietnamese—in the later stages of the withdrawal process.

Another consequence may be strikingly reduced security in certain areas of the countryside, most notably in the northern half of the country.

In the northernmost area, I Corps, the enemy has more than 20 battalions of fresh, well-equipped regulars in the vicinity of the demilitarized zone, and it has the capacity to reinforce them with up to three divisions at any time.

When the three divisions of Americans that are stationed there are withdrawn, the South Vietnamese will have to take on the job of patrolling along the demilitarized zone and protecting the coastal cities of Quangtri, Hue and Danang. At the very least, they will require reinforcements, and it is not clear from where additional troops would come.

There is a parallel situation in II Corps, the area south of the border region, where

mountainous terrain and bad communications are a tangible asset for the enemy.

As a result of years of intensive allied operations, the Communists have been pushed from the heavily populated coastal plain into the mountains. Once the Americans are gone the South Vietnamese may be hard-pressed to keep them there.

IMPACT ON SHAKY ECONOMY

Vietnamization will also have a drastic impact on South Vietnam's already shaky economic structure. The country earns more than 90 per cent of its foreign currency from Defense Department outlays and private spending by American soldiers. As the withdrawal proceeds the supply of dollars will be cut back just when they are most needed to bolster a sorely weakened economy.

In addition, the approximately 145,000 Vietnamese who are directly employed by United States agencies and companies will have to find jobs.

Those bleak prospects are considered by knowledgeable people here to be a principal threat to the stability of the Government of President Nguyen Van Thieu.

The domestic political and economic situation has deteriorated dramatically in recent months. While the attention of the world has been riveted on Cambodia, Mr. Thieu has been coping with just about the noisiest political crisis since his election.

Rather than working to rally his non-Communist political opposition behind him, as the United States Embassy has been urging him to do lately, President Thieu has come down hard on any group that has challenged his authority or criticized his regime. Individuals with the temerity to speak out have been prosecuted and jailed. Groups that have expressed their complaints in public demonstrations have been tear-gassed and beaten by riot policemen.

Now there is a rising tide of criticism of the Government in newspapers and the National Assembly that can only be expected to increase during the Senate election this fall and the presidential contest next year.

In addition, Mr. Thieu has failed to create anything approximating a national party that might be capable of mobilizing the country in preparation for a political battle with the Communists. Instead, his basic distrust of politicians—he was a general—and his reluctance to share power remain as great as ever.

As for the pacification program, there can be no question that enormous strides have been made during the last 18 months in the effort to extend the Government's control into the countryside. There is general agreement that the current program, which is the result of years of experimentation, mistakes and disappointments, is functioning better than any of its hapless forerunners.

But the progress in certain provinces has been counterbalanced by setbacks in others. A proper pacification map of Vietnam would resemble a patchwork quilt, a mixture of bright and dark patches that produce a mottled impression over all.

The combination of problems—military, economic and political—guarantees that the American disengagement, particularly during the next year, will be a painful and troubled process.

BETTER AIRLINE SERVICE NEEDED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the keys to improving life in rural Amer-

ica is to expand business and industrial opportunities in the countryside, creating new jobs and better income. This expansion, in turn, is dependent on a decent transportation network to move goods to the urban consumer markets. Our Second Congressional District has been hampered in this regard for several reasons. Delays in completing Interstate 90 and Highway 60 in the southern region of the district has made it difficult for cities and towns in this area to stimulate business development. The ongoing curtailment of rail service has also complicated our problems. And several of our major cities—Mankato, Worthington, Fairmont—have had continuing difficulties in maintaining good air transportation service.

Consequently, I have introduced a concurrent resolution in the House expressing the need in small and medium sized cities for service by certificated air carriers. This resolution declares that the welfare of such cities requires frequent, reliable schedule air service. It maintains that Federal agencies are encouraging the substitution of carriers without Federal certificates on low-traffic routes without adequate guarantee of reliability or continuance of the substitute service. It urges that the concerned Federal agencies, including the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, review these problems and report to Congress with recommendations for improvement.

Specifically, these Federal agencies are to investigate the need for policy changes involving subsidies, the development of suitable aircraft and air navigation aids for smaller cities, the adjustment of fares and rates which discourage traffic, and the safeguards or subsidies needed in route substitutions by air carriers without Federal certificates.

Importantly, the resolution also declares that pending this review, the CAB shall maintain federally certificated air service to all points now served on a frequency not less than at present.

This legislation was suggested by a concerned citizen in Fairmont, and I am happy to note his example of local responsibility and initiative.

As a further indication of the airlines headaches that plague our area, I am placing in the RECORD a May 5 commentary which appeared in the Mankato Free Press, edited by Kenneth Berg:

AIRLINES ON COLLISION COURSE

With two airlines showing willingness to serve Mankato and a third ordered to live up to its certificate when the new municipal airport is finally opened, it would appear that the city's air service future is secure.

Unfortunately this is not the case, as the three carriers are flying something of a collision course.

North Central Airlines doesn't want to return to Mankato, a stop it was forced to abandon without shedding of tears when the old airport could not handle the heavier 44-passenger prop-jet Convals being introduced. In fact, North Central would like to drop all intermediate stops (Fairmont and Worth-

ington) on its run from Minneapolis to Sioux Falls.

But North Central must continue service at least until 1971 when its federal certificate again is reviewed. And according to that certificate, it must return to Mankato if Mankato wants it—and the city council says we do.

In the other two corners of this triangle ring are Imperial Airlines and Mississippi Valley Airways, third-level or local service carriers who have been filling the vacuum in North Central's absence.

Imperial, which flies jet-powered helicopters between Mankato and the Twin Cities, was coaxed in by North Central after Fleet Airlines went defunct after a short-lived existence. Imperial offers unique, convenient flights . . . and it is justifiable speculation whether at first North Central saw in Imperial a permanent solution to Mankato's plight that would obviate North Central's having to return once the new airport was ready.

Mississippi Valley came along later, also at North Central's behest and support. This was confusing in terms of Imperial's good track record, and also leads to legitimate wonder if North Central belatedly saw in Mississippi Valley a carrier capable of eventually taking over the entire Mankato-Fairmont-Worthington route.

Unless and until Mankato gains direct connection to Chicago with no less than Convair-type equipment, we will remain a satellite to the Twin Cities International Airport. And there obviously is not sufficient shuttle business generated by the Mankato area to insure the financial soundness for more than one airline.

North Central appears to have gone too far in its gamble to serve Mankato's immediate needs with shuttle service (Imperial) while at the same time looking to the future by doing its best to see that Mississippi Valley is not excluded.

The council didn't like the resulting feel of it all, and that's why it wouldn't let North Central off the hook.

This, then, is the apparent collision course. Just who survives, and whether the impact holds any long-term good for the airlines and the city, may not be known until the first commercial plane lands on the new municipal airport in June.

A LETTER FROM THE FATHER OF A YOUNG MAN WHO HAS JUST BEEN DRAFTED

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, in the torrent of speeches, mail, newspaper columns, and petitions on the Vietnam issue which over the years have competed for our attentions, occasionally there is one which states with brilliant clarity some truths that have eluded us.

The other day I received a letter from a friend of mine in Detroit, Mr. David P. Miller. He wrote with a troubled and probing passion, with honesty, and with such basic love of country that the tragedy of the Vietnam war took on a further dimension, stark and indefensible.

I think this letter deserves a wider audience. Accordingly, with the permis-

sion of Mr. Miller, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the letter follows:

DETROIT, MICH.,

June 1, 1970.

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In the last year or two I have responded to your opinion surveys with an indication of my growing distress with the government's war policy in Vietnam.

There was a time when I believed that our purpose was good and that our so-called "limited" commitment was worth the effort. I supported it. But the government has not kept its promise. Our reason for being in that sector of the world is not clear and I am convinced that our military effort has been a sad and wasteful failure.

It is incomprehensible to me why we cling stubbornly to a war policy which gains us nothing, saps our strength, alienates our friends and destroys the peoples' faith in the government and in themselves. When it is really needed where will America find the will to support it? I hope that you will not consider this mere rhetoric. I am deeply concerned for the future of this country because of the disunity and mistrust engendered and I fear deliberately encouraged by a cynical government hell bent on a war in which the people have little interest, faith or belief.

It has been said that the President acted with great courage in making the decision to go into Cambodia. I think not! I believe it was the least courageous choice of the options facing him. Are we so lacking in leadership courage that we cannot admit that this endless war has been a horrible, senseless mistake and upon that admission act promptly to correct it? The American people know that we cannot recoup our sad and shameful losses. But must we continue forever on a course which takes the lives of our people, erodes our economy and undermines our will and spirit—all on the pretense that we are doing good and succeeding. I cannot and will not support such a disrespectful course of conduct.

The argument has been made that a hasty pullout from Indochina will result in a horrible "bloodbath." But is no one concerned for the major role America plays in the continuing bloodbath announced weekly in the cold statistics of the dead and wounded—hundreds of Americans, thousands of allies and untold numbers of neutrals, non-combatants and forces of the enemy. I cannot accept the idea that the blood of any man counts for nothing. Or are we to pretend it is not really happening, that it is only something that might happen if we were to withdraw. Clearly, the world knows the answer and I fear it is one that will forever stain the image of America.

I earnestly request and urge you to speak and act as forcefully as possible to end the war now and refuse support for any continuation of it in any form. We need leadership and it is your constitutional responsibility to give it. I cannot help but express impatience with the adages which may suffice in other circumstances. It does not satisfy the need to say we are limited by the "art of the possible" and the practicalities of political life. This war will be remembered not for those who sustain it but for those who end it. I hope that you will speak out now to end the war.

It may be that my sources of information are limited and thus not wholly reliable. But my work takes me from coast to coast and north and south and I have the opportunity to talk with many people of diverse interests—leaders of business and labor, conservatives and liberals, young and old, work-

ing men and neighbors. All are "fed up" with the war and I can honestly say I have not heard one person in recent months express the view that our effort in Vietnam should be continued. All want it brought to an end as quickly as possible and, with few exceptions, none are concerned with the foolish and phoney notions about "saving face". There can be no quarrel about "honor" as an objective. But it is not our faces that need saved. The critical question is whether America can avoid the dishonor and ruin now threatened in all aspects of our lives by continued pursuit of an objective beyond our will and understandable need.

There can be no doubt that the vast majority of Americans oppose the violent and unlawful acts of dissidents, particularly student dissidents. We do not want our buildings destroyed, our law officers hurt or abused or our flag desecrated. I share this view without reservation. Those who engage in such tactics should be apprehended and punished as the law provides. But we cannot allow the outrages of a few blind us from the real abomination which nurtures dissent in the land. It is painfully clear that our government is now invoking its highest office to incitement against all dissidents to divert attention from its own miserable failures and misdeeds in keeping America in a war it does not want. I hope and trust that you will not be led into the belief that the peoples' opposition to unlawful dissent in any way diminishes their opposition to the war. There are many, including the "hard hats", who believe as I do not only that violent dissent at home is wrong, but also that a violent, costly and futile war is wrong. Neither can be justified. But as long as the war continues the unwanted symptoms of destruction will remain to undermine and weaken all that is good in America.

It seems that the government demands unquestioning support of its war policy. I cannot give it nor can I give in to its effort to stifle dissent. But it is a sad and sobering thought that the climate in this land is such as to make me feel compelled to explain myself. I am not an anarchist or a radical. I am merely an uncomfortably middle-aged American who grew up in the depression and managed to survive almost five years of service in World War II. I remember Europe as an infantryman from Omaha Beach to the Elbe River. My war relics include a Purple Heart, a Bronze Star and a lot of memories. Most of all those experiences left me with the certain knowledge that war is essentially and inherently brutal—and, short of a cause upon which the life of the nation depends, indefensible.

Finally, I write this in one other important capacity—the father of a young man who has just been drafted. For the government he may be just another number of the long line of those few who have been "selected" from among many to serve a purpose which is unreal and misunderstood and for which he has no voice. We visited Washington and the House Chambers when he was thirteen. The Vietnam conflict was in its infancy. Now it is our longest war and he is nineteen—eligible to serve as the essential instrument in the only plan his government has been able to devise to solve its problems. I expect that he will do what he must. He knew there were ways to avoid this consequence, but he has not chosen them.

It is the government—not America—that has called my son to service. It has not done it well or even with decent consideration of his needs. I thought he was entitled to fair notice and a reasonable chance to arrange his affairs for departure. That has been denied. I hoped he would enter the service with faith and pride. The government

has not given him that chance. I hope it will. I hope the government understands that it is responsible for his well being, that he is more than a number—that he is our son and that we believe that he and all like him deserve to be treated with decency and care.

Sincerely,

DAVE MILLER.

SUPPORT FOR NORTH COASTAL RIVERS PROTECTION LEGISLATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of a bill to prevent high dams from being constructed on three free-flowing rivers in the north coast area of California, H.R. 16854, I have received a great number of supportive letters and wires on this measure.

I believe that it is imperative that the plans of State and Federal agencies to construct some 20 high dams on the Eel, Klamath, and Trinity Rivers be stopped, and that a full study be made on the preservation of these rivers.

I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter I received from a past president of the California division of the Izaak Walton League of America which describes the situation in northern California in full and accurate detail.

The letter follows:

MAY 22, 1970.

JEROME R. WALDIE,
Member of Congress,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: In reply to your letter of May 6, 1970 regarding the Klamath, Eel and Trinity Rivers. I am happy to tell you that at the California State Convention of the Izaak Walton League of America held in San Francisco on May 15, the California State Division endorsed your bill in the Congress.

Conservation is defined as the "wise use of our natural resources" but who decides who is wise? The consumers of our natural resources, be they loggers, miners, dam builders or agriculture all say they are conservationists. Loggers are killing themselves off unless they replant timber, the miners are driving down a dead end street and the dam builders are a pestilence, for their end is not yet in sight.

In the meantime the reservoirs and the waters downstream become polluted. Trout and other fish have diseases that were unknown a few years ago. The streams have lost their shade, the rains add to the siltation and our fish can no longer spawn. Pesticides are used by agriculture and the timber industry to the ultimate death of us all. This is a truly sad picture! But we can be saved, our streams can be saved. Out of the thirty-five streams in California only three are left and they are sick.

The dam builders talk of water for the thirsty children in Southern California. Actually nine out of ten gallons are used by agriculture. An agriculture that is producing crops in the United States that are bought and stored by the Federal Government, that are subsidized by the Federal Government

and that the Federal Government pays not to plant. How about inflation?

Who can appreciate the beauty of a wild stream without gaining a respite from present day pressures? Who can contemplate Nature in her natural glory without learning that Nature is the true Mother of us all? How can mere man claim to enhance the esthetics of natural environment? A wild and scenic river enhances every man, woman and child deep in their souls. Perhaps I am a dreamer but I love California and I hate to see what is being done to her in the name of progress. Flood control is a myth as Egypt is beginning to find out from the Aswan Dam in the Nile Valley and as we have found out in our coastal streams. Let the waters be free!

"Enhancement" and "recreation" are the twin deceivers that the dam builders hope will be a sop to the vast number of people who do not realize how close a desert we are becoming. Enhancement is another name for trying to put the horse back into the barn after the barn has burned down. We don't want catfish in a muddy pond when we can keep our trout in a live pure stream. Recreation means resorts, water skiing, pollution, boat races, noise and air pollution with fishing a poor last.

And finally, observe the Great Experimenters of the Department of Fish and Game! The trial and error boys! Their policy is to bring in alien species of fish and game instead of making the needed improvements in our natural ancient environment. In over three years that I worked for the Department we have gone down hill with our resources but we certainly have raised a huge ineffective bureaucracy.

Mr. Waldie, we need more men like you! It is later than we think.

Respectfully,

LEE C. SHEA, JR.,

Past President, California Division I.W.L.A.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Trinity, Klamath, and Eel Rivers, in their free flowing condition, are magnificent and irreplaceable assets which support a wealth of fish, wildlife and scenic beauty; and

Whereas, the California Department of Water Resources, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, are planning the construction of between ten and twenty high dams on the Trinity, Klamath and Eel Rivers designed primarily for water export; and

Whereas, the construction of such dams would mean the end of abundant salmon and steelhead fisheries on those rivers and would inundate over 620 miles of choice salmon and steelhead waters and hundreds of thousands of acres of valuable timberland and essential winter deer range; and

Whereas, the damming of the Trinity, Klamath and Eel Rivers would be an incalculable loss to all Californians; and

Whereas, Congressman Jerome Waldie has introduced H.R. 16854 in Congress which would include the Trinity, Klamath and Eel Rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers system; and

Whereas, H.R. 16854, if enacted into law, will preserve forever the Trinity, Klamath and Eel Rivers in their free flowing condition to be enjoyed by all Californians in perpetuity; now

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Izaak Walton League of America, San Francisco Chapter by a unanimous vote of its Board of Directors, hereby endorses and urges the enactment into law of H.R. 16854 to include the Trinity, Klamath and Eel Rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

WSPA EDITORIAL

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in August of last year I had occasion to visit with Ambassador Armin H. Meyer in Tokyo. I found him to be remarkably aware of the problems being caused to our domestic textile industry by Japanese and other foreign imports. He was eager to receive additional information so as to improve his effectiveness in dealing with the Japanese in an attempt to prevent an economic disaster to certain areas of the United States. He recognized that continued good relations between Japan and the United States required moderation in the increase of textile imports to this country.

Ambassador Meyer demonstrated his interest and concern with this problem by visiting textile plants and areas in the United States earlier this year. I want to personally pay tribute to the efforts of this exceptional man.

Radio Station WSPA, Spartanburg, S.C., in a recent editorial also recognized the efforts being made by Ambassador Meyer. I place their editorial in the RECORD at this point:

WSPA EDITORIAL

A WSPA staff member is in Japan, and our editorial today we are giving some of his observations.

Regardless of how the fight comes out to impose quotas on textiles from cheap labor Asian countries, no one can ever contend that the U.S. Ambassador to Japan did not put the full prestige of his position behind the effort for a voluntary agreement to bring relief to "injured" American textile mills.

It is this word "injured" around which much of the argument in Japan revolves in imposing quotas. Japanese textile manufacturers contend the "injury" is not real, and that it is only temporary and is not caused entirely by Japanese exports.

Fortunately Ambassador Armin H. Meyer, on his own initiative visited the Carolinas on a recent trip to the United States and saw firsthand the effects of what he termed the "flood" of textile exports from Japan and other cheap labor countries.

Only a short time ago he made a speech at Osaka in connection with the opening of EXPO '70. This was made for Japanese consumption. It was directed especially to the textile manufacturers who are resisting Prime Minister Sato's efforts to carry out his pledge for voluntary limitation of textile imports.

No spokesman for the American textile industry could have presented better the justification for textile quotas.

After pointing out that in South Carolina two-thirds of the industrial workers are in textile related industries, Ambassador Meyer reviewed how earnings of textile mills in the Carolinas had dropped and cited a number of mills which had closed recently.

Then the Ambassador put his finger on the problem:

"In 1958, American exports and imports, with respect to textiles, were virtually in balance. In 1959, a deficit had reached \$200 million. Then years later, last year 1969, America's textile deficit soared to a staggering \$1.3 billion. The fact is that America virtually alone has kept its doors open to textile imports. A flood is the result, and it has surged beyond tolerable bounds."

Ambassador Meyer wants to see some voluntary agreement worked out. He is not optimistic but hopeful. He fears if the Japanese refuse to limit quotas, then Congress will act, and the Mills Bill could become a "Christmas tree" and the \$8.4 billion in trade between the two countries could deteriorate.

In a way, Ambassador Meyer is walking a tightrope in trying to preserve friendly trade relations between the two countries and also bring protection to American textile mills.

But it should be encouraging to the American textile industry that the United States has an Ambassador in Tokyo who is not afraid to speak out and call the shots as he sees them.

And it should be pointed out that Mr. Meyer comes from Illinois, a state that exports a lot of soybeans to Japan.

OPIUM IN TURKEY

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the second in a series of articles concerning the illicit drug traffic that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. This particular installment deals with the growing of opium in Turkey and the efforts of the United States and Turkish Governments to halt that opium production. The article vividly portrays the problem and should be most informative for those who desire a better understanding of the difficulties involved in stopping the flow of heroin. It follows:

TURKEY PRINCIPAL U.S. SOURCE—LEGAL OPIUM PRODUCTION SPAWNS ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING

(By John Hughes)

ISTANBUL.—American tourists breathlessly pounding the Mediterranean circuit probably give little thought to the ownership of the pleasant hotel near Istanbul's Taksim Square where many of them stay.

Undoubtedly, they would be startled to learn that it is owned by one of Turkey's major traffickers in narcotics and built with the proceeds of the heroin trade to the United States.

Besides the hotel business, Turkey's "junk," or narcotics, merchants are involved in a shipping company, a trucking firm, an export-import agency, and a string of other lawful enterprises.

The names of the top 9 or 10 men behind the Turkish narcotics racket are known to American, Turkish, and other narcotics agents. But there is little hope of catching them. A loof behind a facade of respectability, they are protected by bodyguards from their competitors and by clever attorneys from the law. They are rich. And they are powerful.

This is the organizational, and money, end of the business which makes Turkey one of the world's principal suppliers of illegal opium, and thus the origin of some 80 percent of heroin used in the United States.

"BIG NAMES" NEVER CAUGHT

Like major traffickers everywhere, the big names in the Turkish narcotics business are never caught in possession of their merchandise, never tainted with the smell, like fresh-cut hay, of newly gathered opium.

They are the wheeler-dealers who finance, buy, sell, and arrange transit out of the country. It is the middle-men, the small-fry couriers, the growers, who run the risk.

Each year on the eve of the opium-planting season, the men who mastermind the Turkish narcotics business dispatch their "commission" men to the growing areas. The bright lights of Istanbul are put behind. The city's skyline, with its soaring spires and minarets and Islamic domes of exquisite contour, recede beyond the Bosphorus.

The "commission" men head out across Anatolia toward southern Turkey into some of the most wild and craggy country in the world. Mountain streams twist and turn through the terrain in frenzy, rushing through gullies and leaping down into gorges. Goat tracks snake upward to peaks which afford smugglers total vantage and total surprise.

PEOPLE HIGHLY SUSPICIOUS

The Turks who live here are jealous of their independence and suspicious of intruders. Says one law enforcement officer:

"They come out with their hunting dogs snarling and their guns blazing. Later, they ask questions."

Provinces like these—Afyon, Usak, Konya, Denizli—are the heart of the opium country. "Afyon" in fact means "opium." Here the "commission" men, renewing their long-standing contacts, set their quotas for the amount of illegal opium they will buy, and that therefore the farmer must grow, in the coming year.

Usually this illegal quota is a percentage diverted from the crop which the farmer grows quite lawfully for the government. Some 110,000 farmers grow opium in Turkey, which is a major producer for medicinal purposes, as well as the foremost illegal source of narcotics for the American market.

Turkey's legitimate opium production has been running at more than 100 tons a year. But the farmer in legal production plants a few more hectares of opium for his private use.

His legal output he must sell to the government. The price he gets is around \$10 a kilo. For whatever he can divert and sell to the illegal buyers from Istanbul, he gets around \$30 a kilo.

Opium production is supposed to be controlled by Toprak, the Turkish Government Land Office. Farmers are licensed and in theory must hand over their entire crop to the state buying organization. But in practice there is little policing. The growing areas are remote from central authority. The Toprak agent on the scene may be paid to keep quiet about illicit production. If he reports evasion, he may be killed.

Turkish policemen are vulnerable. A city cop earns about \$40 a month. That is somewhat less than the earnings of an energetic shoeshine boy hustling tourists. A police captain with long service may make \$100 a month.

In the countryside, some of the gendarmerie earn 36 cents a month. Often they are assigned to their own villages. And as one lawman says, "they're unlikely to turn in their own fathers and brothers."

HARVEST LOOSELY SUPERVISED

There are brave and honest policemen in Turkey. But they are short of equipment to hunt down illegal opium-growers and smugglers. This shortage the United States now is beginning to remedy. Until the United States started distributing new Smith and Wesson .38's, a Turkish policeman could not be sure that his ancient revolver would not explode in his hand when fired.

Thus it is that when the Turkish opium farmer harvests his crop, about this time of year, he does so with little supervision from the government.

The poppy plants have grown to their full height and flowered in delicate shades of mauve and pink. Soon after the petals fall, the farmer and his family move in, carefully

slitting the pods of the poppies which are left behind.

Out through the incisions oozes a milky liquid. This is opium. For a few hours it is allowed to harden. During this time it turns dark brown. Then, from each pod, it is scraped off and kneaded into a ball until the farmer has collected a lump several pounds in weight.

In this manner begins the long journey which terminates with the injection of heroin into the veins of the quivering, shaking "junkie" in New York, or one of a dozen other American cities.

Legally grown opium is turned into the government buying station. But for illegal opium, the next step is delivery of the agreed quotas to the "commission" men from Istanbul.

At a quiet meeting place, usually at night, they take it over and make payment. Everyone is armed, everyone suspicious. This is the time for a doublecross, or an ambush by narcotics agents who have penetrated the organization. When agents do spring a trap, the firefight is usually furious.

NEXT STEP THE BORDER

If the transaction goes through without incident, the opium moves by truck or van on the next stage of its journey out of the country.

Traditionally, the opium smugglers' route has been to Kilis, in Gaziantep Province, on Turkey's border with Syria. Specialists there move the loads—as much as a man or mule can comfortably carry—across into Syria. It is a dangerous business, because both governments have strung the border with barbed wire, sewn it with mines, and dotted it with machine-gun posts.

But some border guards can be bribed, and even the honest ones cannot be everywhere at once. The smugglers know the best times and places to cross. They evade patrols, snip the wire, and drive sheep, goats, or other animals ahead of them to clear a path through the minefields.

Once into Syria, the opium is handed over either to an agent of the Istanbul drug merchants, or an agent of a new ring which has bought the shipment. In a primitive laboratory or at a well-guarded camp, remote in the hills, the opium is converted into morphine.

It is a simple chemical process. In a series of steps the morphine content is boiled, filtered, and precipitated out of the opium. About 10 parts opium make one part of morphine base. In the Middle East it is shipped onward as yellowish powder, in plastic bags. In Asia, the morphine is packed into rectangular blocks.

Besides being much smaller to carry and conceal, the morphine base now is more valuable. Ten kilos of opium at \$30 a kilo are worth \$300 in Turkey. Converted into a kilo of morphine, they are worth \$500. Delivered in Marseille to the Corsican narcotics ring which will convert it to heroin, the same kilo of morphine doubles its value to \$1,000.

But getting it there taxes the drug smugglers' ingenuity. After conversion to morphine base in Syria, the traditional route has been down into Lebanon. There the morphine is smuggled aboard ships bound for Marseille, France, or other convenient ports in the western Mediterranean. There has also been some conversion from morphine to heroin in Lebanon itself.

But Lebanese authorities, stung by international criticism, have lately cracked down on the morphine traffic.

SMUGGLING MORE DIFFICULT

Captain Antoine Saadi, chief of the Lebanese police narcotics bureau, says Lebanon's own heroin factories have been put out of business. Only one heroin chemist is still at large. He is Omar Makkouk, hiding across the Syrian border. Though an

elderly man, he is renowned throughout the international underworld for the quality of his heroin.

Last year, Lebanese police seized couriers carrying 10 kilos of Makkouk's heroin. But 49 kilos of this batch had already gone through undetected, via Amsterdam and Curacao, to Miami.

Though the flow of hashish is still rampant through Lebanon, the crackdown on morphine and heroin has caused traffickers to develop alternative routes for these "hard" drugs. The morphine laboratories still operate in Syria, but now once opium has been converted to morphine the morphine is often smuggled back into Turkey for movement to France by road or sea. Lebanon is considered risky.

Recently one Lebanese trafficker made plans for processing morphine with maximum security. The laboratory equipment was sealed in watertight containers and sunk at sea. It was to be brought up and used only when a shipment came in from Syria, and then submerged again. But his Syrian supplier balked.

"Bring morphine into Lebanon these days!" said the supplier. "You must be crazy."

With their penchant for trade and finance, the Lebanese still act as brokers and financiers in the narcotics traffic. They bring buyers and sellers together. They underwrite shipments themselves. Occasionally they slip. One, caught in France last year, got five years in jail and a fine of \$200,000.

But the Turks have recently been developing and managing their own transportation routes. Many tons of Turkish opium flow eastward into Iran. But to the west, and in the heroin-hungry market of the United States, lies the big money.

SHIPS HARD TO SEARCH

Ships are still especially good bets for smuggling narcotics. They have thousands of hiding places. Two Turkish vessels, the Karadeniz and the Akdaniz, which regularly cruise westward through the Mediterranean, are held suspect by narcotics agents.

Agents caught two French traffickers red-handed with 86 kilos of morphine as they tried to get it ashore from the Karadeniz in Marseille. Recently, agents seized 125 kilos from the Akdaniz. But she carried 400 kilos more which the agents did not get. This was dropped overboard and retrieved by scuba divers in the employ of narcotics merchants.

Many narcotics shipments now travel by road from Turkey to Western Europe. One advantage for the smugglers is that part of the route lies through Communist countries where Western narcotics agents find it difficult to operate. Agents may have a narcotics shipment under surveillance as it enters Bulgaria from Turkey. But they lose it until it emerges in a non-Communist country at the other end of Europe.

Thus traffickers sometimes send a truck through with two trailers. One is "clean" (without narcotics), the other "dirty" (carrying morphine). In one or other of the Communist countries, the "dirty" trailer is dropped off.

TRUCKS WELL DISGUISED

The traffickers wait to see if the truck with the "clean" trailer gets "hit" (thoroughly searched) at a Western European customs post. If not, it means narcotics agents are unaware of the shipment. So the second, "dirty" trailer is sent through on another truck.

Besides dropping off shipments for storage in Communist countries, traffickers also use the opportunity to do paint jobs and switch license plates and registration papers. Thus agents may have complete details of a truck with narcotics aboard when it enters Bulgaria. But when it emerges in Italy or Ger-

many, it may have different drivers, different papers, and be a different color.

Turkey's smugglers have developed specialists who concentrate on various parts of vehicles. Some split gasoline tanks on cars and trucks and fit secret compartments almost impossible to find even with steel probes. Others suspend "traps" from various parts of a chassis. Still others build undetectable boxes into drivers' cabs.

In one case, American and French agents seized a truck carrying watermelons from Turkey to France. They slashed open every watermelon—and found nothing. Then agents ran tape measures over the inside and outside of the truck. They came up with an abnormal discrepancy. Then they ripped open the built-in compartment which hid 525 kilos of opium and 54 kilos of morphine.

A large migrant Turkish community in Western Europe also offers traffickers an opportunity.

More than 200,000 Turks work in West Germany. They travel back and forth to their homeland. As they do, some of them smuggle narcotics. Out of Turkey they carry morphine. Back to Turkey they smuggle weapons. These are high-priced and in big demand in a gun-conscious country. A Smith and Wesson revolver worth \$80 in the United States sells for \$400 in Turkey.

With the production and smuggling of narcotics so widespread and blatant, what is the Turkish Government doing to cut back traffic?

In 1967 the Turks announced they would get out of the opium business altogether by the crop of 1970-71. This seemed to mean that they would reduce the areas of legal opium cultivation until by 1971 nothing would be left.

From 21 opium-growing provinces in 1967 they did cut back to 18 provinces in 1968, 11 provinces in 1969, and 9 this year. The target for next year is 7 provinces.

FARMERS NOT LIKELY ALIENATED

Then the big question is: What happens after that? In theory the legal opium crop should have been eliminated. In practice it looks unlikely that it will be. While legal production continues, illegal production appears inevitable.

In an obvious attempt to jog the Turks along, United States narcotics chief John E. Ingersoll issued some sharp comments at a press conference earlier this year. Director of the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Mr. Ingersoll charged that provinces to which opium production had been limited were in fact the most productive.

He said efforts to wipe out opium production had become bogged down in Turkish politics.

Mr. Ingersoll's remarks needed little interpretation here in Turkey. The hard-core, opium-growing provinces are of considerable political significance to the government of Premier Suleyman Demirel and his ruling Justice Party. Turkish opium farmers number some 110,000. No government lightly alienates them.

Further, Mr. Ingersoll's criticism came in the midst of a government crisis. Right-wing rebels in the Justice Party were challenging Premier Demirel's authority. Obviously no government was anxious at that particular juncture to press such a manifestly unpopular issue as elimination of the opium crop.

There was in Mr. Ingersoll's comment, however, a phrase which stirred some Turks.

UNITED STATES SENDING AID

"We're asking a great deal of them [the Turks]," said Mr. Ingersoll. "But they've got the courage to do it." That touched a chord in a nation with martial leanings, where bravery and honor are highly prized.

With the political crisis behind him,

Premier Demirel now has the opportunity to show how serious he is about taking Turkey out of the opium business.

The United States is giving him help. About \$1 million of a \$3 million American loan for opium-eradication has already been advanced. Half the money goes on a program to substitute other crops for opium. The other half is spent on boosting the anti-narcotics effort of the Turkish police.

The Turkish national police force has assigned 420 men to a new narcotics bureau, and specially trained 330 gendarmes in narcotics work. The United States has helped with training and equipment. Washington has supplied police cars, new weapons, and a spotter plane from which police will be able to detect illegal opium plots.

This program is about one-third operational. As the Turks implement it successfully, additional equipment and funds will be doled out.

Some observers think the Turks are tackling the difficult opium problem about as speedily as they can, and that the government's intentions are good. Others are impatient.

One thing seems clear. Even if legal production should be eliminated, there will still be illegal growers ready to take high risks for high profits. Says one American narcotics expert:

"Even if we knock out most of Turkey's opium production, the traffickers will still be in business somehow."

Second of 10 reports. Next: "Marseille—hub of the heroin manufacturing industry" appears Friday, June 5.

CITIES SAID TO LAG ON ERIE'S CLEANUP

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of June 4, 1970, carried an article under a Detroit dateline which was headlined, "Cities Said To Lag on Erie's Cleanup."

The article points up the fact that both municipalities and industries are lagging in the drive to control and abate pollution along the Detroit River and Lake Erie. However, the article also makes it clear that the Federal Government must share the blame for delay in meeting this water pollution problem since it has failed to provide sufficient Federal funds to carry out its obligations under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to see the article I include its text at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CITIES SAID TO LAG ON ERIE'S CLEANUP—WATER INVESTIGATORS ALSO ACCUSE SOME INDUSTRIES
(By Jerry M. Flint)

DETROIT, June 3.—Federal investigators charged today that most cities and some industries were falling far behind their pledges to clean the water that flows into Lake Erie.

And the Federal Government was accused of failing to provide promised money and to clean its own waste waters.

The charges came at a Federal-state pollution conference on enforcement in the Lake

Erie Basin, called by Walter J. Hickel, the Secretary of the Interior. The beginning of the mercury cleanup program for the lakes were also announced here.

The goal has been a clean Lake Erie by 1972, but the Federal Water Quality Administration investigators said that 78 of 110 cities were not meeting their original cleanup schedule and that 49 were more than one year behind schedule.

On the industry side, 44 of 130 industries were said to be behind the cleanup schedule, 38 more than a year behind.

"The problem is much greater from the cities," said George Harlow, director of the water agency's Lake Erie Basin office.

The water quality agency plans six workshops in mid-month around the Lake Erie Basin to see why cleanup programs have been delayed. Murray Stein, assistant commissioner for enforcement, said that there could be some toughening by his agency to speed enforcement, possibly through court action.

CITIES ARE LISTED

Among the major cities listed as polluters were:

Detroit, with sewage improvements running two years late.

Cleveland, with plants that are still insufficient, where "disinfection has not been practiced even though chlorination facilities exist" and where "typhoid organisms have been isolated in the effluent."

Euclid, Ohio, which has not drawn even preliminary plans for secondary treatment plants, although June 30, 1970, was to be the construction completion deadline. The city is discharging raw sewage and concentrated industrial wastes "containing oil, cyanides and other toxic substances" into the lake.

Some of the major industries listed as behind schedule were:

The Union Bag Corporation, Time Container Corporation, and Consolidated Packaging Corporation, all paper companies at Monroe, Mich., southwest of Detroit.

The Ford Motor Company at Dearborn, where the cleaning of suspended solids from water is 12 months behind schedule.

The Great Lakes Steel Company in Detroit, 18 months behind schedule with oil spills numerous, and Republic Steel and J. & L. Steel in Cleveland.

Mobil Oil, 32 months behind in pollution control at a Buffalo plant.

The Federal Government was not immune from the criticism. Gerald Remus, director of Detroit's water department, said that "inflation is crunching us" and "we must question the sincerity of the Federal Government's war on pollution in light of legislation providing Federal funds for 55 per cent of our projects when it has actually provided only 5 per cent or less."

FUNDS RUNNING SHORT

"The Government is getting good at calling attention to water pollution problems," he said. "But one of the biggest water pollution problems of 1970 appears to include those responsible for our national priorities."

State and local funds "are running short" because Federal grants did not arrive, he added.

The Water Quality Administration conceded that it operated in a large Navy-owned facility that did not meet water quality standards and that there was no detailed plan to complete the cleaning of sewage wastes. The facility is at Grosse Isle, a village near Detroit.

The Government also issued a report at the conference today saying that "mercury was present in fish throughout the St. Clair River-Lake Erie area" and noting that fish sales in the Middle West had dropped 15 per cent since the mercury scares began.

JAMES EARL RUDDER MEMORIAL PARK

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the dedicatory address of Maj. Gen. Al Luedecke, USAF, retired, at the James Earl Rudder Memorial Park, Eden, Tex., Saturday, May 30, 1970.

General Luedecke is the acting president of the Texas A. & M. University, the post held by Maj. Gen. James E. Rudder prior to his untimely death last month.

The address follows:

DEDICATORY ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT A. R. LUEDECKE, AT JAMES EARL RUDDER MEMORIAL PARK, EDEN, TEX., MAY 30, 1970

We are met here today to dedicate this historic park to the name and fame of James Earl Rudder. Nothing that we can say today can add to that fame, but the patriotic devotion of the Earl Rudder Memorial Day Committee has made it possible for us to make this park a city shrine, to which through the ages the countrymen of Earl Rudder may come, and from which they may draw inspiration from the example of his life.

Here Earl Rudder dreamed and planned his life, and from here he went forth strengthened to his greatest victories. After reaching many of the highest honors which can be conferred by his country, here we return today to honor his life. Such a life was filled with years of devotion to country and to the ideals of democracy, of great accomplishment, of sympathy for the men and women who constitute the great mass of people—this was Rudder, whose life we honor today, and whose memory we seek to bring home to the thousands who enjoy the fruits of his labors.

History records the achievements of this man. They will be inscribed on bronze. I wish to pay tribute to the child who was born here in this community and the boy who grew up in your midst. I want to pay tribute to his deceased parents, Mr. & Mrs. Dee Forest Rudder, who give him life and nurtured those characteristics which became the guiding force of a great, great man. His life and achievements should serve to highlight the extreme importance of the guidance provided in the maturing years of any human being. I wish also to pay tribute to his wife—the person who shared his mature life in supplying the patience, love, and affection and the constancy of moral strength so essential to bridging the gaps of depression that are bound to occur in our daily lives. Our major achievements speak for themselves but they spring from the basic tools provided by our early environment and by those whose unstinting love provides a staff to lean upon in time of need.

A product of the highlands of West Texas, reaching maturity in the decades of the thirties, Rudder knew the dry, critty taste of the sandstorms carrying the topsoil of our states to the north. He knew the feel of trickling sweat from the long, hot days of making a living on the farms and ranches. He also knew and understood the violence and extremes of our thunderstorms with their hail, thunder and lightning.

He understood the quiet clam and the odor of superlative cleanliness after their passing. He understood the ingredients of a

relationship with his neighbors of the same environment. Their feelings, those understandings, these judgments became indelibly incorporated as a part of his character as he in later years was to face other challenges in other parts of the world for other reasons. They permitted him to understand the still just before the barrage, to pass through the noise and fragments of bursting shells through scathed and move undaunted through the stench of destruction which enabled him to be a leader in war. These same understandings gave balance to and nurtured those characteristics of patience and compassion which permitted him to live in grace and harmony with his fellow man, permitted him to work with energy and reason toward an objective and to reflect lack of patience with those who refuse to understand and to be loyal to their established goals.

I speak not as a stranger nor as one who knew him recently, nor as one who merely informed himself on Rudder's lifetime achievements. I speak as one who knew him intimately in his college days and as one who has shared with him many endeavors, challenges, successes and failures over a period of nearly half a century. I know the strength of his resolve, the depth of his courage, the absoluteness of his integrity and the energy of his drive.

I know some of the strength of his dreams and some of the deep-seated pleasures of his triumphs. For the same reason, I know the depth of his conviction about right and wrong, of the care he exercised in arriving at a judgment that his actions would be beneficial to his Nation and to his people. I know of his desire to reflect glory upon the way of life he loved so deeply and upon those who shared his devotion to uphold it. I know also of his disdain for those who did not.

I know of his pride in a job well done and of his ability to transmit this pride to other participants. This was part of his ability to stimulate those who worked with him and for him and those for whom he worked. This ability to reflect pride of achievement was one of his characteristics which was infectious and served to strengthen the efforts of those who worked with him. It was one of his qualities of leadership.

He was a splendid man, of great intellect and big heart. As we pause in our daily routine to honor this great man, our thoughts turn to him in light of his accomplishments as a soldier and statesman. Each of us assembled here today is fully aware of Earl Rudder's heroic deeds on D-Day when he led his beloved Ranger battalion up the Cliffs of Pointe Du Hoc for which he, incidentally, received the Distinguished Service Cross—the Nation's second highest award for valor.

We know of his untiring service to this great State in his capacity as Mayor of Brady and land commissioner for the State of Texas. But, I doubt seriously if those in attendance at this occasion today are fully aware of the esteem which his friends—the great students of Texas A&M—held for him.

In Earl Rudder's term of service as president and chancellor of the Texas A&M University system, which spanned a period of 12 years, he was personally known by members of 18 graduating classes. His concern for the future of mankind might most accurately be gaged by his concerns for these students. He loved them for what they were and what they stood for. His ambition was that each of them should have the best opportunity provided to any person getting an education and the opportunity to better understand the meaning of becoming a man or woman. His pride in them was unbounded, his belief in them profound. This conviction provided the basis for his expression of that pride and for his risking of commitments

which depended upon their performance. They never let him down and he never let them down. He took advantage of every opportunity to praise them in every part of the world that he visited. Those 18 graduating classes, numbering in the range of 18,000, had some reason to know him personally; and they constitute a formidable force in today's world. I am confident that each of them carries a part of this man with them in their day-to-day living.

I can find many definitions of greatness. When a man has worked for noble purposes and has accepted each challenge which in succession came before him and when he has mastered those challenges to the credit of his fellow man, his nation, his family and himself, I feel he has fulfilled the best of definitions. In the case of Earl Rudder, I could genuinely characterize him as an exemplary citizen, loving husband and father, brave soldier, dedicated educator and courageous statesman. He walked his path of life with patient pride, mindful of his obligations as a human being. His life gave real meaning to the qualities of compassion, humility, courage and integrity.

Yes, here was a man of superlatively high standards, with boundless enthusiasm for whatever task he took in hand. He never refused to accept a job if it needed to be done. No one whose privilege it was to know him is likely to forget the depth of his conviction, the courage of his faith or the warm and glowing brightness of his friendship. What he believed he believed deeply; what he did he did with his soul. The things he did were good and right. This my friends was Earl Rudder.

HON. J. GEORGE STEWART

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of J. George Stewart, the distinguished Architect of the Capitol.

A native of Delaware, George Stewart received his bachelor's degree in civil engineering from the University of Delaware in 1911. He served as Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from 1935 to 1937. Both before and after his service in the Congress he was involved in the operation of his family's construction firm. In 1954 President Dwight Eisenhower appointed Mr. Stewart as Architect of the Capitol. He was only the eighth man to hold this important office.

I became acquainted with George Stewart when I came to Congress in 1958. We discussed that as fellow professional engineers we shared many common interests. A warm friendship grew between us through the years and I knew George Stewart to be a man of great vision and integrity, and devoted to public service. No man was more dedicated to the Capitol nor loved it more than he did. No man understood its construction better than he did.

Mrs. Murphy joins me in extending to his family our deepest sympathy on their loss.

TRACING THE INSIDIOUS VINE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, in conjunction with their current series on drugs, has printed an editorial which describes the problem in an incisive manner. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

TRACING THE INSIDIOUS VINE

It might seem easy to lose heart over the narcotics problem as it is surfacing, at epidemic rate, in Western nations. In the United States alone, some six million persons are thought to be using marijuana. When heroin and any of the synthetic drugs, such as amphetamines or hallucinogens, are added the total is vastly higher. A Roman expert says that 30 percent of that city's youth between 14 and 22 are using drugs. And so it goes in other nations, and it is getting worse.

Not only is the use of drugs widespread, but the delivery system is fastened on the globe like a rank and fast-holding vine. Monitor correspondent John Hughes has spent five months tracing the lines of that vine. In a 10-part series he is describing the scope and nature of the international narcotics traffic.

The findings are grim. The drugs industry is complex as well as covert. It starts with peasant growers in the hinterlands of Turkey, Iran, Mexico, Afghanistan, and Indo-China. It is promoted or abetted by Corsican manipulators and strong-arm men who control chemical labs in Marseille, by politicians, diplomats, American or other servicemen, tourists.

Drugs are distributed using all the wiles of old-time smuggling and sophisticated jet craft and other appurtenances of the modern era. In short, the international narcotics traffic has rooted itself on the globe, has developed its own sources of production, and has intruded itself into the life stream of society. The world seems aware of it only as more and more addicts are found. Many of them, increasingly younger, forfeit their lives.

It isn't likely that much progress can be made against the narcotics traffic until drugs are seen as a world problem. The attempts of Iran to restrict the legal growing of opium are a case in point. Though Iran managed to cut the number of heroin addicts within its borders from 1.5 million to .5 million in recent years by a hold-down on growing, it has found that the illegal influx of heroin from Turkey is off-setting further gains. Hence Iran recently increased the quota of opium that can be grown within its borders, raising the likelihood that more Iranian narcotics will be smuggled abroad.

Far more could be done in the way of international agreements and policing, to be sure. When one considers the funds diverted into wars or economic development, the scant resources directed toward uprooting the noxious vine of drug traffic is appalling. For instance, only 10 agents are assigned to southern France, where most of the world's heroin factories are located.

This is hardly the time to lose heart over the drug threat. If the challenge of cutting off the drug traffic is great, then so must be the effort of doing so. Exposing the traffic's workings may at least help to awaken the world's youth to the stupefying menace confronting them.

SERMON BY REV. JOHN V. STROM

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a sermon preached by the Reverend John V. Strom, pastor of St. Thomas Lutheran Church in Bloomington, Ind., home of Indiana University. In the midst of all the shouting about this Nation's involvement in Southeast Asia, I believe the words of Pastor Strom represent a prayerful approach to understanding the scope of this controversy and the challenge it poses to all Americans. What follows is the text of that sermon delivered on Mother's Day, May 10, 1970:

SERMON BY REV. JOHN V. STROM

"And the angel said . . . Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus." (Luke 1: 30, 31)

"And when they saw him, they were astonished; and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? knew ye not that I must be in my Father's house? And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them. And he went down with them, and came to Nazareth; and he was subject unto them; and his mother kept all these sayings in her heart." (Luke 2: 44-51)

Preparation for this Sunday's sermon has not been easy, if indeed sermon preparation is ever easy; but this week it has been doubly difficult for me. The events of this past week have left me in a state of depression. Part of the problem, for me at least, is that I am too optimistic to despair and old enough to realize that there are no "simple" situations and no "simple" answers. The issues of the past week are very complex, I submit. And because of this I hesitate to come to conclusions which are clear-cut. However, this much I believe: We are living in perilous times! We are living in confused times! We are living in a day when reason is giving way to passion, when honest debate is giving way to mindless confrontation! Civilization is taking a step backwards in the direction of the jungle.

The Bible verses read at the outset have to do with a young woman hearing the news that she was to have a baby. Imagine her joy at that announcement. When the child reached the age of 12 both father and mother were unable to understand the attitudes and actions of the child. Nevertheless, the son was living in their house and was responsible to his parents. There was respect and love in that home. Over those years a mother's love was constantly alive for her son. She kept a mother's memories of experiences in her heart. Yes, a baby is born, a child grows, normal growing pains focused in a home, love is there, and above all a mother's heart.

Mary is a symbol of motherhood. She filled a mother's role. And that role was difficult. She was not liberated from that role. In the end her son died on a cross—as a common criminal. What heartache for that mother. But let's move up from Mary's time to the present. I believe that there is no more difficult task in today's world than that of being a mother. It has always been rough; but now it is many times more difficult. Why do we say this?

In the first place, a mother's son may grow up to be a soldier. He may grow up and be a member of the National Guard. He may

have grown up to believe that he could best serve his country in that way. He graduated from the same high schools that all others his age graduated from. He went to the same prom. He is a human being even though he wears a uniform. He is a man under orders and it is his responsibility to fulfill his duties. He is also a man who, when pressed to the wall by sheer dint of circumstances, can react—even as any human being will react. He is a man who has a right to defend himself when stones and bricks are thrown at him. A brick is a very deadly weapon. Stoning was the Hebrew method of capital punishment, as you will recall from biblical testimony. Further, a soldier puts his very life on the line whenever he is called upon to defend the citizens of the State or the Nation. Soldiers, per se, are not beasts, not brutes, not animals. They are very human. They feel pain. They bleed. They weep under pressure. They have families. They probably sense awful frustration when their country appears to be suffering an internal breakdown.

The incident of this past week was a tragedy. I refer to the event in Ohio. But when reason gives way to violence, then tragedies happen. It is a common theme in history. Today you would do well to say a short prayer in your heart for the mothers (and fathers) of those students who lost their lives in the fray. But (and I say this fully aware of the broken hearts of those mothers and fathers) please find it in your hearts to offer a prayer for those mothers of the soldiers who, because of circumstances, did what was done. I doubt if those Guardsmen enjoyed their day.

It is difficult to be a mother because a mother's son may grow up to be a soldier. What mother wants her son to go to war? To Vietnam? I feel for every mother who has a son; I feel for that mother because of the uncertainties of our time. I believe that a mother in our day (especially if she has a son) has to be made of stern stuff. I do not pretend to know what course our Nation should take in Southeast Asia. I am a theologian. I presumably know a little about God and about human nature. But I am not schooled in the art of politics; I am not schooled in logistics; I am not a legislator; I am not a lawyer. I can only stand with many of you and cry out, "How long, Lord, how long?"

Secondly, it is difficult to be a mother because one's son or daughter may grow up to be a radical. Only about 5% of the student population falls under this rubric, I know. And by "radical" I mean the violent and disruptive kind. There is room within our system for both conservatives and liberals. But no problems are solved by burning University buildings to the ground. No problems are solved by resorting to mindless and emotional binges. What I am saying this morning might be construed to mean that I am unaware of what many students (and faculty) are protesting against, or that I do not care about the issues in the present. Permit me a personal reference. I, as a student over the years, have had to take courses which seemed to me to be quite pointless. I, as a citizen, am extremely distressed over the course of the conflict in Vietnam. I, as a citizen, was shook up over the incident in Ohio this past week. You know, there is a notion abroad, and I am not sure of its origin, that those over 40, those in the "Establishment," whatever that may mean, are insensitive or do not share a concern for the Nation or the world.

But it is the height of misunderstanding to claim that the President of the U.S. somehow delights in making war. I believe it is extremely cruel when his motives are impugned, when some say that President Nixon gets his kicks by killing the enemy! I believe that the President's heart aches at the situa-

tion; I believe that his guts are tied in knots—even though he may manage a smile for T.V. viewers. He needs the prayers of a People; he does not need obscenities and ill-will thrown at him!

The extremists on the left, and those on the right, would have us believe that we can solve our problems by jumping on their respective band-wagons. But remember this, for it is a cardinal principle: when one government takes over an existing government, the first item on the agenda is the matter of who is going to be the new leader. There will be a new establishment, so it is said. New policies will be determined, so it is said. By the people? Nonsense; New policies will be determined by the new leader, the revolutionary symbol, or the dictator—depending upon whether the left or right prevails. Aristotle was right when he insisted that when you mess around too much with the large "middle" you are in for trouble. The task in a democracy is to incorporate more and more of the fringe areas within the large "middle." Only then can the social fabric avoid being torn to shreds. Only then can genuine and lasting progress be made.

I still believe in the student population in our land. I still believe that the vast majority of students in our universities and colleges are thinking deeply about our social ills. It is those who abdicate reason and embrace violence that are the cause for concern. And I suggest that we must not follow those who holler the loudest, whether from the far left or the far right. I suggest that we must in our day use efforts previously unknown to maintain a balance. We must make every effort to keep cool. We must make every effort to avoid extremes. We must use our God-given brains in the service of the Nation. We must not give free rein to our impulses and emotions. There is a word which might suggest a course of action in our time: it is the word "self-control." It must become the watchword of every citizen; it must be the watch-word of the Nation; it must guide our steps in the days and weeks and months ahead.

You who are mothers of sons—you deserve our prayers. You cannot be liberated from your role. You cannot abdicate your responsibilities. You deserve the respect and admiration of all of us. You want your sons to grow up loving their country, and you want them to grow up as creative and thinking citizens—which implies higher education—or at least some form of training beyond high school. Both avenues are fraught with peril. May God give you, mothers of sons (and daughters), a full measure of grace. May you be able to say that your children are making their way and that you are very proud of them. Modern mother, modern daughter of Mary, we salute you in 1970. Amen.

QUOTATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to announce a brief departure from, followed by a rapid return to "precedent" at the White House.

In his address to the Nation on April 30, 1970, the President said:

It is customary to conclude a speech from the White House by asking support for the President of the United States. Tonight I depart from that precedent. What I ask is far more important. I ask for your support for our brave men.

Wednesday night—June 3, 1970—the President said to the Nation:

When I first announced the decision on Cambodia, it was subjected to an unprecedented barrage of criticism. I want to express my deep appreciation tonight to the millions of Americans who supported me.

MENTAL ESCAPISM

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, parents in Sanford, N.C., recently heard the young ideas of their Deep River High School valedictorian, James William Wicker, Jr. I would like to share Mr. Wicker's remarks with each Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Wicker's address follows:

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS BY JAMES WILLIAM WICKER, JR.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

We, as graduates, are facing our future, the future of the world. If the world is to become better, or to survive at all, it is we who must make it so. We must face our present problems, and the myriad of new ones which will undoubtedly assall us.

A universal set of young people, with talent, education, and a new sense of perspective should be well able *not* just to cope with these problems, but to relieve the bulk of human suffering: Physical, mental, and spiritual.

To accomplish such a task, a realistic outlook must be maintained. Facts *must* be faced, not in order to place limitations on ourselves, but so that our energies will be well directed.

We must avoid the pitfall of escapism. Escapism is just what its name implies: An escape from reality. It is the desire of an idyllic existence. As such, it is a useless goal in today's world of relevance.

Television has often been criticized as a purveyor of escapism. Television programs which show the American life as a race from one ridiculous situation to another, filled with human nonentities who are always solving their petty problems through blind luck or not at all, do little to improve our minds or enhance our image.

But think! What do viewers complain about? The news programs. Why? Because the news programs show too many bad things, too many problems. Because the news programs intrude on the small opaque walls which too many people build around their minds.

Mental Escapism, the squelching of one's own attempt to think constructively, must be constantly guarded against. What are some of the forms of this mental escapism? There are two forms which come to my mind. They are anarchism and reactionary non-thinking.

Much publicized in recent years have been the actions of people who lead in student demonstrations, rioting, and violence over the country. In general, the reaction of the American public to these people has been one of anger and disgust. At first, I thought the average American was against them simply because they generally were long haired and dirty, and were against some ambiguous ideal. Generally, this is why. However, hair length and cleanliness are *not* what make these people and their ideals unhealthy. These people are escapists in their own way.

They have stereotyped themselves. They have made their own actions meaningless. In their battle to destroy the Establishment,

they have limited themselves to being against *everything* the Establishment does, whether good or bad. Like puppets, they have pat criticisms for any and every action. Everything done by the government to aid people is an attempt to placate the people, according to them. All their thoughts are destructive ones. Preoccupation with tearing down a corrupt system has closed their minds to the construction of a new one. Worthy goals are lost as the ends they were originally seeking become lost in the means they are using.

Abbie Hoffman, a well known anarchist, has written a book which attempts, through farce, to justify revolution for its own sake. It accurately describes how he and many others have escaped from useful dissent into meaninglessness. I would like to point out at this time that I am not referring to students who use marches, rallies, and non-violent civil disobedience to express dissent and achieve the often noble goals which they seek. They represent the very opposite of escapism.

But, the anarchist's story is different and it is a tragic story. Very often these people are remarkably intelligent, entertaining, and clever. But, they are *not strong*. They saw the strangling power of the workings of the system, and instead of working to straighten it out, they gave up. Now their noise is only noise, and their violence is ignoble. Their lives are meaningless.

There is another form which escapism takes that I call reactionary non-thinking. People who practice this are not as publicized as the anarchists, but their danger to society is even greater because they are more numerous. The reactionary non-thinker is a person who does not keep informed, is inflexible, and does not try to improve anything. He merely reacts to what happens around him and tries to cope.

Most of the time, this escapist tries to stay asleep. Only when something happens that really hits him in the face does he wake up. Unfortunately all his new found energy is then used up in a short-lived burst of anger, whereupon he turns over and goes *back* to sleep.

Many times, it is not true that these people don't care, they are afraid to care; it isn't that they can't think; they are afraid to think or are too lazy to think. Until they are changed, they are a cancer of frustration to those who would build a better world.

To those who would not give in to escapism, I would say first of all, learn. Keep up with what is going on and with new ideas. Second, think for yourself. Decide what you really believe in your own mind and soul. And finally, do something about it! Get involved. Struggle and work with all your power to help your fellow man. Tell the anarchist not to give up. Tell him he is not alone. Tell the reactionary that ignorance is no excuse. Tell him that silence is no virtue, and is often immoral.

Anyone can try to escape from the world. It is difficult to stand up and be strong. A recent song asks a question: How can people be so heartless, so cold? Then, it answers itself, "Easy, easy to be hard." Don't take the easy way. Care.

NEED FOR RESPONSIBLE ACTION FOR STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND ADMINISTRATORS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Dutch Higgs will be completing a distinguished 2-year term as chairman of

the board of regents of the University of California on July 1. There has been considerable national concern over the turmoil on our campuses and I am pleased to share with by House colleagues Dutch's pointed comments on the need for responsible action on the part of students, faculty, and administrators to preserve our campuses from the excesses of hard-core militants and revolutionaries.

The comments follow:

The provocation and violence at Berkeley earlier this week appear to me to have sheer anarchy, inspired and led by hard core revolutionaries who swept up in their cause many who are not students at the University of California as well as those who are. Swift and sure legal action must be taken by the courts and disciplinary action by the University. Every measure must be taken to protect life and property and insure an atmosphere in which the education of the hundred thousand young people in this University who are not making trouble may proceed. I urge the news media and the parents of this state to distinguish between those in these mobs who are students at the University and those who are pre-college age, as well as older drop-outs, rejects, misfits and others who would destroy our society. I want it made crystal clear that we support Chancellor Heyns and his associates in restoring order on his campus and we are grateful for those individuals engaged in law enforcement who have carried out their duties with discretion and firmness to protect those lives and property which were endangered.

The infiltration of campuses and the location near campuses by those who pamphleteer and conspire to damage the University and our system of government appear to be growing in number. I call upon all of those in the University community who are concerned about the threat to the University's survival to note the fact that Chancellors, administrators, Regents, and police alone cannot cope with what is going on.

If the University is to survive—and it will survive—it will require responsible students and responsible faculty to speak up and act in accordance with their convictions before it is too late.

SILENCE IS NOT GOLDEN WHEN IT COMES TO FIGHTING INFLATION

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that our overriding domestic concern today is the state of our ailing economy. Inflation, that crudest and most discriminatory of all taxes, continues unabated, while real economic growth has completely stopped. Over the past 15 months, 1 million additional Americans have been forced onto unemployment lists. The housing industry has virtually collapsed as interest rates for mortgage money have skyrocketed.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the administration's "tight money" policy can no longer be relied on as the prime means of combating inflation. Not only has it proved ineffective, but the side effects directly attributable to it have been disastrous. The time has come, I believe, for a broader, more flexible course of action

by the administration on the economic front.

Mr. Speaker, the President has at hand a wide variety of alternative policies with which to respond to this domestic challenge. We in Congress already have provided him with almost unlimited discretion in controlling and regulating the flow of credit to the various sectors of the economy. Many responsible economic analysts from all points on the political spectrum have reluctantly endorsed the principle of mandatory wage-price-profit controls.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the administration should at least seriously consider what is by far the mildest of the suggested economic remedies, a system of voluntary restraints for wages, profits, and prices, so-called incomes policies. Indeed, we are beginning to hear a number of voices from within the executive branch making the same proposal. The longtime presidential adviser, Arthur Burns, now head of the Federal Reserve Board, has acknowledged that incomes policies may have a role in dealing with inflation. The Treasury Department's chief economist has expressed similar sentiments, as has George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and a highly respected ex-businessman himself.

All of us, Mr. Speaker, look to the White House for leadership in matters such as these, and I am sure that any proposals made by the administration at this point would receive the most sympathetic, nonpartisan cooperation from virtually every Member of Congress. What is disturbing to many of us, Mr. Speaker, is the complete silence—an "inflationary silence" to be sure—from top administration officials on economic measures. The thoughtful editorial I am appending, published in the June 2, 1970, Washington Evening Star, observes that—

It is somehow demoralizing for the President to remain silent as prices and wages zoom upward without check.

Mr. Speaker, not only the Congress, but the entire Nation, desperately needs responsible leadership from the White House if we are to successfully bank the fires of inflation and regain the high employment levels that are indispensable to the economic well-being of America.

The editorial follows:

INFLATIONARY SILENCE

Pressures are increasing for the Nixon administration to take a more active role in achieving the goal of an economy combining non-inflationary growth with high employment. At the moment there is no real growth, joblessness is rising, corporate profits are falling and inflation continues at a canter if not a gallop. The original ailment, inflation, is the focus of several proposals for more direct government action.

The most influential backing for some form of "incomes policy" to discourage excessive price and wage increases came recently from Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Burns was unspecific about the kind of program he had in mind, but it would be voluntary and would serve as a transitional aid until the current slowdown cuts into inflation.

"Incomes policies" include the wage-price guideposts of the Kennedy-Johnson years, presidential "jawboning" against inflation-

ary actions and government watchdog activities to point the finger at erring industries and labor organizations. Such measures are gaining adherents in and out of the government as inflation continues strong despite slowing business and rising joblessness. (Some congressmen are thinking in terms of sterner control measures: Democrats on the House Banking and Currency Committee would give the President authority for an eight-month freeze on wages, prices and rents.)

President Nixon and his chief economic advisers oppose "jawboning" and similar efforts on philosophical and practical grounds. Such policies intrude on the free market, they feel, and are not effective on a long-term basis.

There is impressive evidence, however, that voluntary controls can be made to work for a limited time, and this might be long enough for past monetary and fiscal restraints to reduce inflationary pressures later this year.

An intensified anti-inflationary effort could help the President restore the credibility of his economic policy. This credibility—important for combatting inflationary psychology—has been battered by war fears and the emergence of federal deficits for fiscal 1970 and 1971.

It is somehow demoralizing for the President to remain silent as prices and wages zoom upward without check. The President should embrace some program for using the moral force of his office to hold down the inflationary spiral. The effort cannot worsen the present dreary economic picture, and it could help.

IS THE MEDIA A PRODUCT OF THE TIMES—OR HAS IT HELPED CREATE THEM?

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said about press, radio, and TV coverage in this country of events, important and unimportant. In this connection I want to bring to the attention of the Members an address made recently by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, to the Pennsylvania Press Conference at Harrisburg. As a former member of the press, and one of the most outstanding in the country in her field, and producer and director of her own weekly television program, Mrs. Bentley is well qualified to speak on the subject.

I strongly urge it be given the careful and thoughtful reading it deserves:

IS THE MEDIA A PRODUCT OF THE TIMES—OR HAS IT HELPED CREATE THEM?

It is not only a pleasure to be present today at this luncheon sponsored by the Pennsylvania Women's Press Association, but an honor of which I am fully appreciative in being asked to address the delegates to the Pennsylvania Press Conference.

By its very nature, such an invitation constitutes a challenge to speak only to what one considers of particular significance and of real import. Such a determination, however, is of necessity a matter of personal judgment, and I can only hope that those present will agree as to the importance of the subject chosen, agree or disagree as they may with my own viewpoint.

I probably should have selected something on the maritime field, since yesterday was National Maritime Day throughout the United States and we did observe it nationally. But there has been something very, very much on my own mind in recent months, so I have entitled my topic today: "Is the Media a Product of the Times—Or Has It Helped Create Them?"

None is more aware than a group such as this that perhaps the greatest strength of our nation rests on the fact that, both individually and collectively, we can express opinions and exchange viewpoints, sometimes at variance, but with an open mind and a willingness to listen one to another. Admittedly, such a subject bluntly put could be considered controversial, and undoubtedly will be so considered by many. I have not chosen it for that reason. On the contrary, I speak to it only in the belief that we should examine ourselves as members of the press—journalists, if you will—operating not only in the newspaper field, but in all media. To set the record in order, let me say that except for the past seven months I have been one with you during my entire adult life, and will undoubtedly rejoin you in the future as a newspaperwoman.

You on your part represent an important segment of the press, of those whose professional careers and lives are closely associated with it. You have a major stake in the future of the press in all its media, since one affects the other, and we as individuals are interchangeable between media. Indeed, you have a stake not only in the future of the press, but as citizens and as men and women in the future of this nation of ours.

Let us then hold up the mirror to ourselves and study our own image. Let us see if we are what we imagine ourselves to be.

Since on the whole we are anonymous, we must look at the end product of our efforts, speak of ourselves as the press, and evaluate ourselves on the basis of its accomplishments.

To begin with, however, let us disabuse ourselves of the idea that we are part of some vaguely philanthropic organization, a non-profit group dedicated solely to public service.

Newspapers, magazines, TV and radio stations and networks do comprise an industry, a business enterprise. This is not so in many other nations, where the press in all its segments is state owned, state operated, state controlled. For this we have reason for thanks, that we of the press of this nation are part of the free enterprise system subject to no dictates and directions to follow a party line or serve as the medium of propaganda. We are fortunate, but more fortunate are the American people.

We are fortunate, too, in our guarantee of "freedom of the press" written into the Bill of Rights as Article One of the first ten Amendments to the Constitution in 1791.

Yes, we are fortunate to enjoy a free press in a free society. Many others do not.

Too, there is the "power of the press." Certainly that power is not exaggerated, and in this age of mass media—and, at times it appears, mass hysteria—it is one with which to conjure in its ability not only to form and to sway opinion, but to provide false as well as true impressions of the American scene. Nor is a recognition of this fact limited to the press, to officials of government, to budding or established politicians, to advertisers. It is recognized, also, by those who agitate and lead others to riot in our midst.

Indeed, do we of the press ourselves fully recognize the extent of that power and its implication in the impact of our press coverage on the nation and on the world?

If we do not, we should—for viewed in its true light, it is an awesome power that we wield, a power to serve the nation, to serve

the freedom we enjoy, the way of life that is ours, or to damage all these perhaps irreparably.

This being the case, does not the guarantee of such freedom, does not the exercise of such power carry also a major responsibility with it? By its very nature, does it not require responsible reporting and coverage of the news, honest and fair handling of it on the part of all concerned? My answer—and yours, as well, I am certain—is an unqualified "yes".

The question then becomes—but are we so doing? Let us all answer then, each for himself or herself, the further question: Is the media a product of the times, or has it helped create them?

Undoubtedly there are those who will take exception to the question, viewing it as a charge rather than as what it is, an attempt to determine if we of the press are indeed meeting our responsibilities to the public, the nation and ourselves who comprise the press. Have we regressed to the days when headlines sold extras and sensationalism was the measure of success in the City Room? Are we reporting accurately, objectively, and judiciously the events of our city, of our nation and of the world, or are we reaching so hard for circulation or ratings that we seek only the sensational, even to blowing up the statements of professional agitators out of all proportion to their importance? Are we who cry out in such anguish about even the least suspicion of management of news by others actually the most flagrant managers of the news? It is simple for us to do so by the slant of coverage we give it, the extent of that coverage, the positioning of a story on page one or farther back in the paper or the magazine, or featuring it or relegating it to limbo on our TV or radio programs.

Let me again say, speaking to responsibility that I consider to be inherent in the freedom of press that we enjoy, it is a responsibility to report the news objectively, not color it to serve ulterior motives or personal opinions or prejudices. And by objectively I mean, plainly and clearly, both sides—the pros and cons, if such there be.

According to Herbert Brucker in the May 9 issue of *Saturday Review*, a study group reporting to Milton Eisenhower's National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence had the following comment: "Few American institutions are as free from responsible and systematic analysis as the American press. The press, which performs the role of reporter and critic for other institutions, has been reluctant to undertake self-analysis." Mr. Brucker states "that comment promises to be the understatement of the year."

An example of lack of what might be considered impartial coverage of both sides of the news would seem evident in last week's pages of a prominent newspaper in a major city located within a radius of some 150 miles of here. This newspaper, incidentally, has other major media interests, including—but not limited to—a TV station affiliated with a national network.

A friend called my attention to the heavy coverage given by this paper to antiwar demonstrations, campus disruptions and strikes, preliminary threats and actual picketings of military bases, but the paucity of coverage of activities or statements that ran counter to such opposition. He was unable to check all editions for each day because he was advised that they were not maintained on file at the newspaper office.

Let me tell you what he found in regard to the massive amount of equipment captured in the drive against the North Vietnamese sanctuaries in Cambodia. This is it—a single column of some four inches on May 11th on page 21 of the first news section, headed: "10 Months of Ammo Captured, Aide Says." Credited to UPI. And that was

all. This despite the fact that massive amounts of equipment, ammunition, and rice have been captured. This despite the fact that the GI's there are saying how glad they are to capture mortars and rifles rather than having them throwing bullets and shrapnel into their backs.

Let me tell you of some other things that my friend found, or rather didn't find. One, coverage of a UPI story out of San Diego which told of a college student standing on guard for three hours to protect his nation's flag from about 100 campus radicals intent on insulting it. Two, he found no coverage of the senior citizen—widow of a former veteran—who jumped from her car and tore the flag from the hands of antiwar demonstrators at Key Biscayne. But the paper carried a picture of the motley crew of demonstrators with the flag being paraded upside down. Three, the paper carried photos of a programmed confrontation at Fort Dix, but it did not extend its coverage a few miles farther north to carry either a picture or story on the Armed Forces Day Parade in New York City.

These are but small examples of the lack of balanced coverage in one paper, and I maintain that this is "managed news" and "news censorship" in the editorial rooms with a vengeance!

As a sidebar, it can be noted that other papers in that same city carried stories or photos on one or all of the same subjects ignored by the paper to which I have reference.

Two weeks ago great play was given in many of our national papers about a 25-year old man who announced himself as resigning from the Nixon Administration because he was disgusted. He was headlined as Nixon's Youth Advisor. I made some inquiry about this young man after I returned from Europe. Nobody in the Administration had ever heard of him before! He was a GS-11 hired on in government by the Johnson Administration—and I am not criticizing administrations—in January of 1968. In addition, a GS-11 in the Federal Government is pretty far down the totem pole. But the newspapers never checked with the officials to see whether or not this young man was actually President Nixon's Youth Advisor. I did. Nobody in the White House or the Executive Office Building had ever talked to him. Mr. Finch had never talked to him; the President had never talked to him. But he set himself up as a Youth Advisor and the papers carried him as such. In the mass hysteria of that week, they played it up.

In another instance, the question of "what is news today?" comes up in relation to the prestigious *New York Times*. On May 13th, the Governor of New York, three State Senators, and the Director of the New York Narcotics Program met in Washington for two hours with 17 New York Congressmen, Republicans and Democrats alike. In the bipartisan session the State's immediate need for Federal assistance in drug enforcement, education and treatment were detailed. Representative Shirley Chisholm and State Senator Stewart, both representing districts primarily black, spoke urgently of the problem and the necessity of immediate action.

Broad agreement by the New York Congressional Delegation was arrived at on three major points. They were: First, Congressmen from New York would put in for an appropriation to get a number of additional Federal narcotics agents—possibly several hundred, it's that serious in New York—into the State to further stop drugs at the point of import. Second, they would sponsor an amendment to the foreign Aid Bill to bar aid to any country permitting the manufacture of drugs for import to the United States. Third, they agreed to attempt to obtain more Federal funds allotted for work in New York in education against drug use and for treatment of addicts.

At a briefing following the meeting, participated in by Governor Rockefeller and by others, including Representatives Celler and Chisholm, the press was informed of what had taken place. A *New York Times* reporter was present, yet not one word of the meeting on the narcotics problem in New York State was reported in the next day's *Times*. Indeed, on that very day, May 14th, the *Times* carried an editorial criticizing state and city officials for failure to "move responsibly to take remedial action." Somewhere within the *New York Times*, communications certainly did break down.

As a sidebar, the *Times* of May 14th did recognize that pie-throwing in Washington is "news", after a fashion, for it gave 20 column-inches to the story of a young man throwing a pie into the face of a participant in a hearing in Washington on the 13th.

I ask you, which story was of greater significance to the reading public?

I couldn't help noticing on a television newscast last night that Vice President Agnew was given 30 seconds of time relative to his criticism of the media, but Jane Fonda, the publicity-seeking revolutionary who was born with a gold spoon in her mouth and who has never had to work a day in her life, was given nearly two minutes of time to denounce the United States and call for youth and the military to destroy this country and its Establishment.

In my travels last week—and I make it a point wherever I go to pick up all the newspapers on the stands just to read and check and balance out—I picked up a paper in Los Angeles and this columnist had this to say—he was on the same subject I am on today of the "play" of news:

"The latest example: Clark Clifford, Sec. of Defense under LBJ, blasts the Cambodian operation as 'an infinitely greater mistake' than the Bay of Pigs, and gets the red carpet treatment. Yet when LBJ, at a Democratic rally—which made it all the more newsworthy—recently asked for support of RMN's decision, he got small mention in our liberal papers and even shorter shrift on TV. Ask around—as I have—and you'll find most of your friends know the Clifford views, but very few are aware of LBJ's appeal."

Then there is the "continuing story", building up out of all proportion as we keep it going day after day, bleeding it to the full by canvassing comments from the great, the near-great, the not-so-great, the witless, or those with an axe to grind. It is tempting to do so, to keep a story going, and to do it the easy way.

Again, do we let the opinions of the few who admittedly provide "good copy" because of the denunciatory character of their attitude and remarks steal our front pages and our prime-time TV and radio news coverage? Is it possible that we who think of ourselves as being objective, intelligent practitioners of journalism are being taken in by the sheer propaganda of hard-core dissidents, misfits and malcontents of our society? They think so.

For those of you who haven't had the very questionable privilege of reading Jerry Rubin's book, let me read you a few quotes from it. They will make your hair stand on end as they did mine.

One quote: "Within two hours I was on the steps of San Francisco City Hall in front of four television cameras, five photographers, four newspaper reporters, and seven radio stations, denouncing HUAC (House Un-American Activities Committee) as a 'witch-hunter.' I raved. 'The government is trying to stifle antiwar dissent.' The press hung on every word. I was playing Angry Radical, but inside I was laughing, standing on my hands and turning somersaults."

Another quote: "We needed a spectacular press conference to grab the imagination of the world and play on appropriate paranoias. For that we needed the help of Amer-

ica's baddest, meanest, most violent nigger—then H. Rap Brown. Rap's presence at the press conference, whether or not he even showed up at the Pentagon, would create visions of fire. Rap agreed to come. We needed to fill out the script with the other right character actors—a Vietnam veteran, a priest, a housewife from Women Strike for Peace, a professor, an SDS leader and then such folks as Dick Gregory. Dave Dellinger was Leading Man, combining stirring guerilla-war rhetoric with a kindly, benign appearance; he could be your Uncle Dave. Bob Greenblatt, national coordinator of MOB and then a Cornell professor, lent the prestige of the academy. And my wild hair and handlebar mustache suggested the anarchist bomb-thrower, capable of anything."

A third quote: "The press was great. They picked up an offhand remark by Dave—'There will be no government building left unattacked'—and made pacifist Dave sound like a terrorist. AP reported, 'When asked if his followers would practice nonviolence in Washington, Rap Brown turned away without answering.' It added, 'A spokesman for Defense Secretary McNamara had no comment.'"

And I'll give you one or two more: "Every Revolution Needs a Color TV . . . [He cited Walter Cronkite as] SDS's best organizer. [Cronkite] brings out the map of the U.S. with circles around the campuses that blew up today. The battle reports . . . Television proves the domino theory: One campus falls and they all fall . . . The first 'student demonstration' flashed across the TV tubes of the nation as a myth in 1964. That year the first generation being raised from birth on TV was 9, 10 and 11 years old. 'First chance I get,' they thought, 'I wanna do that, too.' The first chance they got was when they got to junior high and high school five years later—1969! And that was the year America's junior high and high schools exploded! A government survey shows that three out of every five high schools in the country had 'some kind of active protest' in 1969. TV is raising generations of kids who want to grow up and become demonstrators."

And a fifth quote: "Have you ever seen a boring demonstration on TV? Just being on TV makes it exciting. Even picket lines look breathtaking. Television creates myths bigger than reality. Demonstrations last hours, and most of that time nothing happens. After the demonstration we rush home for the six o'clock news. The drama review. TV packs all the action into two minutes—a commercial for the revolution. The mere idea of a 'story' is revolutionary because a 'story' implies disruption of normal life. Every reporter is a dramatist, creating a theater out of life."

And it goes on and on. And if those quotes don't make you stop and think, then I'd be very disappointed. But this is what is happening today and how they feel they are controlling the media.

I ask you indeed, are we just acting the gullible part of the "fall guy", and entirely guiltless of cooperating with the perpetrators of "manufactured news" because it makes good copy? Is it possible that we who pride ourselves upon being objective journalists, and our editors in all media fall for "contrived news" or the "scheduled riot"?

If such is the case, then we should all have our IQ's checked, for collectively we have been "taken". We have been used in a way that seems well-nigh impossible. We have covered riots, near riots, and pseudo-riots on prime-time TV news programs, the radio, and on the front pages—with continuations—ad infinitum. One might even say ad nauseam.

We have covered them in depth, even when they were "contrived". We have covered them in detail, even when they were "manufactured". We, who eschew the professional and usually respectable press agent and would not give him the time of day, to all appear-

ances have fallen for the amateurs—who it now develops are the real propaganda pros—so long as they are from the "Liberation" this, the "Democratic" that, the "Black Panthers", the "SDS" or some other home-grown, self-named, self-styled committee alleged to be protesting an alleged breach of their freedoms. Yet in their cavortings for newspaper and TV cameras they have no hesitancy in denying the rights of other citizens.

In the pages of the newspapers, often the front page, and on TV screens across the country, their contrived performances are witnessed by tens of millions of Americans. Taken out of context, blown up out of all proportion by its very coverage, it has a disruptive effect on the nation. A handful of demonstrators intent on confrontation with the police, a violent few strategically located in cities across the country, can give the impression on any day that much of the nation seethes with violence, that the American scene is one of complete discord.

Then there was the contrived news, dated Chicago, covered daily and in great detail throughout the country as the trial of the so-called "Chicago Seven", whose aim in court and elsewhere, along with that of their counsel, appeared to have one intent—to disrupt and embarrass the legal system, and bring our laws into disrepute, which could be achieved only through the cooperative coverage of the nation's media. The question I feel we must ask ourselves is whether we believe the extent of that coverage—and the coverage still being given to its Chief Counsel and the others—was or is warranted as news. Is it news—or propaganda?

I return to my initial question. By such coverage, are we accurately reflecting the state of the nation today, and thereby merely doing our job by reporting the times, or are we helping to create disruption on an ever-widening scale?

If the latter is the case, then isn't it time that we realize that this great power of the press that we wield, this freedom that we hold to print, or show on the TV screen, what we please is a two-edged sword that can not only strike out for laudable purposes, but can inflict deep wounds on the body politic?

Perhaps as important, what image are we of the media projecting of ourselves as a stable people abroad?

In a recent speech at Tulane University before both labor and management leaders of the maritime industry, I called upon all of them to build together in their field of activity—to be Americans first, and to be shipbuilders, shipowners, labor leaders, seamen and dockworkers second. In short, to be Americans first, last and always. To those present and to all members of the press of all media, from top to bottom, I say the same. It is time for all of us to be Americans first, and journalists, editors, publishers, newscasters and commentators, owners of newspapers and magazines, radio and TV stations second.

Some may disparage and call that waving the flag. Let them. For my part, I am proud to be an American. I am proud of this land of mine. It may not be perfect, but its imperfections are far outweighed by its virtues, its freedom for the individual—yes, its freedom of the press—its opportunities, its way of life.

Perhaps I have a greater appreciation of what is to be an American than most. If so, the reason is simple. I am a "first generation" American, the daughter of immigrants. My Yugoslav father and mother loved this land that took them to it and welcomed them, accepted them as citizens, gave them the fulfillment of a new life of freedom and opportunity for themselves and their children to be. That love of America and of its

institutions they passed on to me. They passed on also, so that it was cut deep into my mind, their memories of the hardships, the frustrations, the oppressions of the Old World at the turn of the century. I, who have never known anything but freedom, have their deep-etched memories to remind me that it is not so elsewhere in the world. I have the knowledge that the opportunities given me, that were mine by right from just having been born an American, would not have been mine in any other land. A copper miner, my father could have afforded no paid schooling, no college education. But it was not necessary, for the nation provided the grade school, the high school—and assiduous study and scholarships took care of college. And no one closed the door on a job because I was "first generation"—a "Bohunk", if you please.

I would be the most crass ingrate were I not to cherish this country and all that it means to me and meant to my parents.

This is a great nation, this America of ours. If it is not Utopia, it is the closest approach to it that man has achieved throughout the whole history of his existence. For my part, I feel that we of the press do the public, the nation, the world, and ourselves a great disfavor in seeking at great length to expose our faults—and in many cases, alleged faults—but rarely our virtues.

As Salim Rizk, author of "A Syrian Yankee," and himself an immigrant, said recently in speaking to the Phi Beta Kappa Chapter in Washington: "I do not have to tell you that these days it does not pay to write or say one good word about America or Americans. On the contrary, you can become rich and famous and important, you can make headlines and parade before the cameras and the microphones every day if you write about America and speak of America as if it were Nazi Germany, or Communist Russia, or even old Imperial Turkey, and dishearten young Americans and make them despise their institutions—even themselves—and doubt the greatness and the humanity of their country, and the loyalty and patriotism of their neighbors, and their teachers, and their leaders."

"And you stand those who disparage you before microphones and cameras to make statements to the world, statements that indicate that the heroes of humanity were not George Washington, Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, but instead Che, Fidel and Mao."

I offer you Mr. Rizk's statement as an indictment for, if he is right, we of the press have failed our young who someday must take our places. What is more, we have failed our nation—and it is the only nation we have.

Millions of other people around the world welcome the opportunity to come to this country, to become citizens despite our induced and programmed turmoil if they but could. It takes walls and machine guns and land mines to keep them within the confines of their own countries. There are no walls to keep us in—but there is need for none. Even those who berate us know full well that there is nowhere the equal of this nation and its freedom in all the world. There is no other America to which to go!

To borrow the expression, however, of the chanters on the streets of Chicago in 1968, "the whole world is watching," and it is up to those of the press to have the world see us as we are, not as the relatively small numbers of professional propagandists within our midst would make us appear to be.

For that matter, isn't it time that we Americans see ourselves as we are? Isn't it time that we get off the psychiatrist's couch as a people? Isn't it time that we stop crying "Mea culpa! Mea culpa!" to every charge—true or false—leveled against us?

Let me give you a prime example of what

I mean, then come to your own conclusions as to whether the media is the product of the times or has helped create them.

I knew my informant first as a fellow reporter on the *Baltimore Sun*, one who worked with me on the newspaper, and was always considered a top-notch reporter. Later, he worked on national news magazines. Now he is on the personal staff of Governor Nelson Rockefeller. As one of the key members of the party that accompanied the Governor on his four trips to South and Central America at the request of President Nixon, he said that the official party was amazed upon its return to the United States and had time to look over the press coverage, the reports back home.

As a former newspaperman he had to find an answer as to what had happened, and why newspaper and TV coverage while the party was away did not jibe with the facts as he knew them. He discovered that because the airplane carrying the official Rockefeller party always landed in the foreign airport first and the party then was swept on to the halls of negotiation and discussion immediately, the press was left on their own. They had little to write about, and so some began going to the universities and urged the students there to demonstrate so they would have something to photograph and report.

One photographer, with whom he had worked while they had both been on one of the weekly magazines, told the Rockefeller staffer that, after the first few days in Latin America, he had instructions from the news desk of his network television headquarters to include in what he sent back at least two minutes of film each day showing rioting and demonstrations. That they wanted, definitely.

As a good factual newspaperwoman, I cannot vouch for this from personal knowledge; I repeat it as having been told me by an individual in whom I have full confidence. However, he has no objection to my naming him as my source. He is Jim Cannon, formerly of the *Baltimore Sun*, *Time Magazine*, and *Newsweek*.

All this being true, then those responsible have committed an unpardonable breach of journalistic ethics, and done great damage to the nation, both within and without its borders.

Then, too, where is the concern of the press for the vast majority of students attending our schools who seek an education, who want to attend classes without constant disruptions? Here is a generation that has received more consideration on the part of our society, more concern with its welfare than any other in our history. Are we, then, to turn our backs on the vast majority of this generation in which we as a people have a massive investment of time and effort and allow the few to disrupt classes and campuses, denying them the right to that education—the few even subjecting the many to the possibility of physical harm or death as the result of arson, or, still worse, possible bombings? Even if there were but one who desired to attend class and learn, it would be his right to do so. Why, then, do we of the press and the editorial pages of our papers, the TV commentators, not speak out in this regard? That, certainly, would be a public service.

Indeed, do we of the press not owe it to the public that our media serves to differentiate between an entire student body and the hundred, the five hundred, the thousand, or even two thousand, who may constitute the total number resorting to violence in a confrontation with the authorities? The violent protesters may comprise only a small minority in many instances, out of a total student enrollment of ten, fifteen or twenty thousand. Yet our headlines and our stories

on the whole lead the reader to believe that all students are involved—and, also, that all involved are students! Do we not thus further the propaganda efforts of the anarchists?

If we are to retain our form of government, our guarantees under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights,—yes, and our “freedom of the press”—then it is time that we reverse our thinking, stop overemphasizing discord, “made news”, “contrived events”, and start concentrating our efforts in the media toward showing what is right with this nation of ours.

However, before anyone rushes out to proclaim that “Government Official Seeks To Muzzle Press”—“Says Papers Should Be Instruments for Propaganda”, let me make myself very clear, so that any such reporting will be with the full intent to mislead. I have spoken with no such idea in mind, nor could I—a newspaperwoman for some 25 years—embrace or accept it. But as a newspaperwoman I also know that the presentation of the news determines its impact. I do not say that we should not report the legitimate news. On the contrary, I say that we should report it impartially, whether bad or good. I do say that we should not be taken in by the “contrived” nor stoop to the “manufactured”. I hope I have made myself plain beyond question of a doubt.

Let me also make clear the fact that, in what I have said, I have spoken for myself, and myself alone. It seems but a sign of the times that I must say: “This speech is mine own poor child—and mine own alone!” I am not required to clear it.

As for my statement that we should be Americans first and all other things second, I stand by that, and you may quote me to the ends of the earth—for I am proud just to be an American!

Now let me finish with a story from Hans Christian Andersen that would appear to be apropos when taken in conjunction with the attempts at disruptions of our universities, indeed in relation to our entire society.

You may be acquainted with this tale in which, to find a husband for the princess, it was proclaimed that whoever in the country achieved the most incredible thing would be chosen. One man worked hard and for long years to design, create and construct a beautiful and wonderful clock. It not only told the time, but served as a calendar as well. It showed the ages of the past and those of the future. The greatest spiritual and cultural minds in the history of mankind were represented by sculptured figures surrounding the face of the clock. It was a creation of love, of patience, of skilled hands. Magnificent in its mechanism and a thing of great beauty, the many at the judging unanimously agreed it to be a thing of incredible beauty and practicality. But before the princess' hand could be given to the constructor of the incredible clock, another of no understanding, who had nothing to offer in comparison, pushed forward. “No” he bawled out. “Leave it to me. I am the man to do the most incredible thing.” And he swung his axe at the craftsman's clock. It was wrecked beyond repair. “I did that,” said the lout. “My work beat his, and bowled you over, all in one stroke. I have done the most incredible thing!”

But wouldn't it be even more incredible if the intelligent youth of our nation on the campuses of their universities were to continue to be misled into allowing a handful of agitators and anarchists to make a mockery of academic freedom, denying it to all but the malcontents—faculty and students alike—and wreck their institutions?

In similar fashion, if we Americans, the press included, with all our freedoms were to permit them to be stolen from us—even

abetting those who openly declare intention to do so by creating a state of anarchy—then wouldn't that constitute the most incredible thing in the history of mankind?

COLUMBIA INTERNATIONAL LAWYERS FIND CAMBODIAN INVASION ILLEGAL

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there are strong constitutional questions about the U.S. invasion of Cambodia. It has been asserted that the President has overextended his powers as Commander in Chief. But also very important to our standing in the international community of nations is our adherence to international law. The world community depends on the functioning of international law as we depend on our own laws. Members of the Columbia Society of International Law and the Columbia Journal of Transnational Law have prepared the following statement about the legality of the Cambodian invasion under various international agreements to which the United States is a party:

LEGALITY OF CAMBODIAN INVASION

Throughout history, and especially since World War II, the United States has been a leading proponent and defender of freedom and independence for all nations of the world. It has helped initiate and has supported efforts to establish a system and a world community based upon respect for international law, for the right of self-determination of all people of the world, for the peaceful settlement of disputes and for all the principles of the United Nations Charter.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

In the Preamble to the U.N. Charter we affirmed our determination “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, . . . to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, . . . and for these ends . . . to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest . . .”

Article One states that one of the purposes of the United Nations is “. . . to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace . . .” Most importantly, in Article Two we agreed to act in accordance with the principles that “All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.”

By unilaterally sending United States military units into the neutral territory of Cambodia, without the invitation or consent of the Cambodian government, and without

consulting the Security Council, the United States has committed a grave breach of international law. This decision seriously threatens the principles of the United Nations, the principles which in the past the United States has staunchly supported.

This intervention also violates the domestic law of the United States. After due ratification, the United States Constitution declares that a treaty becomes the "Supreme Law of the Land." No action short of total withdrawal from and renunciation of the Charter can terminate our obligation to act in accordance with every one of its terms. Since we have not renounced or withdrawn our ratification of the United Nations Charter, our actions are an unconstitutional and unjustified violation of United States Law. Clearly, the U.N. Charter is in full force as law of the United States, and just as clearly, we have violated its provisions and its spirit.

SEATO TREATY

Under the South-East Asia Collective Defense Treaty, Secretary of State Dulles told the Committee on Foreign Relations in 1954 that action would be taken by the United States only "in accordance with its constitutional processes." This, he explained, meant that action would be taken only after consultation with Congress. In approving the SEATO Pact, it is clear that Congress expected to be consulted prior to each United States military intervention in a country covered by the Treaty.

Cambodia did not become a member of the SEATO pact. The SEATO signatories, however, included Cambodia as a protocol party and not as a member of the organization. Cambodia has renounced its protocol status and has proclaimed its neutrality for many years. But even the SEATO Treaty itself, which accords to its members a unique power of unilateral intervention in the territory of a protocol party as well as members, specifically states that "no action shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent" of the government. The United States has violated this provision by initiating military action without obtaining Cambodia's prior consent.

UNITED STATES POLICY

The State Department has repeatedly justified our involvement in Vietnam on the basis of the SEATO Treaty, and has said that additional legal support was given to this position by the Joint Resolution of Congress of August 10, 1964 (The Tonkin Gulf Resolution). Section 2 of that Resolution, however, affirms that the minimum condition for military engagement on the soil of a non-belligerent nation is the request of the other government. It states that "... the United States is ... prepared ... to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

The fact that our administration has failed to cite any request for armed intervention shows that it has failed to satisfy the most basic requirements of the Tonkin Gulf Resolutions as well as of the SEATO Treaty. It is inconsistent and hypocritical for this country to condemn the Soviet Union for invading Czechoslovakia and then to invade Cambodia without the invitation of the Cambodian government.

It has been suggested that although Cambodia did not invite the United States to enter its sovereign soil in force, it has ratified our intervention by subsequent actions. The belated acquiescence in or "appreciation" of our intervention by the weak and unstable Cambodian government, faced with a military fait accompli by the world's greatest military power, cannot detract from the fact that the United States invaded a small coun-

try without its consent or invitation, in total disregard of its sovereign rights.

The United States is in fact applying the very kind of power politics for which we condemn the Soviet Union. But the consequences of their invasion of Czechoslovakia cannot compare to the devastation and prolonged civil war which will now engulf this defenseless country. Our latest military expansion is likely to lead to direct confrontation with the other major powers in an area in which China has particularly strong regional interests, at least as strong as those claimed by the United States in the Western Hemisphere.

If we are opposed to anarchy and contempt for the law domestically, we should also be opposed to it internationally. Recently under-Secretary of State Richardson announced the doctrine of spheres of mutual restraint. The breach of our own doctrine would encourage other powers to act unilaterally in the areas in which they have superior conventional power. What we do, we cannot expect other nations to refrain from doing.

The President has attempted to justify American actions as necessary to protect American troops and the Vietnamization program. It is clear, however, that this is not a valid exercise of the right of self-defense embodied in Article 51 of the U.N. Charter. It has long been accepted, and was affirmed by the Nuremberg Tribunal that invasion of a neutral territory for self-protection is justified only if there is a necessity for self-defense, instant, overwhelming and leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation. The United States' massive, unannounced strike into Cambodia failed to meet this standard at the outset—and reports from Cambodia fail to disclose evidence of a threat sufficient to satisfy the requirement of overwhelming necessity.

The administration has made no effort to justify its actions in the light of international law. Not even lip service was given to law when our troops crossed the Cambodia border. Just five days before Operation Total Victory began, Secretary of State Rogers censured North Vietnam for violating its treaty commitments to respect Cambodia's neutrality. He went on to say, "A more explicit and unprovoked violation of the fundamental provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of additional specific international obligations to respect the territory of others could hardly be imagined." The Secretary's words describe exactly our invasion of Cambodia. This action is demonstrative of the administration's contempt for and disregard of international law.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

It has been asserted that the President has sole decision-making power in this area as Commander-in-Chief. Although, by an evolutionary process, the Executive has gained the power to use the military in the conduct of foreign affairs *short of war*, the Congress still retains the sole power to declare war and to appropriate funds to support any military involvement.

Inherent in the power to declare war is the power to limit war activities and to declare the end to wars. The recent Resolution on Laos and Thailand was an expression of this power in declaring that the geographical extent of our ground involvement in Southeast Asia would stop at the borders of those countries. This was not an attempt to limit the Executive's power to conduct foreign in those areas, but was an expression of Congress' sole responsibility to declare and limit war. Congress has the power to exercise the same responsibility in regard to our action in Cambodia.

We request the Congress of the United States to resolve that United States forces be immediately withdrawn from Cambodia, and to reaffirm our intention to respect the

principles of the United Nations Charter and of international law.

AMERICA'S FINEST—THE GOLD STAR FAMILIES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the speech I made on Memorial Day included a few words. But the real message came from the faces of the families.

Our memorial program out at Laurel Land Cemetery was held on a beautiful morning. American flags were flying everywhere in the breeze. Legion and VFW caps were abundant. The Carter Band provided stirring music. I said a few words—there was a benediction and then we visited for about a half hour with the neighbors who came to honor our heroes. I thanked my good friend, George Young, who arranges this fine tradition each year at Laurel Land and Restland.

As I started walking back by myself to the gate, I saw a family in a group and went over to visit. It was the Gomez family. We had all been together back in December when I gave a Christmas party for all the children with relatives in Vietnam.

The family still had the wholesome, clean-cut look. The big girl was in a pretty, red, white, and blue dress. Her little sister still had her cute twinkling eyes. Little brother was still shy, but when he put out his right hand he shook firmly like a man. The other fellows in the family were quiet, polite, and well mannered.

I saw Mr. Gomez standing at the side all alone. Tears kept streaming down his face. We started to talk but he speaks little English. But this man's face spoke more than words. He loved his family dearly. The sweet Mrs. Gomez and I talked on about this young hero. It was a fresh grave with the dirt still loose. He had just come home.

Gomez was named after his dad, but in his outfit the fellows all called him Tex. He used to tell them great stories about Texas because his heart was always with his family. As his mother said, he wrote a letter home every day. Wherever he was, he wrote that letter to stay in touch. And the family saved and still treasured every one of them.

She told me how much he appreciated the picture that I had sent him of all of us at the Christmas party at Dallas. And he told mom that the Congressman wrote him about how proud we were of his service.

I did not know a few months ago that we would all be grouped around this small mound. And we all shed some quiet tears as we gazed softly at the American and Texas flags flying side by side over the grave.

Tex Gomez was only 20 but he was all man. He had been overseas for 9 months. Just recently he had received a battlefield promotion to sergeant in his infantry outfit. Just a few weeks ago in

the jungles of Vietnam, the name of Tex Gomez was reported killed in action.

Every day I am reminded of so many mixed-up youngsters, and it was so inspiring to talk about Valentine Gomez. He went to church every Sunday. Every brother and sister in the family loved each other closely. He respected his dad deeply and the tears in dad's eyes told us how close they were. And mother Gomez quietly repeated over and over about how he was such a good boy, always a help, always considerate.

Thank God for families where children are close to their mother and dad. And we are all so thankful for parents who were so concerned and so close as a family.

We in Texas have many glorious names. This year in Laurel Land we inscribed the names of Stanley Adams, Danny Berrier, Richard Boswell, Jr., Martin Droigk, Jerry Ervin, Roy Hammonds, Kenneth Heath, Paul Janto, Donald Kelly, Stephen Lane, David Larson, Michael Loyd, Charles Manning, George Mitchell, Roddie Perry, Dennis Phillips, Don Robertson, Charles Robinson, John Rosemond, Robert Russell, Savas Trevino, Donald Ray Washington, and Jimmy Willeford. These are the heroes buried here during the past year, who died while serving their country.

These names add to a heritage begun with Houston, Austin, Travis, and Crockett. And as we joined around the flags over Tex Gomez, we realized that we had lost one of our sons, but the Gomez spirit will be with us always.

THE INESCAPABILITY OF INTERDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with the Members an outstanding exposition of the new directions in foreign policy delivered by U.S. Ambassador Glenn Olds to the Economic Commission of Asia and the Far East. This statement deserves the widest possible circulation and I compliment Ambassador Olds on putting our new policies in perspective. The speech follows

THE INESCAPABILITY OF INTERDEPENDENCE (By Ambassador Glenn A. Olds)

There is an ancient Chinese proverb that "one picture is worth a thousand words". And, swimming as we do at these conferences is a sea of words, I am sure you would welcome a simple picture. Indeed, as one who marvels at the mastery of my native tongue, English, by so many of you from so many different cultures and traditions, and my own impoverished effort to master yours, I feel reduced to the simplicity of a picture. I want you to see it as a symbol and a setting for what I have to say in this opening debate.

About a year ago a good friend of mine, now a grandfather, was visiting his son, a university professor, over the winter holidays. The grandfather was a world traveler and wished to give their first and only grandson, then five years old, a gift. He bought him a round globe, a map of the world, which could be set and spun on a desk, which the grandson carried around, cradled in his arm,

during their whole visit. The last evening, my friend, the grandfather, was sitting in the living room describing a trip he had just made to Africa, when his son remarked he did not know where to locate one of the new African nations mentioned. Just then they could see the little boy asleep through the open door into his bedroom with his world locked in his arms.

The father said, "Just a moment and I'll get the globe you gave the boy and you can show me."

He tip toed softly into his boy's room, slipped the son's sleepy fingers from around the world, took it up and was just on the threshold of the living room when the little boy leaped bolt upright in bed and shouted,

"Hey, dad, where are you going with my world?"

The picture is powerful! The question is prophetic! With over half the population of the southern hemisphere young, under twenty-one, and a world restless and resentful of what the older generation has done, and is doing with their world, their voices rise in a chorus even in this quiet hall, "Where are you going with my world?"

Deeper than statistics, GNP's, trade balances, and economic plans, important as they are, is the deeper stirring of our times, the rumbling of a world awakening to the hunger for a larger measure of personal freedom, a wider range of social justice, a knowledge that poverty, disease and ignorance are not God given, ordained by nature, birth, or station—but are man made, and as such are amenable to change, can be broken, need not continue as they are. Like those who listen to the beat of a distant drummer, they may seem out of step with our sense of times, but they are on the march, and as our friend from Fiji reminded us, we do well to listen.

My own remarks are set in this wider, deeper setting. They are shaped by the convictions that the changes through which we are now passing are far deeper and ultimately more consequential than our conventional economic analyses, that they implicate, the whole human family, our entire globe, and every aspect of man; that they will make earlier epochs of man, and episodes of human history seem pale by comparison and that rightly understood and channeled, they will usher in an unparalleled period of human development; but misunderstood, neglected or mismanaged, and we may well ring down the curtain on the whole human race. If this may seem overly dramatic, undiplomatic, emotional, or sensational. I hope you will hear me out, for I do not intend to philosophize. Instead, I intend to let the facts speak for themselves, and around four points:

(I) Interdependence is the fact of life, only reluctantly and fitfully grasped as the condition of our economic and social life;

(II) Such a fact calls for a fresh strategy and new response in international affairs, and a look at U.S. efforts of the new administration in this direction illustrate the trend;

(III) Viewed in this light our problems are really a product of our successes not our failures, and are opportunities in disguise; and

(IV) Innovations of interdependence lie near at hand as the frontiers for development, national, international, and human, providing the frame-work of the future.

(I) INTERDEPENDENCE IS THE FACT OF LIFE

It may seem trivial to remind us of what nature has been trying to teach us from the dawn of our history—that we live in one world, in a uni-verse not a multiverse, in a cosmos, not a chaos, that every aspect of our splendid world, whether in outer space or the inner recesses of the atom is intrinsically and ultimately inter-connected. Poets have spoken of it, "Touch a flower and you stir a star," said Francis Thompson. Religious seers have spoken of it, "That are thou," says the wisdom of India. But only in our time, have we been stubbornly, inescap-

ably confronted with the fact, that this is not the creation of poetry, religion, or philosophy—it is the very nature of things, the stuff of our world.

We do not defy the law of gravity when we leap from a cliff. We illustrate it! We do not set the universe aside, when we try to live, as though we could, alone, cutting our world up into accidental (I almost said accidental!) pieces rooted in historic accident, arbitrary history, or human preference—we merely invite the consequences of our folly in conflict, destructive and discordant disorder.

We have found economically it is one world or none! Virtually every basic commodity is an international citizen. Every cup of coffee, every teaspoon of sugar reminds us of our inter-connected world. Scientifically we know knowledge is one. Truth has no nationality. We are able to understand and predict because it is one world; its structure and processes are open to understanding on the same conditions for anyone and everyone. Socially, we know, beneath all the differences of culture, language, and human condition, there is a human continuity which links us inexorably on this shrinking spinning ball, and that no effort at divisive ideology can rob man of his elemental sense of human identity and unity. The rallying of the world to the fate of the astronauts is no American phenomenon—it is universal and human. And our gratitude is matched only by the generosity of all those whose help and hope fastens on that tiny craft in space—man against the elements—hurrying "home."

It was this sense of our economic and social solidarity which was grasped and given expression in that swift moment of sudden illumination at the end of World War II, when men and nations saw in the mirror of history the folly of their failure to grasp this fact, and sought to give a rational human frame to this interdependence—and the United Nations was born. However, attractive or wistful it may appear to some to wish to return to a simpler segregated, insulated world, freed from the corruption of contact with others, there is no way back. We have passed the point of no return.

(II) A FRESH STRATEGY AND NEW RESPONSE OF THE UNITED STATES

It is the logic of these events which have been at work in the transformation of our own foreign policy, and the earnest effort of President Nixon and our new administration to chart a fresh course. We know the charges that have been made against our power, our motives, our ambivalent isolationism, involvement with the needs of others. Even the report before us remarks on the inordinate role of good or ill we play, the import of reduction of U.S. aid, implications of our fluctuating monetary policies to contain our inflation; implications of shifts in Asian security arrangements, and regional reconstruction efforts. Yet, as our President recently remarked in his address to the Latin American nations, we are learning! He said: "For years, we in the United States have pursued the illusion that we could re-make continents. Conscious of our wealth and technology, seized by the force of our good intentions, driven by our habitual impatience, remembering the dramatic success of the Marshall Plan in postwar Europe, we have sometimes imagined that we knew what was best for everyone else and that we could and should make it happen."

"But experience has taught us better.

"It has taught us that economic and social development is not an achievement of one nation's foreign policy, but something deeply rooted in each nation's own traditions.

"It has taught us that aid that infringes pride is no favor.

"It has taught us that each nation, and each region, must be true to its own character.

"What I hope we can achieve, therefore, is a more mature partnership in which all voices are heard and none is predominant—a partnership guided by a healthy awareness that give-and-take is better than take-it-or-leave it."

Underscoring this desire for partnership in an interdependent Asia in his remarks in this city of Bangkok, on July 28 of last year, the President pointed out our desire to participate as appropriate in such a community, (1) as a Pacific power, (2) as a benefactor of the diversity of the vital and gifted peoples of Asia, and (3) through sharing with those increasingly able a wider responsibility for the security and development of the region.

The very concept of "partnership," our President spelled out in great detail in his February report to the nation on "U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's—a new strategy for Peace". It roots in (1) the integrity and dignity of every nation and culture—respected and treasured in every relationship; (2) mutuality of interest, not paternalism, charity, or exploitation, and (3) underpinned by principles and practices to give expression to mature partnership.

These principles have been spelled out in detail in a number of recent policy statements, and relate to several of the comments made by other distinguished delegates in this opening debate. An illustrative but not exhaustive list of the President's recommendations follows:

(1) Affirmation of the primary initiative and responsibility for setting priorities and programs with each country itself in developing regional cooperation;

(2) Modification of U.S. trade and aid policies to facilitate expansion of developing countries' exports, including semi-manufactured and manufactured goods as well as conventional raw materials and foodstuffs. In the ECAFE region alone from 1960 to 1969 our exports increased 95% while our imports from that region increased 224%.

(3) Reduction of non-tariff barriers to trade and increased technical assistance to promote trade expansion of developing countries.

(4) A liberal system of generalized tariff preferences for all (I repeat all) developing countries, with broad product coverage and no ceilings on preferential imports, with equal access to industrial markets. In this recommendation the President has been supported by the U.N. General Assembly resolution 2503 (XXIV) of November of last year, the Pearson Commission, the National Foreign Trade Council (November 1969), the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO Labor support, and if you will, the *Wall Street Journal* (November 13, 1969).

(5) Elimination of "tied" aid for Latin America, and review of these practices everywhere "with the objective of modifying or eliminating them".

(6) Reconsideration of external debt service and recommendation that international financial organizations seek possible remedies.

(7) Encouragement of private investment where it is desired and under conditions designed to enhance social and economic development, and security against unwarranted or arbitrary risk.

(8) Sharing our rapidly advancing science and technology for purposes of international development. To use our President's prophetic words: "This I pledge to you tonight: The nation that went to the moon in peace for all mankind is ready to share its technology in peace with its . . . neighbors."

Incident to these principles of partnership, is rejection of the mistaken notion and polarization of nations into so-called "developed" and "developing" nations. No nation that we know of is "developed"—all of us in one way or another is "developing". We give lip service to the view that development is a complex, comprehensive, and or-

ganic matter, involving much more than money, G.N.P. or economic measures; that it involves human, as well as natural resources, qualitative as well as quantitative factors. Yet we continued to speak of rich and poor nations, "developed" and "developing" as though material measures were the only real ones. Is there anything more pathetic than a man rich in things but poor in spirit, of whom T. S. Eliot wrote, speaking of such hollow men—"Whose only monument is an asphalt road and a thousand lost golf balls". And who has not been moved by those who measure maturity of culture not by possessions but by perfection of the spirit.

This does not, of course, excuse or ignore the real struggle to survive of millions of peoples, or the mounting gap between rich and poor. It does not make sleep easier to know that two thirds of the people of the earth will go to bed hungry, will die before they are 45, and struggle to achieve an annual per capita income between \$100 and \$300 a year. But it does remind us that affluence is no unmixed measure of cultural maturity; that the price of pollution of air and water, urban and industrial squalor, mechanized and dehumanized relationships exact a high price. In short, it reminds us that we are all "developing" nations, with a rich variety of needs and gifts, that elude sweeping and simple generalities.

Finally, our response to the world's interdependence has been a renewed emphasis on international mechanisms for realizing a more rational order, just distribution of resources, and on an instrument of global development. Though we contribute 30% of the assessed budget of the U.N., 40% of the UNDP which sustains multilateral assistance, and over 50% of some of the international agencies, we recognize that we and others must do more to strengthen the quality and volume of this effort.

We have welcomed the Jackson capacity study and its emphasis on strengthening the coordination and delivery capability of the U.N. system. The President has announced his intention to dramatically increase our contribution to the Asian Development Bank by a pledge of \$100 million to its Special Funds and to respond positively to proposals for replenishment of the International Monetary Fund.

These and other means, though quantitatively small in the terms of gross need, still constitute the catalytic conditions to multiply through other means acceleration of development.

(III) OUR PROBLEMS AS OPPORTUNITIES

We have viewed our problems so long from the distortion of our fragmented and parochial perspective, we have often failed to see they are frequently a product of our success not our failures. Even as cancer is not a degenerative disease, but rather the reverse—a growth—so rapid it outruns the cell and organ structure which surrounds it that it strangles and kills; so also many of our problems are rooted in growth—not degeneration—but growth so rapid, and out of balance as to strangle and not enhance life.

Three illustrations will suffice: (1) The population explosion, (2) the widening development gap, and (3) the threatened human environment.

The population explosion rests on our amazing medical triumph over infant mortality, the ability to sustain and prolong life. It takes from a morally neutral nature the winnowing of the weak from the strong, and provides a rational basis for completing life we are able to create. But it is precisely this rational condition which must be applied to the whole process, if we are to sustain only wanted children, and ensure the health, welfare, and education of all the children we bring into the world.

Rational application of medical measures to save life we beget must also influence

the process of begetting the life we would save. We have only begun to turn this problem into an opportunity—the opportunity to control the life we release on earth to insure that it be sustained and perfected in the fact of our limited resources.

Similarly, the widening development gap underscores the unsavory wisdom of the Biblical proverb, "To him that has shall much be given; to him that has not, shall be taken even that which he has." It would appear that the richer nations are getting richer, and the poorer, by comparison, and relatively, are getting poorer. It is staggering to realize that our G.N.P. is 30 times greater than 1/2 of the nations of the world; that 34% of the world's population living in the industrialized countries live on 87 1/2% of the world's product, while 66% of the rest of the world live on 12 1/2% of the product; and that whereas the income gap between the rich and poor nations is now about \$3,500 per capita, it is estimated that by the year 2000 it will be \$9,000 or 3 times the present, unless dramatic changes are made.

Yet, the clue to the change is implicit in the problem. It turns on accelerating the human resources and knowledge, generating, thereby, scientific and technological adaptation to productivity which radically and rapidly multiplies goods, services and capital. Held in balance, nations small in size and natural resources, like the United Kingdom and/or Japan, may achieve remarkable development—and often, in a very short time. Though there is no simple shortcut, the conditions for generating this acceleration of knowledge, and transformation of human resources are reasonably well known, open to special national and regional adaptation, and constitute a remarkable alternative to discouragement or despair.

Finally, our threatened human environment reflects the ambitious success we have achieved in the mastery of nature. So swift and certain has been our mastery of nature's secrets, we have sought to accelerate and reconstruct those processes to suit our needs and advantage, with small regard for the ecology—the interrelation of the whole—in which our contrived efforts are given a disruptive part. Bulldozers can sweep across a landscape, alter the course of rivers, realign the soil it would take a million years to make or restore. Subtler adjustments are forgotten, and before we know it, we have destroyed what we intended to improve.

But here, too, the problem is not met by a retreat to a more primitive state; it lies in pursuing to a new harmony that same knowledge of nature with which we have destroyed it. We are well within reach of breaking the carbon monoxide—oxygen code, so that we might substitute for the photosynthesis process of chlorophyll a new technical process taking our polluted carbonated air and water, releasing the free oxygen, and reducing the carbon to a primitive usable fuel again. And how far are we from tapping solar energy, to be programmed from cycling satellites, back to earth in a usable energy form, without pollution or fallout? We are just beginning to scratch the surface of our marvelous interdependent world whose energy and partnership, locked up in her order and power, is only beginning to be open to man—and open to every man on the same conditions—wonder, discipline, dedication and sharing!

(IV) INNOVATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

Even as our problems prophecy new possibilities, our interdependence invites innovation. What we could not do alone, or singly, we may be able to do together. Two illustrations made it clear.

The language of one world, we are finding in science and technology. Here cultural and ideological differences pale before the demands and disciplines of ordered thought. Guided by the universal language of mathematics, and the real, stubborn, public world

of fact, the scientists of the world are drawn together in a common quest that is celebrating the fact and promise of one real world.

If one were to call the role of the scientists who paved the way toward man's venture into space, it would include most of the major cultures of the world. Adaptation of that conquest of space involves the peaceful cooperation of everyone. Indeed, as today's efforts to rescue three lone men in space testifies, the whole world seeks to help.

A month or so ago, we took about 40 ambassadors at the U.N. to our manned spacecraft center in Houston, Texas, where even now men wait in fateful anxiety over the return of Apollo 13. We were learning about the earth resource sensor program which, through camera, radar and ultra-violet photography, permits impressions of the earth to be taken from a moving airplane and eventually a satellite, which could, at 60,000 feet and up to 65 miles, locate water, certain mineral resources, identify the conditions of trees and foliage, the type and condition of crops, the presence of fish, water currents, weather cycles, and eventually measure air and water pollutants. What revolutionary possibilities are in store for man from this—and how totally they depend on global cooperation to be effective.

This could be multiplied for our other frontiers: the open and deep sea—its food, fuel and minerals—all requiring international agreement and collaboration for discovery and exploitation; and so too for our symbolic world of communications, with telstar satellites, radio and television capability of instantaneous transmission—shared educational skills in every field of technology and development, and so on through transportation and the inter-connecting links drawing us more closely and vitally together.

Finally, the *language* of one world must be filled with the *life* of one world which lives in the aspiration, attitudes, and action of our most precious and precocious possession, our youth. Their hunger for personal freedom and social justice is a universal phenomenon. Their restlessness is the sound and shape of tomorrow—the distant drummer to whose beat they march.

Their weariness of dying for narrow national goals is no act of cowardice. They want only to live for a larger loyalty, for a wider world of man. Their appetite for change is a large part of the "Economic Situation in Asia"—and the world, and we can be grateful for that.

So, I end as I began—with another picture. This time it concerns a little girl, hardly five. I was passing her on the sidewalk, as she was trying to fold her doll blanket into the wind on a breezy March day back in Oregon. Every time she tried to throw out the blanket into the wind, it blew over her face. She was almost frantic with frustration. I watched a moment, then knelt down beside her and said,

"Honey, the wind is your friend. Just turn around, don't fight it, let it help you."

She looked up as though to say, "Go on old man. Nothing this frustrating can be that easy."

But slowly and cautiously she did turn around. To her delight and surprise, the wind did help her—holding her blanket in gentle folds as she neatly put it in place.

The lesson was simple and complete! The winds of change are blowing. They root not in angry downdrafts frustrating anxious children, but in the very nature of things. The interdependence of our world celebrated in nature and science can inform our economies, social and political institutions, and finally invite a new ethic for man.

We can continue to fight it like small children, with a whimper or cry, lash out in violence at even the stranger or passerby; or learn to turn around, go with its logic and reconstruct our institutions and our world.

As for me, *this is the new realism* as it is for my country! It roots in no inordinate pretensions or sniveling sentimentality, but in that guarded optimism which knows that this crowded little island in the sky is a very rare and precious home for man and even as it is held together in delicate interdependent balance, so we too must be held together—interdependent, balanced, respecting the space and traditions that separate us and sharing the world and its goods that bring us together.

Then we shall be able to respond to our startled children who cry, "Hey dad, where are you going with my world?" And as with our astronauts in space, we can reply, "We are finally, as the family of man, headed home!"

PROJECT CROSSROADS—IS AT ITS CROSSROADS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we have become too uncreative in our solutions toward crime. More jails, more police, more guns will not halt crime—it will only put it in abeyance. To solve crime we must attack its causes as well as its effects. We must rehabilitate our cities as well as the offenders.

Project Crossroads of the District of Columbia is a program sponsored by the Labor Department in an effort to keep young first offenders out of jail and put them into jobs. Project Crossroads helps the city as it assists the offender. By putting offenders (not defendants—the project gets its participants before the court adjudges them) into useful jobs the city benefits by getting additional productive taxpayers while the individual betters himself by gaining pride and involvement in society.

Project Crossroads saves money and lives. So many congressional hearings, crime reports, and criminologists have told us of the high costs and meager success of our penal system. Mr. Leon Leiber, executive director of the program has demonstrated that Project Crossroads is economically sound, personally benefiting and unequivocally successful. He should be commended for his efforts and leadership.

Now it is our turn. Project Crossroads is at its crossroads. It will either terminate its 2-year experiment program with only the District of Columbia utilizing its work and efforts or it will go across the country into all the troubled cities as a full-fledged program. I prefer the latter. And, I urge my colleagues to support this program as a permanent part of our rehabilitation system.

I was happy to hear WRC in its editorial endorse the program. I insert that editorial into the RECORD:

PROJECT CROSSROADS

Have you ever heard of Project Crossroads? Probably not. It is a two-year experiment with more than a thousand young first offenders from the inner city who became involved with the law in both Juvenile and General Sessions Court.

When a youth is arrested for an offense, but prior to his processing through the legal

channels, a Project Crossroads counselor moves into the case. If accepted for the program, the counselor works with the first offender to provide intensive, pre-trial rehabilitation services—a job, training and added education.

After three months the Project Crossroads counselor reports to the court on the progress made with the youth and recommends the action to be taken.

The results have produced a number of plus values. The first offender who goes through the program is unlikely to be a repeater. General Sessions Court Judges were so impressed with the result that charges against 74 percent of the 346 young people who finished the program were dropped before trial. In only three of the cases did the court refuse to follow the recommendation of Project Crossroads. Thus, it is an alternative to delinquency adjudication and criminal prosecution and can appreciably reduce the case backlog.

Project Crossroads, funded by the Labor Department, will come to an end in September. It has been so successful the Court of General Sessions intends to ask that it be made an independent arm of the court system.

WRC-TV supports this proposal and urges that the Project Crossroads concept be greatly expanded.

BEEF FOR FATHER'S DAY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a little more than 2 weeks that annual event known as Father's Day will again be observed. Most of the Members of this body are fathers and no doubt will be asked for Father's Day menu suggestions.

When that question arises in your household, and in the households across the country, I suggest the answer be beef.

Again this year the American National CowBelles—the women's auxiliary of the American National Cattlemen's Association—is sponsoring the "Beef for Father's Day" event in their efforts to see that all American families can share in the delights of a dinner featuring beef while assuring the product they produce continues to enjoy expanded sales.

It seems entirely fitting that beef should be the featured dish for Father's Day dinners. Some of our Nation's best known fathers had a decided preference for beef.

George Washington, the father of our country, enjoyed roast beef with Yorkshire pudding and round of cold boiled beef with horseradish at festive meals in his Mount Vernon estate.

Abraham Lincoln personally planned the menu for his inaugural luncheon served at Willard's Hotel at noon on March 4, 1861. He ordered corned beef.

John Philip Sousa led the U.S. Marine Band at President Garfield's inaugural ball in the Smithsonian Institution where guests marveled at an early electric light bulb and enjoyed roast beef.

This body saw fit in November of 1775 to approve a resolution outlining the daily rations for each soldier in the U.S. Army and heading that list was the re-

quirement that each man should receive 1 pound of beef daily.

More recently, our Nation's astronauts before leaving on their epic journeys into space enjoyed a hearty breakfast featuring beef steak.

Whatever your household custom for dining might be or whatever your favorite cut of beef, no doubt the entire family will be happy with "Beef for Father's Day."

SOVIET UNION UPSTAGES THE WEST IN NIGERIA

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Col. Irving Salomon, the distinguished head of our San Diego County World Affairs Council, has an extensive set of credentials in foreign affairs. His activities include being a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations and chairman and vice chairman of the American delegation to the UNESCO conferences in Paris and Geneva. He has traveled extensively in Africa and is recognized for his expertise in Soviet and African affairs. I know my House colleagues will find his analysis of Soviet opportunism in Nigeria of great interest and am pleased to share his recent article from the San Diego Union:

SOVIET UNION UPSTAGES THE WEST IN NIGERIA

(By Irving Salomon)

The Soviet Union is prone to seize any opportunity whenever a major nation of the West becomes persona non grata and where there is a chance to enhance its future position.

No greater international opportunist for extending influence exists in the world today than Russia. Whenever there are impatient stirrings among the citizenship of an undeveloped country and wherever there is disenchantment with a former colonial nation or with any major power, Russia can be counted upon to step in.

A case in point is Nigeria which is attempting to recover from its years of warfare with the Biafrans. While the conflict was still in progress, Gen. Yakubu Gowon made the statement that he was going to avoid the danger of economic domination by any one country or group of countries, and to seek a balance of foreign interests. That gave the Soviet Union just the cue.

This condition was made possible for Russian opportunism by the fact that the British press coverage favored Biafra and the British refused to give Nigeria the bombers or big guns they requested.

France also has been distinctly at a disadvantage because of the widespread ill feeling toward it due to its support of Biafra. Under these circumstances, and as could be expected, the Soviet Union came forth with MIGs and Ilyushins as well as a couple dozen 122mm guns. This material was accompanied by a flood of Russian propaganda.

It was particularly publicized for the U.S.S.R. when Gen. Gowon called in the Soviet ambassador, Alexander Iosifovich Romanov, just after the war, to express his personal thanks.

The Russians also took careful note that the United States lost its stance in Nigeria because of its careful non-commitment in

the Biafran struggle. So with Britain, France and the United States of America cashiered, Russia could cash in—easily—and today has the strongest position.

Nigeria's economic development was interrupted by the war, but it has many interesting investment opportunities for the United States and other Western nations. How the Russian influence will affect American potential investors is a question.

It will be interesting to watch what the Soviet Union will do both politically and economically with the foothold it has established.

SPIRO MAY SAVE AMERICA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an editorial commentary in the Wednesday, May 27 Greek Press of Chicago, is interesting in its emphasis and timing coming as it does from a publication whose publishers and editors have been keen observers of the public career of Vice President SPIRO AGNEW. The editorial, in my opinion, merits attention and, therefore, I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

SPIRO MAY SAVE AMERICA

These days of intensive communist efforts aiming at the creation of confusion and leading to anarchy with an ultimate goal the destruction of the American Society, voices like Spiro T. Agnew's assume a crucial significance.

If any one man in America today can save the country from deluge this man is Vice President Spiro T. Agnew.

Because Spiro is a man.

He stands up and calls a spade a spade without mincing words.

He said the other day in Texas: "I have sworn I will uphold the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Those who would tear our country apart or try to bring down its government are enemies, whether here or abroad, whether destroying libraries and classrooms on a college campus, or firing at American troops from a rice paddy in Southeast Asia."

This is the crux of our troubles today. The minute we identify our enemies we have diagnosed our disease. The cure is easy. Because the body of America is strong. And it is strong because we have men in our Society like Spiro.

Spiro's critics want him to "cool it." And who are his critics?

"The loudest complaints," Spiro tells us, "come from those really illiberal, self-appointed guardians of our destiny who would like to run the country without ever submitting to the elective process as we in public office must do."

These are the so-called "liberals" who tell our students that "until you people are prepared to kill your parents you aren't ready for the revolution . . . The American school system will be ended in two years. We are going to bring it down. Quit becoming students. Become criminals. We have to disrupt every institution and break every law."

These are the dirty young rebels who invoke the Constitution in order to destroy it. "That happens to be my Constitution too," Agnew reminds them. "It guarantees my free speech as much as it does their freedom."

We pray God blesses America and Spiro T. Agnew. Because if the Constitution guarantees our Freedom, Spiro guarantees the preservation of our Constitution.

CAMBODIA THROUGH ASIAN EYES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, viewed through Asian eyes, the present military role of the United States in Indochina has its historical precedent in Japan's militarist expansion. According to Tokuma Utsunomiya, member of the Japanese House of Representatives, it was under the banner of anticommunism that the Japanese militarists expanded their battlefronts throughout Asia, on the pretext of severing enemy supply lines and destroying enemy rear bases, a policy which eventually led to the Pacific war. While the analogy is not exact, it is uncomfortably close to what is taking place in Indochina today—close enough to provide a clear warning to us. Such a warning from Asians who are friendly to the United States is contained in the following declaration unanimously adopted by the 110-member Afro-Asian Problems Research Group of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party. After the declaration, I would like to insert in the RECORD Mr. Utsunomiya's observations on President Nixon's intervention in Cambodia.

The material referred to follows:

DECLARATION ON CAMBODIA

The series of actions undertaken recently by the United States against Cambodia is very similar in nature to the mistakes made by the militarists of our country in the process leading from the China Incident to the outbreak of the Pacific War. Because Japan's militarists possessed overwhelmingly superior military forces, they believed that problems could be solved by military might and they launched one large-scale military campaign after another. This endless expansion of hostilities finally led to the Pacific War and brought our country to the verge of extinction. The greatest mistake lay in the belief in the possibility of military victory over nationalism.

The sole aim of Japan, as a friend of the United States, in participating in the Asian Conference on Cambodia, should be to give sincere advice to the United States on the basis of the experiences which Japan gained at the sacrifice of several million lives. Further, more than anything else, Japan must advise the United States that it is Asian nationalism—even before Communist expansionism—that the United States is facing in Indochina and that there can be no military solution there. Further, Japan must advise the United States that the continuation of military action beyond the present stage and the expansion of hostilities would simply force into the arms of Communism the great masses of the peoples of Asia in whom nationalism has just been awakened, would intensify the confrontation between Communist China and the free countries of the world and would give rise to an irrevocably serious situation in Asia.

Further, the schism in the public opinion within the United States is deep and many political leaders of good sense in the United States, such as Senators William Fulbright and Mike Mansfield, are worried that if the military escalation is allowed to continue blindly the United States could disintegrate from within.

If Japan loses this opportunity of showing her true friendship to the United States, Japan would be betraying the confidence in

her of the people of the United States and would be losing forever the trust of the peoples of Asia.

In face of this truly serious situation in Asia, the Afro-Asian Problems Research Group of the Liberal Democratic Party strongly urges Prime Minister Eisaku Sato and Foreign Minister Kiichi Aichi to give courageously their sincere counsel to the United States and, thereby, fulfill their responsibilities to the peoples of Japan and the countries of Asia.

TOKUMA UTSUNOMIYA'S OBSERVATIONS

President Richard Nixon says that the United States has advanced into Cambodia, in order to ensure the security of the American forces, by destroying the military bases of the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese Liberation forces in Cambodia; and, is not committing aggression against Cambodia. However, whenever campaigns in South Vietnam were undertaken against the National Liberation Front near the Cambodian territory, the battlelines were often confused and action was fought from time to time within Cambodian territory. It is also a fact that, at times, National Liberation Front forces, overwhelmed by the military might of the United States, fled into the remote mountain fastnesses of Cambodia. We cannot call this aggression. Because the NFL forces sought sanctuary in the remote mountain valleys along the border, the Sihanouk regime did not sweep out these forces by use of arms and, as a matter of reality, recognized their presence. In this way, he was able to maintain a policy of neutrality and enable his people to leave in peace. This was a problem which would have been solved when the Vietnam War was settled.

The developments which changed this situation drastically were the expulsion of Sihanouk and the establishment of Lon Nol Regime, both said to be instigated by the CIA. The Lon Nol Regime launched, in collaboration with the South Vietnamese military regime, the large-scale massacre of Vietnamese in Cambodia, in an effort to consolidate its shaky foundations. This served only to increase the instability of the Lon Nol regime and certain American influences decided to intervene forcibly in Cambodia in order to save this regime. This is the truth of the situation. Clearly, the military in the United States, where civilian control is supposed to be in effect, took this action on its own initiative.

The United States Senate, which was deeply disturbed by the possibility of the war spilling over into Cambodia, summoned Secretary of State, William P. Rogers, to the Senate the day before the advance of U.S. forces into Cambodia, in order to prevent the extension of the war into Cambodia. Secretary of State Rogers confirmed, with full confidence, that there were no plans for military escalation into Cambodia. However, at that time, the advance into Cambodia was already under way. President Nixon had on his own initiative approved the de facto situation created by the military in Cambodia, without consulting either the U.S. Congress or the competent ministers in his own cabinet. Thus, the authority of the Senate, as laid down in the Constitution, was, as a matter of fact, ignored. In the political world, criticisms are being levied at President Nixon from politicians other than those belonging to the dove faction.

President Nixon, during his presidential election campaign, changed the image of the old Nixon and, as the new Nixon, promised the American people he would deescalate and de-Americanize the war in Vietnam. His Guam Doctrine was the embodiment of this promise. And, in accordance with this doctrine, he publicly declared that he would withdraw an additional 150,000 U.S. troops

from Vietnam, even after the establishment of the Lon Nol regime.

Erroneous reports are being circulated in Japan regarding the restlessness spreading among the people of the United States. However, the incontrovertible truth is that the great majority of the American people are critical of the continuation and the escalation of the meaningless war in Asia. One of the reasons is that the economy of the United States can no longer stand the burden of war.

For this reason, the advance into Cambodia, which seems to indicate a sudden change in President Nixon's plans to deescalate the war, has come as a great shock to the American people. This is evident from the sharp plunge on the New York stock market. Moreover, several hundred universities, even those which had not experienced any student unrest until now, as well as university presidents, and professors, have launched movements in opposition to the intervention in Cambodia. According to a UPI dispatch, only 23 Senators are in favor of President Nixon's decision to intervene in Cambodia, while 51 are openly opposed. Further, not only the Communist countries of China and the Soviet Union, but also the governments of the great powers of the free camp, including Great Britain, France and West Germany, are either very worried over or are critical of the U.S. military intervention in Cambodia.

Thus, at this juncture, the Japanese Government should restrain itself in both word and action, lest Japan give the impression that it is supporting U.S. military intervention. For Japan to adopt the attitude of supporting the military actions of the United States, contrary to the trend of world opinion, would be to arouse fears toward Japan's policies not only in China but in all the countries of Asia. There is, furthermore, the danger of deeply implanting a sense of wariness toward Japan, in view of the past experiences of these countries. Further, there is also danger that such a move would create distrust among the people of the United States rather than appreciation.

As was the purpose of the Santa Barbara Conference, Japan should urge and cooperate with the United States in reducing its military intervention in Asia as quickly and as smoothly as possible and in linking this effort to the consolidation of peace in Asia. There is a growing trend among political leaders of the United States to look increasingly to Japan to play such a role and, in this sense, they welcome the contacts now being made between Japan and China. Representative of these leaders are Senators William Fulbright, Mike Mansfield, and Mark Hatfield, who have been strongly critical of the President and the U.S. military for their unilateral actions.

If we, Japanese politicians, were to stand by with arms folded, saying nothing, these leaders would lose all faith and trust in Japan and Japanese politicians as playing their role in Asia. This is, again, another reason why we should make our views known with all candor.

We believe that the Japanese Government should request the earliest possible withdrawal of U.S. forces from Cambodia, and, at the same time, we should ask for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Cambodia and the restoration of Cambodia's neutrality, with the condition that Sihanouk be returned to power. This may seem for the present Japanese Government a bold and difficult proposition to make. However, unless Japanese diplomacy takes such a posture, Japan will not be able to make any positive contributions to Asian peace and, although Japan may be a great economic power, the time will come when Japan will be regarded with lower esteem as a politically trite country even by the people of the United States.

LEO PAULIN CHALLENGES TODAY'S YOUTH

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the RECORD, the May 13 editorial of Mr. Leo Paulin in which he dealt with student demonstrations and strikes against the so-called "establishment." He has followed up this editorial with his column in the May 20 edition in which he lays down a challenge for these same youth to do something constructive rather than seeking to tear down our Nation on the presumed grounds of their objection to the taking of a human life.

The editorial follows:

STOP THE WAR, NOW!

In all my contacts with people, in all walks of life, in all my appearances before a wide range of groups of differing philosophies and religions, in all commentaries that I have read and heard, I have never encountered anyone who is not opposed to war as an instrument for settling disputes between nations.

When I ask for reasons I get a melange of answers. Many respond that we should be more civilized and others give the repulsive line, "Better Red Than Dead." The current student protest, and that of a number of well-meaning, peace-loving adults seems to be based upon the very reasonable abhorrence of the act of one man killing another. This certainly is a sane approach and one that is common to almost all citizens.

And for that very reason, I suggest to the student protestors and others of similar sympathies that they involve themselves with a war in addition to Vietnam in which we are engaged. This war is the war of our nation's highways. Since 1961, the year of our first significant involvement in Vietnam, to May 9, 1970, 41,901 American military men have lost their lives in those distant rice paddies. In the same period our wounded numbered 276,725 of which just a little more than half required hospitalization. From 1961 through 1969, almost half a million of our citizens were killed and over 36 million were wounded in highway accidents.

In 1969 alone over 56,500 were killed and 4.7 million injured on our streets and highways. And our gung-ho youth was responsible for a disproportionate share of the slaughter. One fifth of our drivers are under 25 but they are involved in one third of all fatal auto accidents. Where are their protests and demonstrations against this kind of killing? Do they burn their draft cards and run to Canada because they don't want to kill or is it because they don't want to risk their own lives in a cause to which the administrations of four presidents of this nation have been dedicated?

Are we, as a people, really concerned with the taking of life, period? Or does it make a difference how and where the killings occur? To the parents, wives, husbands and sweethearts of a citizen killed at home, the tragedy is as brutal and as traumatic as the news that a son or husband has lost his life in Vietnam.

During 1969, there were 14,607 homicides in the United States. Many of them were innocent victims (black and white) of criminals. Who marched in protest? Where are the Fulbrights, the McGoverns, the Coopers, the Hugheses, the Mathiases, the Churches, when they read evidence that more people die of homicide in this country than are killed by our enemies in the far Asian countries? Con-

gress is still piddling with a crime bill that has been sitting in its lap for months. Have any among the doves of Congress raised his voice over the appalling leniency of the courts which permit confessed felons to roam the streets? Where are their anguished cries over the slaughter in traffic accidents?

Sure, we all hate war and I deplore the Vietnam fiasco as much as anyone. But let's be consistent. If we truly respect life, let's mount an offensive against death from criminal attack, against death from the drunken driver, the hopped up youth, and from the stupid speeder.

If youth wants a cause, if it wants to be involved in an area, where perhaps, it is better informed than it is in the Vietnam war, then let youth pick up the sword and do battle with the street criminal whether he has a gun in hand or a steering wheel. The stakes in terms of life are infinitely higher.

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRESS

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1970 I introduced legislation that would establish a National College of Ecological and Environmental Studies. This college, funded mainly by the private sectors of the country, would provide for an organized nonpolitical youth forum where needed communications can be channeled into solving environmental problems. The Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population of which I am chairman, has studied environmental problems for the past year, and we have become aware of the necessity of providing the means by which our young people may actively participate in solving many of our pollution problems. This bill, H.R. 16847, has been referred to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and we are hoping to hear a favorable report from this committee in the near future.

I would also like to draw attention to a program sponsored by the Department of Labor that will enable young people to participate in summer oceanography programs. This is the type of activity that will give our young people an opportunity to participate in a constructive manner, and I commend the administration and the Department of Labor for the development of this program. I would like to have a release of this program description printed in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

NYC HELPS 75 YOUTHS PARTICIPATE IN SUMMER OCEANOGRAPHY PROGRAMS

About 75 disadvantaged youths will get summer jobs in Federal oceanographic laboratories in Miami, San Diego, and Seattle, the U.S. Department of Labor announced today.

The Labor Department will assign 25 of its authorized Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) training positions in each of the cities to provide this special summer employment to gifted high school students from poor families.

The Manpower Administration has the cooperation of the Departments of Interior and Commerce, the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and the three city school systems.

Based on a pilot program conducted last summer in Miami, the students will be selected by each local school system. They must be in the 11th or 12th grade, come from low economic backgrounds, and have an interest in oceanography.

Last year's pilot program was conducted on a limited basis in Miami by the Interior Department's Tropical Atlantic Biological Laboratory and the Commerce Department's Environmental Science Services Administration.

The seven students in the program sorted plankton (microscopic sea life), sorted and sampled fish larvae, analyzed samples and cores from ocean basins, recorded and assembled data on physical oceanography, and categorized oceanographic data.

BATH VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER PRAISED FOR TREATMENT OF VETERANS

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently Life magazine published a cover story purporting to show neglect in the treatment of patients at the Bronx Veterans' Administration Hospital. The story, with its accompanying photos, was shocking and deeply disturbing to me as it must have been to the thousands of families whose loved ones are patients at VA hospitals throughout the Nation.

It was reassuring to see a quick and incisive rebuttal of this article come from Donald E. Johnson, VA Administrator. Staged pictures and the use of selected information, he said, provided a wholly distorted picture of the VA medical program. Such articles tend to unjustly indict all VA hospitals and could have a lasting demoralizing effect on the thousands of devoted VA employees now serving our wounded veterans.

Recently, as the Memorial Day speaker at Bath, N.Y., in my home district, I was privileged to be taken on a personal tour of the Veterans' Administration Center in that community. I am happy to say I found every indication that only top quality medical care, for which the VA is noted, was available and was being provided. To be sure, the Bath VA Center is suffering from a shortage of personnel because of the increase in our veteran population. But it is to the credit of hospital Director M. Michael, Jr., and the entire staff that this was in no way affecting the care and treatment of the patient. The entire Bath VA Center was a model of cleanliness and efficiency and everywhere I went there was a warm, homey atmosphere.

It is no accident that the Bath VA Center is regarded with great pride by the community. Its tradition is a long and historic one going back to the days after the Civil War. Some 25,000 persons attended a cornerstone-laying ceremony on June 13, 1877, for a new building which was to become a home for Union veterans. The speaker was Henry Ward Beecher. A year and a half later, it was opened by the Grand Army of the Republic as a New York State Soldiers home as 25 Civil War veterans sat down to a

holiday dinner. From that beginning, it has grown to a 40-building complex deservedly considered as one of the show-places in the Finger Lakes region.

It is one of the few VA facilities which maintains its own cemetery, a quiet tree-shaded hillside where 7,000 veterans rest in peace. It is the only facility in northeastern United States to have a building designed especially for the housing and care of the blind and wheelchair patients. Its theater and recreation center, considered one of the finest in the southern tier, is the scene for many dances and parties arranged for the veterans by a host of area residents who view the hospital as a very special part of the community.

There are 166 VA hospitals in the Nation and all are fully accredited by the Joint Commission on Hospital Accreditation, a body composed of representatives of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the American College of Physicians and the American College of Surgeons. I think this says something about the quality of care being offered our veterans. It should also be noted that President Nixon is asking Congress for \$1.7 billion for the fiscal year, starting July 1, for the VA medical care program. That's the highest figure in VA history. This extra money will allow for the hiring of more than 5,700 employees for VA hospital staffs, permitting a continued improvement in service.

I do not know what damage the Life magazine article has done to the morale of VA hospital employees or how much needless alarm it has caused the families of our veterans. But I do know, if the Bath VA Hospital is any criterion, there is no neglect in treatment and VA staff people are totally dedicated and hard working, concerned only with providing the best in medical care for our veterans.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER McCORMACK

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing my feelings on hearing the announcement of your retirement. Sadness at your leaving was my first emotion, and this remains, but alongside this rests a great pride.

The sadness comes from the knowledge that we are losing a courageous leader, a man who has brought great wisdom and 42 years of experience to this chair. Your leadership has facilitated the passage of far-reaching legislation that has enabled this country to keep abreast of the times. There will be a new Speaker chosen and I am confident we will choose a worthy successor, but this man, whoever he is, will be guided and inspired by the matchless tradition you leave behind.

The pride comes from having been fortunate enough to be your friend and colleague for the past 7 years. Your stature adds stature to the Congress and to all of

its Members. I am proud to be a colleague of one of the greatest statesmen in the history of this Nation. It is appropriate that as we approach the 200th birthday of the United States, Mr. Speaker McCORMACK will join the other great patriots that have made this Nation the great Nation it is.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your glowing career and I extend my best wishes for a rewarding retirement of many years of health and happiness to you and your devoted wife.

THE POLLUTION OF MIND AND BODY

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the honorable Carl Harper, county solicitor for Escambia County in my congressional district, has made an appropriate and timely address on the dangers of pollution of mind and body by drugs, obscene literature, and mass apathy. This speech was made in Pensacola on May 27 to the Gopher Club, an organization of the chamber of commerce. I feel that it would justify the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY CARL HARPER

It is indeed a real privilege and an honor for me to come before you this morning and to discuss with you two forms of criminal activity that constitute a real threat to our community and our basic morality.

Most of you will agree that our bodies are threatened by the pollution of our rivers and streams and of the air we breathe. Yet, there are forms of pollution that not only threaten our bodies, but our minds as well. I am speaking of drug abuse and the public distribution of obscene materials, both of which are illegal under Florida law.

Our legislature, in its wisdom, has made it a felony to unlawfully use, possess or sell narcotic drugs to another, punishable by confinement in the State prison for five years, unless the sale is to a minor in which event the confinement is for a minimum of five years or a maximum of life in prison.

Also, under the Florida drug abuse law, it is a felony for any person to possess or deliver to another any dangerous drug, such as barbiturates, central nervous system stimulants or hallucinogenic drugs, punishable by imprisonment in the State prison for two years.

Yes, we are a pill oriented society. We take pills to promote pregnancy, pills to prevent pregnancy; pills to gain weight, pills to lose weight; pills to stay awake and pills to induce sleep. Some take pills to turn on—others to turn off.

Last year, in the court of record alone, we prosecuted about 65 cases of drug abuse, involving the sale of heroin, marijuana, LSD, STP, amphetamines and barbiturates. These cases represent only those violators who were caught.

According to Investigator Marco White of the Escambia County sheriff's office, there are about 2500 known drug offenders in this county, ranging in ages between 16 and 23 years. Let me emphasize, these figures relate only to the known offenders—there is substantial evidence to believe there are thousands unknown to us who experiment with these dangerous drugs.

It cannot be denied that there is ample medical proof that these drugs, when abused, can bring about serious physical and mental problems, and even death. Just recently here in our community, a young man caused his own death by an overdose of tuinol, a barbiturate.

Yes, we do have a serious drug problem in our community, but we are making successful strides. Our laws are ample to meet the drug problem, with the exception that I do believe the penalty provisions of our drug abuse laws should be increased to provide for maximum sentence on sale of dangerous drugs to correspond with sale of narcotics.

While our laws are ample to meet this drug problem, we are failing to provide ample enforcement in this field, manpowerwise. To my knowledge, there are only 3 investigators working full time in the drug abuse field—two from the city police department and one from the sheriff's office. In a county of over 200,000 population, this is, in my judgment, inexcusable.

These three men have done an admirable, almost miraculous job, but they will be the first to tell you they have hardly scratched the surface, and need more help and support.

We can never eliminate the drug problem for I believe it is here to stay. However, we can control it with stronger enforcement by adequately staffing and funding full time narcotic squads, properly trained and supervised on legal procedures to be employed.

While we have the support of our courts in the drug abuse field, unfortunately the same is not true, insofar as the Federal courts are concerned, regarding the public distribution of obscene materials.

It is a misdemeanor under Florida law for any person to sell or distribute obscene materials and subsequent convictions are felonious. The Florida anti-obscenity laws are easy to enforce, but our difficulty here is with the courts—and I should point out—the Federal courts.

In 1957, the U.S. Supreme Court, by virtue of the first amendment, pre-empted the field of public dissemination of obscene materials, handing down a legal definition of obscenity binding on all 50 States. According to the Supreme Court, a thing is obscene if to the average person applying contemporary community standards the dominant theme of the material, taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest in sex and is utterly without redeeming social value.

Shortly after this decision, the Florida Legislature in regular session adopted the Federal definition, but failed to include the element of no redeeming social value. Because of this, challenges are being made as to the constitutionality of our obscenity statutes. However, the Supreme Court of Florida, in construing our statute, read into it the element of no redeeming social value and has held our statute to be constitutional. Nevertheless, prosecutors throughout Florida are being restrained from the enforcement of our obscenity laws by Federal courts who consistently hold there is a substantial doubt as to the constitutionality of our law.

Even in those cases where there was no assault on the constitutionality of a State's obscenity laws, the U.S. Supreme Court and lower Federal courts, in split decisions, have reversed the overwhelming majority of obscenity convictions, resulting in a legal quagmire or hodge-podge.

As a result, pornographers have made millions of dollars peddling their filth, under the pretense of free speech, but in reality, in quest of the almighty dollar.

As you know there are a number of cases pending here in our county and throughout Florida brought on behalf of this State in an attempt to enforce the obscenity laws of this State as enacted by the majority of our people. These cases involve the filthiest

movies and magazines imaginable containing pictorial accounts of nude males and females, posed together in such a manner as to allow the unimpeded view of the camera to the genitals of each and engaged in sexual intercourse including cunnilingus, fellatio and bestiality.

What then is the cause for the growing incidents of drug abuse and the public dissemination of obscene materials?

To me, there is a combination of reasons. At the top of the list is our complacent, apathetic and permissive society. For too long now, the so-called silent majority has been content to sit back and allow a liberal mass media, certain national political leaders and members of the Federal judiciary to openly advocate disobedience of a law deemed unpopular to them. Many educators, and even church leaders, advocate legalizing marijuana and encourage civil disobedience, violent dissent and consequently promote anarchy and disrespect for the law.

Furthermore, in the past, the U.S. supreme court, or rather the Warren Majority of five justices, has extended our so-called constitutional freedoms and safeguards far beyond that ever intended by the framers of our constitution. Hopefully, with a new majority now on this court, we will return some sanity to our judicial system. There can be no doubt that our judicial system, especially the supreme court of the United States, has fallen into disrepute over some of its controversial decisions, and justices like Warren, Fortas, Black and Douglas. However, with the appointments of justices Burger and Blackmun, we are hopeful that the pendulum is beginning to swing back toward constitutional Government, with law and order.

Several years ago, Nikita Khrushchev said that he would bury us without firing a shot. There is more truth than fiction in that statement unless the vast silent majority of our people stand and be counted. We must use every legal means to combat those crimes that tear down our social, educational, political and religious institutions and which destroy the basic morality of our people. Our Government will fail, as did the Roman Empire, when our morality is destroyed. I can think of no crime which affects morality of young and old alike as much as drug abuse and public distribution of obscenity.

The silent majority cannot afford to be silent any longer. We must speak out to our national leaders in Congress and to the supreme court that we will no longer tolerate disobedience and disrespect of our laws, or acts of violence and civil disobedience, nor will we permit treasonable and unpatriotic conduct by anyone or any other activity adversely affecting our moral fiber.

Over 600 years ago, an Italian poet, Dante, wrote the epitaph of the silent majority when he said: "The Hottest Places in hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crisis, maintain their neutrality."

In conclusion, President Abraham Lincoln gave us the answer to the moral crisis we find ourselves in today when he said:

"Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the revolution, never to violate in the least particular, the laws of the country; and never to tolerate their violation by others.

"Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in schools, in seminaries and in colleges;

"Let it be written in primers, spelling books and in Almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls and enforced in courts of justice. And in short, let it become the political religion of the nation: and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars."

OUR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
HAVE GROWN PROGRESSIVELY
WORSE

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, college campuses, apparently quieting down for the summer, are in the process of recovering from the upheaval of violent student confrontation and from the paralysis of student strikes in the past months.

Still, the question remains unanswered as to how we can avoid similarly harrowing times next year. It is the same question we asked last year, but the legislation introduced by my colleagues and myself in the Congress which might have helped considerably in curbing campus disorders, for the most part, is still sitting in the Democrat-controlled committees of the House and Senate. All the while we have waited for congressional action, however, the disturbances cropping up at our Nation's colleges and universities have grown progressively worse than the ones preceding them.

In the wake of the weeks-long student strikes and extended shutdowns which occurred recently, however, another question has been asked: What happens to the many students who do not want their education threatened, interrupted, postponed, or delayed by a small group of militant dissidents violently disrupting the college campuses?

Often, these law-abiding students and their families have made great financial sacrifices to attend college, and for this high price, they should not be subjected to unnecessary, violence-caused school closings. But, because of the failure of some school administrations to cope with these problems at the local level and the present limitations in the law, these students have had no recourse except to put up with this injustice. As early as last July, however, I cosponsored legislation which would afford a student the legal means of protest when he is denied free access to his school's facilities by disruptive students. This measure, entitled the "Student Antiviolence Act," as I am sure you are well aware, also permits the Attorney General to proceed on his own without such a complaint whenever he determines that prosecution is in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is long past time for serious consideration of this bill, especially when we observe the recent disorders and resultant shutdowns at educational institutions across the country. One of the mysteries of our permissive age is the toleration and even acceptance of the arrogance, destructiveness and ignorance of the small minority of radical students. Violence and destruction should be met with expulsion by university officials, but where faculty and administrators fail to take firm disciplinary action, the vast majority—the serious-minded, law-abiding students—must be provided a means to assure themselves of a meaningful education without fear of violence or intimidation. Passage of this Student Antiviolence Act will equip these students with the adequate legal weapons for

combating the radicals who are disrupting and closing our universities.

I would like to take this opportunity to outline the major provisions of this bill, H.R. 13261. Essentially, it stipulates that a student may file a complaint, asserting that his educational rights have been denied, with an appropriate U.S. attorney. It would, in effect, cover every campus in the Nation since H.R. 13261 is directed at campuses receiving Federal funds. It provides for penalties of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year for those convicted of interfering with services, privileges, or advantages of an educational institution. In addition, the Student Antiviolence Act closes a loophole in the Firearms Control Act by including a separate penalty of up to \$10,000 and up to 10 years in prison for anyone using a firearm or any other destructive device in a campus disturbance.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to take prompt action on this measure and aid the serious students who are in college not to provoke violence but to obtain an education. When we provide them with the proper legal means for dealing with today's radicals, I am sure they will personally solve many of the campus problems and, internally, bring about an end to the violence and disruption. Furthermore, I have a tremendous amount of confidence in the integrity and responsibility of most of America's youth; however, it is the school administrators who are shirking their responsibility. Hopefully, this legislation will provide the students with the necessary tools to insure a calm and tranquil atmosphere on the campus that is necessary and conducive to obtaining a meaningful education.

TO CONTROL POLLUTION CAUSED
BY NONDEGRADABLE OR NON-
REUSABLE PACKAGING

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills which meet head-on the problem of packaging wastes and their adverse impact upon our environment.

My first bill deals specifically with the problem of nondisposable bottles and, through the imposition of taxes, seeks to encourage the use of returnable, glass bottles. My bill would give a bottler two choices—he could either fill deposit bottles which could be easily reused, or he could fill taxed bottles where the tax would be refundable if the bottle was returned to the bottler.

The bill also addresses the problem of the increasing use of plastic containers that either exude toxic poisonous fumes when burned or do not burn. It would place a 25-cent tax on each plastic container that is nonrefundable. This tax could only be lifted if the Secretaries of the Departments of the Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare both certify that the plastic does not pose a waste disposal problem.

The bill applies to containers filled with soft drink, beer, ale, malt liquor, and wine or distilled spirits. Fruit juices and food products, medicines, and other are not included.

However, Mr. Speaker, since my deposit beverage bottle bill only deals specifically with the problem of nondisposable bottles, I am also introducing much broader legislation that attempts to relieve the stress that all packaging wastes place upon our environment.

The Packaging Pollution Control Act directs the Secretaries of the Departments of the Treasury and Health, Education, and Welfare to study the packaging problem and put into effect a schedule of national packaging charges that are scaled to reflect the level of adverse environmental effects which each type of packaging has. For example, the charges for a returnable beverage bottle might be minimal or nonexistent while the charges for an aluminum beverage can that is nondegradable might be quite high. Hopefully, these charges would encourage packagers to use those materials that could be returned, reused, or recycled, or could be easily degradable when discarded into our environment.

Second, this bill would provide an additional source of revenue for solid waste facility construction because the funds generated by these packaging charges would be returned to local governments in the form of grants.

Finally, the bill instructs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop and publish national packaging standards that will insure that all types of packaging will either be easily degradable or able to be reused or recycled.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot afford the luxury of so much nondisposable or nondegradable packaging. The consumer pays and pays and pays—for the additional prices of a nonreturnable bottle, for the collection agency that has to pick up that bottle, and other mounds of garbage, and for the construction of the waste disposal facility that must destroy that garbage because there are no more "open" areas where we can simply toss our garbage. He pays again when we use up our natural resources at too great a pace and when we foul our environment with mounds of trash.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when all these "payments" are added up, the price is too great. We need to pass strong legislation that will enable us to come to grips with the solid waste disposal problem, and I urge early hearings to consider these bills.

THIS, TOO, SHALL PASS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, objectivity is too often lacking in discussions of current complications and this has been the case in public commentary in the situation which prevails on campuses and among our young people. One of the more thought-provoking and

penetrating articles that I have seen in recent months appeared in the Blue Island Sun-Standard on Thursday, May 28, in a column written by Leonard Carriere whose law and civic work certainly qualifies him to penetrate the complexities of the day and to philosophize in a responsible fashion. The article follows:

IN PASSING

(By Leonard Carriere)

Discipline! Discipline in the home! Discipline in the schools! Discipline has taken on the aura of an all-encompassing solution that afflicts the young in our schools. This is true in the sense that if everyone behaved, there would be no trouble. This begs the question in that it is a fact of life that people, including the young, do not always behave for one reason or another. Hence there is strife; there is commotion; there are jails full to the brim with people; there are police departments; and there are armies.

The rebelliousness in our midst cannot be attributed to any single cause. Rather, it is the manifestation of many causes, remote and subtle, direct and indirect. It is not a question of our young people in this place for any specific localized reason. It is not race alone though that is being given undue emphasis; it is not failure to communicate; it is not that no one listens. It is in part these things, but it is also ever so much more.

Neither is it more black teachers nor more Afro-American studies, though they contribute. There are communities without these things where there is no trouble. There are communities with these things with trouble. We seem to be looking for simplistic answers to an involved problem that has all but engulfed us at a national and international level. We put the blame in many quarters on many people, from the President of the United States down to an insignificant local school board; on God; on the death of God. Where haven't we put it?

It is that in part and yet it is not that at all. We are all concerned with the problem. There are as many solutions as there are people. Everyone has the answer and no one has the answer. It is in that concept that our problem actually lies. We are confused and bewildered groping but not finding.

Over the last twenty years, for an infinite number of reasons, the world has become a complicated, terrifying place, not only for the young, but for the older generation as well. Where there once was faith, there is now only disbelief. No one willed it this way yet it came to pass, as it has come to pass on numerous occasions in the past. It never was a pleasant experience at the time but somehow people survived, times changed, and as we are wont to believe, they changed for the better.

We are in the midst of a plague that afflicts the mind, a plague for which no cure has been found. Perhaps there is a cure, perhaps not. Plagues for which there was no cure ran their course and came to an end pretty much as they had begun. In the process an immunity was built up in the people afflicted. If you survived, the chances were you would not die from the cause although you were bound to die from some other cause sometime. The plagues of the past were specific and pathological. This time we have been hit with several at the same time, all psychological. They are more difficult and take a little longer.

This does not mean we should not attempt to cope with the situation, but rather that we had better accept the fact that there is no speedy, simple, specific solution. There is going to be more of the same. The world has gone mad before. It did manage to regain its sanity for a time only to go mad again. Our sophistication has brought us to the brink of disaster. We will stop short of the

precipice. Not all will go over. We are in for a bad time. Something within us failed. I do not know what it is.

The clergy can pray a little more enthusiastically, as one of our school board members implies, yet the turmoil will continue with or without their prayers. It doesn't hurt, however. As a wise man once said, "This, too, shall pass,"—and so it shall, but not tomorrow. Meanwhile let us do what we can, not the impossible.

MAYBE MR. AGNEW IS RIGHT

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this coming Sunday there will be aired over radio station WJFC in Jefferson City, Tenn., a speech by Dr. D. Harley Fite, my good friend who is president emeritus of Carson-Newman College which is located in Jefferson City, on the subject of "biased news reporting."

A good example of biased news reporting is right in the middle of the Nation's Capital. Both major Washington newspapers are biased to the point that it is impossible to get the true story on any matter. Our national television networks also show a great amount of expertise in the field of confusing the issues.

Dr. Fite's timely article is entitled "Maybe Mr. AGNEW IS RIGHT," and it is an excellent analysis of the conditions which exist within the news departments of radio, television, and newspapers across the country.

I would like to submit Dr. Fite's article for the readers of the RECORD:

MAYBE MR. AGNEW IS RIGHT

(By Dr. Harley Fite)

Newspaper editors and reporters, radio and television newscasters take the liberty of criticizing the President, Vice President, Governors, Congressmen and any other person at will. Yet, when the Vice President criticized the news media for biased reporting, they became angry and accused him of wanting to curb a free press, which was a false accusation. Mr. Agnew is not asking for no criticism; he is asking that they tell it as it is.

It seems that three questions are in order. One, why is it so much worse for them to get a little of what they have been "dishing" out in such enormous amounts? Could it be that they know they are guilty of biased reporting? The hit dog yelps, you know. Why have the people of the news media reacted so violently to Mr. Agnew's statements of opposing views expressed in polite, genteel English and have found nothing wrong about dissidents using the vilest, four letter words to describe the President and Vice President of the United States?

Mr. Agnew has raised his voice against biased news reporting and news casting less than once per week since he was elected Vice President. But not a single day has passed since the election that some newscaster has not criticized the Administration. During the last six months there has been violent criticism by the news media—yes, every day, seven days a week. Recently one weekly news journal, with possibly the largest circulation of any journal of its kind in the United States, devoted 18 pages in one issue to praise for the rioters and criticism of the

government, the war, the president, the police and the courts.

Biased news is one of the greatest dangers to American freedom. What happened in Germany when Hitler controlled the press? What happened in Italy when Mussolini controlled the news? What happened in Russia? In one generation the youth of three nations were turned into maniacs, hating the rest of the world and all people who disagreed with them. What will happen in America if we have a controlled press and biased newscasting? The same thing that happened in these other countries; only here it is not the government that is controlling the news media, but opponents of the government. Of course, they can do it faster when they get their men elected—and they are trying to do this very hard indeed. If the controlled press gets much worse, they may do it; for when people hear only one side of the story, and hear it over and over again, they begin to believe it.

Broadcasters, some university presidents, and others are urging the president to demand that all criticism of rioters cease. They say criticism makes them worse. Why don't these same people follow their own prescription and cease their criticism of the Courts and law enforcement officials? This would do more good than anything I know. Their joining in with the rioters encourages them and inflames them to do more. In fact, those who uphold the rioters and criticize judges, the courts, and other law enforcing people are aiding and abetting the criminals and hard core revolutionists.

During the riots at the National Democratic Convention in Chicago and at other riots, television cameras were there in abundance. They photographed everything; but when the news broadcasts were televised to the public, the acts of violence which caused the police and National Guard to have to take over were not shown. The telecasts did not show policemen getting hit with rocks; they did not show the metal spikes used by the rioters; they did not show rioters kicking the police with razor blades in the toes of their shoes, or the violent resistance to arrests; but they did show the policemen when they had to get rough to keep from getting killed. Even in the Black Panther raids and the Kent State University episode, the use of guns and other deadly weapons by the students and other protestors has been played down.

The police and National Guard have been accused of starting the riots in Chicago and elsewhere. How could this be true when the riots were planned months in advance? Could these weapons have been picked up on the spot without premeditated plans for rebellion and rioting?

Let's see what others have to say about biased reporting. Maybe, just maybe, Mr. Agnew is right.

Henry J. Taylor, columnist, said in a recent article (Knoxville News-Sentinel, May 3, 1970) entitled "Inciting via Networks," "The pigs are in the pasture on TV, weakening America around the clock; and if we don't see through this vicious and deliberate push, we need our heads examined. CBS, NBC, and ABC are obviously infiltrated. A full hour CBS handed over to convicted 'Chicago Seven' riot instigator Abbie Hoffman on the Merv Griffin show was hardly off the air when CBS unabashedly pushed another convicted criminal's venomous propaganda into the nation's homes. This time it was infamous Jerry Rubin on the Joseph Benti program—three days in a row during a single week.

"Under the subterfuge, as usual, of 'news' CBS aired Rubin's all-out pitch for revolution, murder, city burning, the destruction of the police, and violence of every kind. 'Thank you for coming,' said Joseph Benti—three days in a row."

Let's look at another report on bias. Ralph

de Toledano, in an article (Knoxville Journal, May 5, 1970) entitled "Conservatives Target of Double Standard" says, "Fred Friendly made a career of touting free speech and the free conscience of journalism." Whenever there was the slightest hint that the rampant liberalism of the networks was under even the mildest attack, Friendly would speak out loud and clear.

"What happened when he was notified (by the station manager) that William Woestendick, news editor of a program on Washington's educational station WETA-TV had been fired? Mr. Friendly, now with the Ford Foundation, which supplied the money for the TV program, said not a word."

Mr. Toledano further states, "... I think it is worth pointing out that had Mrs. Woestendick gone to work for Abbie Hoffman, or for Students for a Democratic Society, or for Kingman Brewster of Yale (instead of for the wife of a conservative government official) Friendly and the Ford Foundation might have been thundering from every New York and Washington rooftop about civil rights, dissent, and the black silence of fear. And probably thundering along with them would have been every jackanapes editorial writer who had nothing better to fulminate about that day..."

There are many other columnists who have voiced the same opinion—that the news media are giving us biased reports—but these seem sufficient for this broadcast.

Many of the people these two columnists had in mind have openly opposed the democratic process of trial for the eight panthers for kidnapping, murder, and conspiracy. These people who are being tried are not idealistic, non-violent protestors; they are hard core anarchists and revolutionists bent upon destroying this government. What kind of bias would one have to have to oppose justice by court trial? Well, your opinion is as good as mine.

All of us who believe in America and our Democratic form of government should oppose vigorously any attempt to control the news. In the meantime, I shall take with a grain of salt much of that which I hear over the networks and read in the editorial columns of some newspapers.

LABOR DEPARTMENT MEETING NIXON GOAL FOR TRAINING "UN- POLLUTERS"

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is moving on many fronts to combat pollution. It is doing so realistically and carefully. The task is enormous and not fully understood. Work, therefore, is proceeding carefully.

One of the most interesting and important areas in the fight is to be found in the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor. The Department is undertaking to fill one of the most urgent needs in the pollution battle—trained manpower. There is a great shortage of this, both in terms of actual numbers of persons engaged in it and in terms of the quality of their training.

Equipment is getting increasingly sophisticated and techniques for disposing of waste materials are becoming more complicated.

Through its manpower training efforts,

the administration is helping to meet the need for skilled technicians in the pollution field. At the same time, it is opening a new area of opportunity for the disadvantaged. These jobs pay well and have high personal status.

At this point, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the current issue of Manpower, the official publication of the Manpower Administration. It is called "Training Unpolluters" and is an excellent description of how the Nixon administration is moving on one major front in its battle against pollution. I commend them for it, particularly Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz and his Manpower chief, Assistant Secretary Arnold Weber. Their work today is already bearing fruit. Over the years it will enrich the lives of thousands of individual Americans whom they are benefiting directly. It will also enable the fight against pollution to go forward properly staffed with qualified personnel.

The article follows:

TRAINING UNPOLLUTERS

On June 22 last year, a fire in Cleveland burned two railroad bridges, melted the tracks, and caused \$50,000 in damage before firemen put it out. What made it unusual was that the blaze started in a river. The Cuyahoga is so fouled with oil and other flammable material that it is called "the only river in the world that is a fire hazard."

"It's a funny thing," said a Cleveland Plain Dealer reporter, "if you don't live in Cleveland."

The signs today are that the humor of it is lost on people outside Cleveland as well. For what has happened to the Cuyahoga is an extreme example of what is happening elsewhere. "Virtually every stream, river, lake, and estuary in the country is polluted to some degree," according to the National Wildlife Federation. "The Great Lakes are becoming dirtier every year. . . . The once great commercial and sport fishing industry in Lake Erie is dead, and recent DDT threats to Lake Michigan foretell the same fate for it."

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) estimated 2 years ago that only 55 percent of the Nation's population lived in areas where sewage treatment was adequate.

The public, the business community, and the Federal and State governments have given ample evidence of their mounting concern over water pollution. A recent Fortune Magazine poll of 270 chief executives of the Nation's largest corporations showed that 57 percent want the Federal Government to step up regulatory activities in water pollution.

Between 1964 and the spring of 1969, statewide ballots in nine States were taken on water pollution control bond issues. Seven were approved and the other two attracted majority voter support. The total "yes" vote was 11,725,444, or 66 percent of the 17,625,254 ballots cast.

California last year completed the first major revision of its State water quality laws in 20 years. It provides for fines of up to \$6,000 a day for violations, improves enforcement procedures, and requires violators to pay cleanup costs.

President Nixon, in his February 10, 1970 message to Congress, asked for more stringent control of water pollution by cities and industries, and fines up to \$10,000 per day for offenders.

The Federal Government already has programs in operation to help train manpower to battle water pollution. Among these is a new 44-week training course worked out by the Departments of Labor, Interior, and

Health, Education, and Welfare for waste water treatment plant operators. Training for more than 1,900 operators was funded in fiscal 1969 and this number is expected to rise 2,900 in 1970.

Cleansing water is a complex job because pollution has become so complex. The major contaminants are bacteria and viruses, pesticides, and weed killers, sewage, fertilizers and animal wastes, trace amounts of metals, acid from strip mining, chemicals and drugs, and heat. The Public Health Service lists 51 contaminants or characteristics of water supplies that should be controlled.

Pouring from municipal sewers and industrial outlets, or washed down by storm water, these contaminants trigger a process that kills the oxygen in the receiving rivers and lakes faster than it can be restored by nature.

Adding to the difficulty is the sheer volume of water required in the U.S. Americans use 387 billion gallons of water per day, according to the FWPCA, and this figure will rise to 494 billion in 1980. Each American now uses four times as much water as did his 1900 counterpart, and industrial use is now at 202 billion gallons daily, 13 times more than in 1900.

SKILLED MANPOWER SHORT

Despite Federal and other efforts already underway, the shortage of trained manpower remains a troublesome problem that will have to be overcome as the national attack on water pollution accelerates. Total manpower needs are not large when spread out over the national scene, but they are complicated by the fact that cleaning up dirty water requires a high degree of skill. Training and education programs to date have been inadequate. "In small communities, the guy who runs the treatment plant also has to run the snow plow in winter and cut the courthouse grass in the summer," said one FWPCA top official. The Public Administration Service, a private consulting firm, noted 2 years ago that "Pennsylvania has over 200 schools with small plants, usually operated by the janitor." As a consequence, too many facilities operate at low efficiency levels.

Experts have attacked the false economy involved in putting undertrained low-paid employees in charge of expensive modern water-cleaning machinery. "I cannot see the logic of building a half-million dollar treatment plant and hiring a man with absolutely no qualifications to operate it at \$5,000 a year," the director of New York State's Erie County Division of Environmental Health, told a congressional committee. "The \$3,500 a year saved on an operator can result in 10 times that in extra maintenance costs."

The total manpower in the country involved in treating waste water, in both the public and private sector, was 11,300 professionals (about half of them engineers), 10,300 technicians, 23,500 sewage treatment plant operators, and 50,000 operator assistants and maintenance workers, the FWPCA reported to Congress in August 1967. By 1972, the FWPCA said, the need for professionals would rise 219 percent to 36,000, for technicians 225 percent to 33,500, and for operators 80 percent to 42,000. (No estimate was made on assistants and maintenance personnel.)

Today, however, the FWPCA reports that these estimates were highly conservative—by as much as 50 percent in some categories. Among the factors that threw the estimates off was industry's practice of using personnel for other tasks than sewage treatment. The professional engineer in a factory in charge of purifying sewer wastes may also double as chief of the power plant.

LIVELY COMPETITION SEEN

But the figures, even though understated, do indicate that competition is likely to be lively for the available manpower as gov-

ernment and business race to meet their needs in the next few years. Engineers, other professionals, and technicians are always in short supply, and while the shortage of sewage treatment plant operators is less drastic, "the skill levels of many . . . are unsatisfactory," the FWPCA believes. Federal and private employers will do all right, pollution officials feel, because of their generally higher pay rates. But States and municipalities may suffer.

A survey made by the National Society for Professional Engineers last year among 32,000 of its members bears out this view, at least on the professional level. The overall salary median was \$16,490 annually. Above this figure was median pay for engineers in the Federal service (\$16,730), industry (\$16,440), consulting firms (\$17,890), and construction (\$19,000). Below it were county and municipal engineers (\$15,280), and State (\$14,580).

There is some evidence, however, that on the nonprofessional level cities are becoming more competitive with industry, thanks to recent pay increases. Sewage treatment operators in Cincinnati, for example, have received boosts of up to \$1,000 in the past 3 years, depending on classification. As a result, a noncertified beginner starts at \$6,400 and can work his way up to a Class 4 certified operator earning \$10,000. The Ford Motor Company at its plant in nearby Sharonville pays sewage disposal employees a flat \$3.72 an hour, or about \$7,700 annually.

A look at the type of manpower needed for water pollution control and how it is trained and recruited can throw some light on what may be needed to forestall serious shortages. About one-half the professionals in the trade are chemical, mechanical, and sanitary engineers. The rest are biologists, oceanographers, chemists, economists, and public administrators. All require college educations and they may be drawn into pollution work from other fields. Many sanitary engineers, for example, earn bachelor's degrees in civil engineering and then return to school for an extra year for a master's in sanitary engineering.

Technicians are employed in a variety of tasks. Some collect and prepare water and biological samples for laboratory examination. Others perform routine lab exams or help professionals with more complex analyses. Drafting, data processing, computer programming, and repair and maintenance of equipment are also classified as technicians' jobs. Technicians generally are recruited from technical-vocational schools and junior colleges, or from other trades.

The training and recruitment of waste treatment plant operators is haphazard in the extreme. Standards vary from State to State, both in educational requirements and in training. Some plants will hire men with only an eighth grade education but with a knack for mechanical work and let them advance through experience and on-the-job training. Others require a man with college training for top treatment plant jobs.

"It's a question of semantics," said William G. Hamlin, manager of field services for the American Society of Civil Engineers. "Waste treatment plant operator is a term used for a scientist or engineer, and for a common laborer who took a short State training course. Basically in large municipalities you need a professional who understands the very complicated waste treatment system and he has to have large numbers of men working under him. In a small community of 1,500 you have an operator and a laborer, and employ a consulting engineer to oversee the operation."

Until recently, the main tool for preparing operators for treatment plant work, other than on-the-job training, has been short State training courses. These range from 1 to 2 days up to 5 weeks; the States usually make the courses available through a college or vocational school and invite cities to send their men for training and instruction.

CERTIFICATION ADVOCATED

Forty-four States had such training in 1968, according to the Water Pollution Control Federation (WPCF), a professional association of people interested in water pollution problems. They provided at least 100 courses and 306 actual programs of instruction, attended by more than 16,000 people. The average course lasted 31 hours. The weakness of these programs is that they often fail to reach the people who need them most, the small plant operators.

"Most States find that their voluntary programs reach a maximum of 45 to 50 percent of the eligible plant operators," the Public Administration Service reported 2 years ago. "Smaller towns, for the most part, never become involved, either because they are not cognizant of the benefits or because they have only one operator and he cannot leave the plant for any length of time."

Some States get around this barrier by taking the training to the operators. The Engineering Extension Service of Texas A & M University holds up to 80 short school sessions throughout the State annually. They last 2 weeks with students meeting for 2½ hours 4 nights a week.

Professionals and technicians as well as operators attend State short-course schools. The FWPCA noted that nationwide in 1968 some 23 percent of the courses offered instruction in administration, and only one-third were identified as practical in-plant instruction.

With professionals and technicians in short supply and with so many operators badly trained, what can be done to assure the most effective use of the waste water treatment facilities now in place and the new plants that will be built in the years ahead? The answer is coming down to this: Upgrade the nonprofessional, nontechnician waste water treatment plant operator. This can be done in two ways, according to experts: By certification and by intensive training.

The WPCF for years has been a leading advocate of both methods, and has taken a particularly strong role in promoting certification. "It is the knowledgeable and skilled maintenance and operation of waste water systems that will ultimately determine the success of our national pollution control effort," says Heinz B. Russelmann, task force chairman of the Federation's Personnel Advancement Committee. The Federation, jointly with the American Water Works Association and the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, has drawn up a model law and regulations for mandatory certification of operators, and has pushed for its adoption throughout the United States.

This campaign is paying dividends. In 1969 alone, six States adopted mandatory certification, bringing the number to 23. All but three States now have some form of certification, voluntary or mandatory, sponsored either by the State or by a member association of the Federation.

The Administration has thrown its support to certification. President Nixon in his February 10 message announced that in the future "federally assisted treatment plants will be required . . . to be operated only by State-certified operators." Under certain conditions the Federal Government funds up to 55 percent of the construction costs of a municipal or county treatment facility. From the inception of this program in July 1956 to January 31, 1970, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and its predecessor agency had invested \$1.3 billion in 9,331 projects; spending in this area in fiscal 1969 alone was nearly \$212 million. This sum will escalate sharply in the coming years. The total FWPCA construction appropriation in 1969 was \$214 million; in 1970 it is \$800 million.

The FWPCA has been moving on a broad front to ensure better training for waste water treatment personnel. It has expanded the short-course training programs for profes-

sionals and subprofessionals which have been offered at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati. Similar courses are now offered at Federal water pollution control laboratories in five other locations. Thirty different courses lasting up to 2 weeks are offered annually and about 1,500 people will attend this year. It also makes money available to universities for instructing faculty and students in water pollution; in fiscal 1969, nearly \$4 million was awarded 76 schools for research fellowships, and for professional and technical training grants for nearly 1,000 people.

But these efforts are subordinate today to the agency's innovative new 44-week training program aimed directly at converting ordinary workmen into certified treatment plant operators. The curriculum was worked out in cooperation with the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the program is funded through the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA).

Under a national contract approved last year some 940 people in 28 communities, most of whom were already working in municipal or county plants, are now being trained at a cost of \$1,031,000. MDTA-funded State programs to train another 981 persons were also approved last year at a cost of \$1,161,555 through the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS). The CAMPS target for fiscal 1970 is more than \$2.5 million to train another 2,900 operators.

The year-old national program has had a good measure of success. Less than 50 men have dropped out so far, and more than 900 are still in training or have graduated. The 44-week program calls for 320 hours of classroom instruction including basic education and training-related courses. This is supplemented by 11 weeks of combined classroom and on-the-job training, and in the final weeks by straight on-the-job training. Each man is entitled to 70 hours of individual on-the-job training by an instructor. (These national guidelines also apply to the States MDTA programs generally, but have been adapted in some cases to local conditions.) Nearly all the trainees work for public employers, though in Gary, Ind., 10 private plant operators whose facilities discharge waste water into Lake Michigan were admitted.

TRAINING PROGRAM OUTLINED

Classroom subjects include basic math, communications, chemistry, biology, physics, measurement, and drafting. The trainees also learn how to operate the equipment in a modern sewage treatment plant, and how to clean waste water, chemically and mechanically.

In St. Louis, 18 men being trained for jobs with the Metropolitan Sewer District are scheduled to complete the program this month. Unlike the other projects, most of the St. Louis trainees were new hires. To make up for their lack of knowledge of plant operations, their classroom instruction was increased to 335 hours. And of the 23 trainees, five quit or were fired, a higher dropout rate than normal. Otherwise, the St. Louis program is fairly typical of the others being conducted throughout the Nation.

The trainees range from 19 to 54 years of age; eight are over 40. One man, 23, with a wife and child to support, had been unemployed 48 weeks when recruited through the State employment service. He finished the course 3 months early.

The men began their training as local civil service employees officially classified by the Sewer District as apprentice treatment plant operators. Starting pay was \$2.77 an hour. In November they were raised to \$3.15. Minimum qualifications for each trainee were that he be a high school graduate and have 1 year's experience in mechanical work or in maintaining power equipment. But experience was allowed to count as a substitute for academic qualifications. For every 2 years

of experience he had, a man was credited with 1 year of high school. Two of the trainees were not high school graduates.

A 4-week initial phase was devoted to orientation and basic instruction in math, physics, chemistry, and communications. The classes were taught by a high school teacher and a chemist, who worked part time, and the program's regular instructor, Gordon Perley. (Perley, 34, has been in the waste water treatment field for 12 years and has been a licensed stationary engineer, qualified to handle power equipment, for the past 4 years. He and other full-time instructors in other cities were taught how to teach the courses through a series of seminars held around the Nation last year under the direction of the U.S. Office of Education.)

A good deal of the instruction in the first phase was by movies and slides. The trainees also toured a number of water treatment plants and learned the fundamentals of handling chlorine.

The second phase lasted 21 weeks and the course of instruction became somewhat less tightly structured as the men spent only 1 day a week in class and 4 in on-the-job training at four different plants. They now studied their basic courses in some depth. And they learned about the tanks, pumps, meters, valves, and mixers in a treatment plant and actually performed some of the tasks in the treatment of water wastes, under the expert guidance of skilled foremen.

After the second phase they graduated from the apprentice ranks. Each was classed as an Operator I, the first step on the career ladder, was tested, and received a raise in pay.

During the third and final phase, they have been spending all 5 days a week in on-the-job training, with Perley exercising general supervision in the four plants. To reach Operator II status, each man will be required to have 1 year's experience.

One of the trainees is Walter Davis, 45, a high school dropout. Unlike most of the recruits, he was not a new hire. He had been a janitor for the St. Louis Sewer District for 2 years, earning \$2.67 an hour, when he entered the program. He is now an Operator I and plans to make waste water treatment plant operation a career.

"At first you're kind of frightened, especially with the math, and with so much equipment to get acquainted with," he said. "But when you get into it, it's not as hard as you think."

SHORTER COURSE URGED

He was not bothered by the classroom training as high school dropouts often are. "It's better than just on-the-job training, where they just explain it and you get too much to remember," he said. "We got the basic principles (in class) and when you go on the job, you know what to expect and to look for. It makes it much easier."

He said he liked the training and the work "very much." He added: "They say they're short of people in this particular trade. So it's steady work and there's no telling how far you can go. People think it's a dirty job but usually it isn't. It's got great possibilities and really looks promising for the future. Once you get the training you can get a job anywhere."

The program was deliberately designed nationally to upgrade in-plant employees like Davis. The idea was that moving such men upward out of routine jobs would help create a more flexible career ladder within local civil service structures. Moving men upward also opens entry-level jobs to the hard-core unemployed.

"It's a good thorough course," said Perley. "But 44 weeks is long and I'd like to see it shortened. We need more manpower and we need it now. I'd like to see the classes cut down from 320 hours to about 160. It's worth a try. We could use 20 to 30 more trained men right now (in the St. Louis system)."

FACT SHEETS OF COMMITTEE OF CONCERNED ASIAN SCHOLARS

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars is comprised of students and faculty who believe in the necessity of relating the professional study of Asia to current ethical and political problems. Founded in 1968, the committee now has chapters at every major university center for the study of Asia in the United States.

The Harvard chapter of the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars has revised and updated its packet of fact sheets. I think my colleagues in the House would be most interested in the information presented by CCAS and at this point I insert the fact sheets in the RECORD:

A REBUTTAL TO PRESIDENT NIXON'S APRIL 30 SPEECH

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

In an attempt to justify his decisions, President Nixon "explains" the situation in Cambodia and tells us what we will do.

"For the past five years . . . North Vietnam has occupied military sanctuaries . . . Vietnamese Communists began to expand these sanctuaries four weeks ago."

In fact, on March 18 a right wing coup in Cambodia replaced Prince Sihanouk (the man who had kept Cambodia neutral and spared her the agonies of the war) with General Lon Nol, whose troops began attacking Vietnamese Communist forces. When the Vietnamese Communists begun fighting back, they were driving away from the Vietnamese border, toward Phnom Penh, where rightist Lon Nol has his headquarters.

"The aid we will provide will be limited to the purpose of enabling Cambodia to defend its neutrality."

Cambodian neutrality was destroyed in mid-March when General Lon Nol, in anticipation of U.S. backing, overthrew the neutralist government of Prince Sihanouk and turned Cambodia into a battlefield for foreign powers.

"Once enemy forces are driven out of these sanctuaries and their military supplies destroyed, we will withdraw."

Even if the U.S. withdraws its combat forces from Cambodia, the Saigon regime has indicated that it has no similar intention regarding withdrawal of its own forces. The South Vietnamese Army is reliant upon the U.S. for everything from spare parts to transportation to advisers to tactical combat support. By creating a situation in which the South Vietnamese could invade Cambodia, Nixon has opened a wider Indochina war and jeopardized the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam.

"I warn the North Vietnamese that if they continue to escalate the fighting when the United States is withdrawing its forces, I shall meet my responsibility as Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces to take the action that I consider necessary to defend the security of our American men."

Since the North Vietnamese "escalation" of which Nixon speaks is self-defense, he seems to be telling them that he reserves the right to employ U.S. forces in any way he sees fit, but if they fight back, he will escalate even further.

"We have stopped the bombing of North Vietnam."

Yes, but four air raids were flown during

the week following Nixon's speech and the Secretary of Defense has threatened that more raids will be launched if the North Vietnamese attempt to interfere with the daily U.S. violations of North Vietnamese air space.

" . . . the future of South Vietnam (should) be determined not by North Vietnam, not by the United States, but by the people of South Vietnam themselves."

These are strange words from a country that actively supported a regime (Diem's) which obstructed the holding of elections for all of Vietnam in 1956, and since then has virtually dictated the political life of the southern half of Vietnam. Not only would the Thieu regime fall if it did not have our support, it would never have come to power had we not been there.

"American policy since then [1954] has been to scrupulously respect the neutrality of the Cambodian people . . . from 1965-69, we did not have any diplomatic mission whatever [there]."

It was not due to voluntary disengagement that we had no diplomatic mission in Cambodia from 1965-69. Prince Sihanouk refused all U.S. military and civilian aid after 1963, and broke off diplomatic relations entirely in 1965 when it appeared that the CIA was attempting to overthrow him. Since then, the CIA has continued to recruit, train, and pay elements of the Khmer Serei, a right-wing group opposed to Sihanouk.

The President's final remarks reveal what seems to be the real reasons for his decision:

"If when the chips are down the U.S. acts like a pitiful giant, the forces of totalitarianism and anarchy will threaten free nations and free institutions throughout the world."

The fear that we will be regarded as weak and spineless if we withdraw from Southeast Asia is contrary to the opinions expressed by the majority of the world diplomatic community. Many countries, rather than seeing us now as a staunch defender of peace and freedom, consider us stubborn and senseless in our continued attempts to win a clear-cut victory. As a leading Japanese official said recently, "What we are concerned about in Vietnam is not your good faith, but your good judgement." The most prominent result of our actions seems to have been to alienate our allies and bring untold horror and suffering to hundreds of thousands of American and Vietnamese soldiers and families.

"A Republican Senator [Aiken, Vermont] has said that this action means my party has lost all chance of winning the November elections. Others are saying today that this move against the enemy sanctuaries will make me a one-term President. No one is more aware than I of the political consequences of the action I have taken. It is tempting to take the easy political path. . . ."

This tone of martyrdom is distasteful. He insists on attempting to strengthen his arguments by calling attention to the difficulty of the decisions he must make. The difficulty of a decision however is no insurance of its correctness. Unless his decision can be justified on other terms, his emotional appeal merely clouds the issue.

One does not "withdraw" by attacking. One does not stop a war from "dragging on interminably" by widening it. One does not "keep casualties down" by sending troops into battle.

CAMBODIA

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

Area: 70,000 square miles.
Population: 6½ million; 85% Cambodian, 8% Vietnamese, 6% Chinese.
Government: Neutralist Kingdom until Army coup of March, 1970.
Capital: Phnom Penh (pop. 450,000).
Armed forces: The Cambodian Army

(FARK) has a strength of approximately 40,000.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

For centuries, Cambodia has sought to preserve its independence and neutrality. Since the 1600's Cambodian territory has been the center of big-power rivalry in Southeast Asia. In 1884, King Norodom was compelled to abandon independence by placing his country under the control of France in order to prevent Cambodia's partition between Vietnam and Thailand.

It was not until 1953 that Cambodia, under the leadership of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, became independent. Sihanouk abdicated his throne in 1955, organized a political party, won an overwhelming majority in national elections, and brought his country into the United Nations.

Sihanouk was convinced that too close an association with one side in the cold war would entail the risk of provoking hostilities from the other side as well as diminish Cambodia's independence in foreign and domestic affairs. He therefore waged a ceaseless and brilliant political effort to repel the advances of both the Communists in Indochina and right-wing forces encouraged by the U.S. As a result, Cambodia survived and acquired prestige and influence far in excess of what the mere size and strength of the country would seem to have justified.

In the process of maintaining neutrality, Sihanouk found it necessary in 1964 to sever relations with the U.S. when it appeared that the CIA was seeking to overthrow him. He renounced U.S. aid, even though he thereby ran the risk of increased domestic pressure due to the resultant economic austerity. On the other hand, Sihanouk in 1967 denounced Communist Chinese intervention into Cambodian affairs and announced the withdrawal of the Cambodian embassy in Peking. In 1968, he rejected an offer of substantial direct aid from China because too many strings were attached. Last year, after prolonged negotiations, Sihanouk resumed diplomatic relations with the U.S. after Washington finally agreed to recognize Cambodia's frontiers and territorial integrity.

In carrying out this balancing act in order to preserve a policy of virtually unarmed neutrality, Sihanouk unwillingly was forced to submit to a modicum of foreign military intervention. On the one hand, the Viet Cong used portions of Cambodia's eastern provinces for logistical purposes. On the other hand, the CIA and Green Berets recruited within Cambodia, and paid and trained in Vietnam a Cambodian mercenary force (the Khmer Serai, or Free Khmer) to fight the Viet Cong in the largely Cambodian-populated southwestern provinces of South Vietnam. The Khmer Serai was dedicated to the overthrow of Sihanouk.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

From 1966 on, Sihanouk's policies came under increasing attack from the right-of-center General Lon Nol, who exploited the Cambodian army's discontent with economic austerity necessitated by Sihanouk's rejection of foreign aid. For the army, this policy meant aggravating cutbacks in military spending. To strengthen his hand, Lon Nol played up the issue of the Viet Cong in Cambodia in order to force Sihanouk to abandon neutrality in favor of a more militaristic approach which would step up the flow of funds into the hands of Cambodia's generals.

Sihanouk felt compelled last summer to establish Lon Nol as premier of Cambodia. Once in a position of political power, Lon Nol soon took steps to increase army salaries and attempted to remove foreign policy from Sihanouk's control. This past March, in an attempt to further Cambodia's neutralism, Sihanouk traveled to Moscow and Peking to seek support for reducing the Viet Cong presence on Cambodian soil. While he was away, Lon Nol instigated riots against

the North Vietnamese and Chinese Embassies in Phnom Penh in an attempt to embarrass Sihanouk. Then, aware of Washington's long-standing coolness toward Sihanouk, and relying upon the U.S. to support an anti-neutralist coup, Lon Nol overthrew Sihanouk's government and launched a massacre of Vietnam residents of Cambodia (most of whom were not communists, but nationals of the Saigon government).

Sihanouk was regarded as the embodiment of the Khmer nation and as such held the devotion of the masses of Cambodian people, particularly those in the villages. In contrast, Lon Nol represents an urban, privileged, foreign-oriented elite. Since the coup, nothing has revealed the depth of Sihanouk's support among the Cambodian people so much as Lon Nol's frantic, fearful propaganda attempts to slander the man he ousted.

WHAT HAS THE U.S. ACCOMPLISHED IN CAMBODIA?

The U.S. response to nearly two decades of Cambodian neutrality was to mount an invasion of Cambodia. As a result, the Cambodian countryside, which had been an island of tranquility in war-torn Indochina, has been devastated by U.S. "search and destroy" tactics. Entire towns, such as Snoul, have been rendered virtually uninhabitable. Now the U.S. withdrawal has begun and the Nixon administration is calling on our "allies" in Saigon and Bangkok to intervene militarily in order to save Cambodia—a cruel joke in view of Cambodia's centuries-old struggle to avoid being carved up between its more powerful neighbors. Already the Saigon regime is on record as having suggested a cessation of part of Cambodian soil to Saigon in return for the latter's arms aid and diplomatic recognition. Saigon has declared it has no plans to withdraw its forces from Cambodia for the time being.

At the same time, Sihanouk has been forced to accept the support of Peking and Hanoi for an all-Indochina united front against the U.S. This already has given new life to the "Red Khmer" movement which reportedly has begun military operations in northeast Cambodia.

What does it all mean for Cambodia? As Sihanouk, speaking from exile, said: "the liberty, democracy, relative prosperity, and national union which our people enjoyed not long ago have all been destroyed, reduced to nothing". Khmers now fight Khmers and the U.S. has set the stage for the traditional racial and national rivalries between Thais, Vietnamese, and Khmers to take their bloody course while the great powers sit by and lend encouragement.

VIETNAMIZATION

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

What is "Vietnamization," President Nixon's announced formula for military disengagement from Vietnam? What are the prospects for its success?

WHAT IT IS

By "Vietnamization" the President means two things. First, that the United States has not abandoned and will not abandon the aim of a "victory" on the battlefield. Secondly, that such a victory can be won by South Vietnamese forces, the ARVN or Army of the Republic of Vietnam, however poorly equipped and inadequately led, although this goal has eluded our own far better led and infinitely better equipped military forces for the last five years. So far, President Nixon has given no indication that Vietnamization will permit the total withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam. Rather, Vietnamization seems to imply a continued U.S. support role requiring the indefinite stationing of some 250,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam.

It is a formula for prolonged fighting and destruction in the already ravaged nation of Vietnam.

ITS PROSPECTS

There are good reasons for believing that "Vietnamization" is an illusion even more cruel than the Johnson Administration's earlier objective of a military victory by the U.S. forces. Vietnamization fails to take account of basic political, military, and social realities in South Vietnam.

In the first place, the President and his advisors have sought to train the ARVN to fight a war against well-trained guerrilla adversaries, using the same tactics, essentially American tactics, which have failed in the past. These tactics rely heavily on the use of helicopters and such sophisticated equipment as "starlight scopes" (permitting soldiers to see clearly at night) which the Pentagon cannot make available to the South Vietnamese in numbers sufficient to make any difference.

ARVN MORALE

The South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) in sharp contrast to the North Vietnamese Army and the Viet Cong, retains the rigid class distinctions characteristic of Vietnam's traditional society. A few top-level officers live in luxury, usually by virtue of equipment and money filched from American sources. They and the government in Saigon which they represent have shown unconcern for both the material well-being and the group morale of their own troops, as well as for the South Vietnamese people in general. On-the-scene reports in the September 29, 1969, and February 9, 1970, issues of *Newsweek* magazine provide evidence of the ARVN's disenchantment with such leaders and their reluctance to fight for the government they represent. Suppression of even the most basic freedoms by the Saigon government only intensifies the reluctance of the ARVN soldier to fight for goals laid down by President Nixon.

More fundamentally, the reluctance of the ARVN soldier to do the fighting is connected with the nature of the war that is being fought in Vietnam. Predictably, the Vietnamese soldier finds it difficult to fight in a war that requires him to destroy villages and evacuate thousands of his countrymen to barbed wire compounds. A group of Vietnamese Catholics has described this succinctly: "Those whom the United States accuses in its ignorance as Communists, are in reality our relatives, our brothers, our sisters, our friends dispersed in villages and hamlets." The ARVN soldier cannot participate with enthusiasm in a war which must destroy his country in order to "save it."

The results of trying to win a military victory by using the South Vietnamese Army might be predicted from the record of the ARVN in the strategic Mekong Delta where they have already largely replaced American troops. "Vietnamization" in this area has enabled the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong to increase the numbers of their forces to 80,000 troops, a level they have not achieved in the Delta since 1963.

HEARTS AND MINDS

Most fundamentally, President Nixon and his advisors, like their predecessors in the Johnson Administration, have failed to understand the underlying political issues at stake in the Vietnam War. The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese fight well because they believe they have something to fight for. Their government and the nationalistic beliefs it espouses elicits a far more enthusiastic response from the average Vietnamese peasant than the Saigon government's traditional authoritarianism and its lack of any semblance of badly needed social, economic, and political reforms.

SELF-CONTRADICTIONARY POLICY

Even if Vietnamization were to be successful, the war in Vietnam would not end. On the contrary, Vietnamization would only prolong the civil war and postpone, at the expense of thousands of Vietnamese lives, the reconciliation of political forces that must take place if there is to be peace. The cynicism of the Vietnamization should also be noted. The success of the policy entails stopping the killing of Americans but the continuation and even escalation of the destruction of Asians. This emerges clearly in Ellsworth Bunker's statement that Vietnamization simply means changing the color of corpses. Vietnamization is doomed to failure.

There is no reason to believe ARVN will be more successful without U.S. combat support now than it was when the U.S. had only "advisors" in South Vietnam. As Vietnamization proceeds, we are likely to see a series of military defeats of the South Vietnamese Army and large-scale ARVN defections to the Viet Cong. As in 1965, this will present the U.S. with the choice of committing our troops to Vietnam in the search for victory or accepting the defeat of the Saigon regime. This is the inherent contradiction of Vietnamization: it represents an effort to stave off defeat by means that will only emphasize the weakness of our position in Vietnam.

BUYING TIME?

This contradiction can be resolved by assuming that Vietnamization is really a policy for accepting defeat slowly. It is an effort to save face for the U.S. by "buying time" for a withdrawal that can temporarily be camouflaged as victory. If so, it is a cruel hoax on the many South Vietnamese and Americans who will die in the fighting in the next few years.

THE EFFECTS OF AMERICAN-STYLE WAR ON PEASANT SOCIETIES

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

Most of the people—80 or 90%—in the countries of Southeast Asia are peasants who live in small villages in the countryside. Transportation in these areas is apt to be difficult (Laos, for example, which is the size of New York and Pennsylvania together, has only 3,500 miles of roads), and many peasants have never traveled more than a few miles from their villages. Often there is little contact with the national government, which exists primarily in the cities, except for paying taxes and getting drafted. There is a considerable gulf between the peasants and the city people, most of whom either work for the government, live off rents from the peasants, or engage in commerce and services for government personnel and landlords (and in South Vietnam and Thailand the Americans). The city dwellers, richer and better educated than the peasants, often dressed in Western clothes and able to speak a foreign language, are the ones the Americans deal with.

WEAPONS AND DEFOLIANTS

The United States has been able to build enormously destructive weapons of war. Our airpower ranges from the Huey helicopter with the firepower of a World War II infantry battalion, to the B-52 bomber which drops 30 tons of bombs from so high that it cannot be seen or heard. Out of these efficient American machines of war have come more tons of explosives than were dropped on the Axis powers in all of World War II; 750-lb. bombs which have left in South Vietnam three million craters 45 feet in diameter and 30 feet deep; cluster bomb units which scatter fragments all over; machine-gun fire at the rate of 6,000 rounds a minute, enough to shred and disintegrate a man; phosphorous rockets, napalm cannisters, and

fire bombs which can set fire to 50 square miles of jungles at a time;¹ herbicides and chemical defoliants which destroy crops and poison people (since 1966, 10 million gallons of herbicides per year have been sprayed in South Vietnam over an area of four million acres, the size of Massachusetts; the National Cancer Institute has found that some of these may cause gross birth defects such as the Saigon press has been increasingly reporting²).

DISREGARD FOR LIFE

Because of the nature of guerilla war and of our impersonal machines of war, we are unable to distinguish enemy soldiers from peasants in South Vietnam. Individual pilots and ground commanders have virtual freedom to destroy anything that looks suspicious. In areas considered under Viet Cong control, which means most of South Vietnam, peasants are legitimate targets. The "Iron Triangle" (an area of 60 square miles) and other free-strike zones have been completely devastated by bombing and artillery. The American soldier often feels contempt for the peasants whose way of life is so different from his own. The peasant comes to feel that the Americans are big, rich, overfed foreigners, distant and fearsome with their deadly machines and withering firepower. The American soldier may react to this distrust with racial hatred for all "slant-eyes." And so search and destroy missions, of which there have been thousands since 1965, become, in the words of a Marine colonel, "savagery," and there arise incidents like the one at Song My, where 450 to 500 civilians, mostly old men, women, and children, were murdered (and three weapons captured).

The American style of war affects the peasants in three ways.

1. Many are killed and wounded. In 1967, 95% of the surgical cases in Quang Ngai province's civilian hospital were war injuries (from cannon, bombs, bullets, and war burns.³ In 1968, Senator Edward Kennedy's subcommittee on refugees found that about 150,000 civilians in South Vietnam were being wounded annually because of the war.⁴ How many are killed nobody knows, because of the common practice of reporting all dead as enemy soldiers; the 450-500 peasants killed at Song My, for example, turned up in military statistics (and in *The New York Times*) as 128 North Vietnamese Army dead.⁵ Secretary Laird said last November that there had been 566,501 "enemy" combat deaths in South Vietnam since 1961; how many have been defenseless peasants is anybody's guess. After three weeks in Cambodia, our military say we have killed five thousand "enemy" so far. But most have been killed from the air. Who can say who or how many they are?

2. Many others become refugees. In South Vietnam perhaps a quarter of the peasants have been uprooted by the war, and this country which was once 85% rural is becoming almost half urban as large areas of the countryside become burnt-out wasteland. Saigon has quadrupled in size in the last few years, and the overcrowding is terrible. Conditions in refugee camps resemble prisons: over-crowded, lacking adequate sanitation, food, or medical care, people with nothing to do but just sit. In 1969 it was thought three million peasants had gone to the cities during the previous three years: 1.5 million as refugees and another 1.5 million lured by hopes of employment at U.S. bases, where they do everything from shining shoes and washing cars to prostitution.⁶ In the cities, the economic and social effects of the enormous influx of Americans and American money has been, in the words of former Information Minister Ton That Thien, "devastating, disintegrating, and explosive." The government has become more oppressive than even under Diem, and a Vietnamese Senate committee reports that

by the end of 1969, 50,000 people had been detained without trial. In Laos, the same thing is happening. Our air strikes have increased to the rate of 20,000 sorties a month. Laos now has 600,000 refugees, or 20% of the total population; 150,000 of these have been generated in the past year.⁷

3. Finally, many peasants join the guerrillas (or at least support them with food, shelter, and information), for they are not foreigners, bombing and burning villages, killing indiscriminately, and allied with a corrupt and far-out government. When the government is largely limited to the cities, and the guerrillas are the only ones with an effective organization in the countryside, foreign troops and planes increase the strength of the enemy. In China in World War II, the result of Japanese bombing and pacification was to increase Chinese Communist strength tenfold, from 10 million to 100 million. In an anti-popular war in Algeria, the French could not win even with 10 to 1 superiority in troops. And in N. Vietnam, millions of tons of American bombs only increase the resolution of the people, just as they did in London in World War II. The kind of war we fight tends to destroy the society and turn peasants into enemies. This is what has happened in South Vietnam; it is happening in Laos; and it will happen in Cambodia.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Frank Harvey, *Air-war Vietnam*, Beacon Paperback, 1967.

² I. F. Stone's *Weekly*, December 15, 1969, p. 4.

³ Jonathan Schell, *The Military Half: An Account of Destruction in Quang Ngai and Quang Tin* (Vintage paperback, 1968), p. 208.

⁴ *New Republic*, June 8, 1968, p. 11.

⁵ Seymour M. Hersh, "My Lai 4," *Harper's*, May 1970, p. 72.

⁶ *Newsweek*, January 20, 1969, p. 32.

⁷ *Nation*, January 26, 1970, p. 76-77.

CONGRESSIONAL EFFORTS TO END THE WAR

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

The Founding Fathers placed on the Congress the responsibility for deciding on offensive action by the armed forces. In the course of the 20th century, presidents have gradually usurped the powers of Congress in foreign policy. Now in Congress a number of efforts are being made to reassert Congress's role in making war.

ACTIONS BEING CONSIDERED BY CONGRESS

Twenty Senators and twenty Congressmen, both Republicans and Democrats, plan the following actions:

1. Amend a foreign military sales bill to provide that no funds be expended for keeping U.S. forces in Cambodia or for air operations over Cambodia except for those operations required to keep Communist troops and supplies from entering Vietnam. (Sponsored by Senator Church of Idaho and Senator Cooper of Kentucky.)

2. Repeal the "Gulf of Tonkin" resolution under which Congress (misled by what proved to be a vastly exaggerated Pentagon report) gave Lyndon Johnson a free hand to make war in Asia.

3. Amend a military procurement bill to provide that all U.S. military operations cease in Cambodia in 30 days, in Laos by December 31, and that all U.S. forces be withdrawn from Vietnam by June 30, 1971. ("The Amendment to end the War," sponsored by Senators Hatfield of Oregon and McGovern of South Dakota.)

THE PRESIDENT'S USURPATION OF POWER

The backers of these proposals argue that the President has usurped the Constitutional powers of Congress, and furthermore has involved the military in essentially civilian decisions. In this latest escalation, he even

ignored the expertise of the chief foreign policy advisers of his own administration—the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. Our representatives in Congress no longer can depend upon the President or his administration to inform them reliably of the truth of our foreign involvements. The truth about the Tonkin Gulf incident, about the U.S. military involvement in neutral Laos, about the My Lai massacre, was dug out of the administration only after months, even years, of probing. Most recently, Congress was misled by Secretary of State Rogers who, himself left in ignorance by the President, assured the Senate that the U.S. had no intention of invading Cambodia.

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS

1. The Cooper-Church Amendment: *If we cut off funds, won't we deprive our troops of the guns and ammunition they need to defend themselves?* Certainly not. The amendment is carefully drawn to specify that no funds be earmarked for "retaining" U.S. forces in Cambodia, that is, for establishing installations of a permanent nature. The amendment would prohibit long-term bases in Cambodia, but in no way endanger the security of our men. If this amendment passes, no item of equipment would be withheld from our troops during the process of exiting Cambodia. Equipment already "in the pipeline" from American arsenals in Thailand and the Philippines will supply our troops' every need.

2. The Tonkin Gulf Resolution: *If we repeal this resolution won't we tie the President's hands in the event of some future emergency?* No. Mr. Nixon apparently has recognized that the highly questionable evidence surrounding the Tonkin Gulf incident has rendered the resolution virtually meaningless. He has stated that he does not rely upon the authority of the resolution, but rather upon his position as Commander-in-Chief. Nothing in this or the other two proposals diminishes the President's proper Constitutional role.

3. The Hatfield-McGovern Amendment to End the War: *Thirty days may not be enough time to allow our men to withdraw from Cambodia in safety, and as for Vietnam, why give the enemy a timetable of what we're going to do?*

Since the enemy apparently had two or three days warning of our invasion (they were better informed than the Secretary of State) they were able to evacuate the border areas. Therefore, there is no substantial enemy force in the vicinity to hinder or take advantage of our withdrawal. The main point of this proposal is to ensure that the President honor his pledge to have all American troops out of Cambodia in 4 to 8 weeks without providing surplus time during which our soldiers might be ordered into further adventures and the enemy given time to regroup and counterattack. Since our forces are nowhere more than 20 miles inside the border, 30 days is more than ample time.

As for Vietnam, it has been our unwillingness to commit ourselves formally to withdraw our troops that has obstructed the Paris Talks. Once we make our intentions definite and official, the way will be opened for the negotiated settlement which Mr. Nixon has so often said is our goal.

THE WAR AND THE ECONOMY

(A Fact Sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

Everyone knows that hundreds of thousands of men have been killed and maimed in the Vietnam War. However, some think that the war has somehow been good for business, jobs, and paychecks—that without it more people would be out of work and get less pay.

In fact, the war has had the effect of decreasing pay, increasing prices, and creating

an unhealthy boom that will be cured only by a recession and unemployed workers. It has cost \$140 billion, or \$3,000 for the average American family. Let us look at what happened before and after the war started.

Wages.—Every housewife knows that what really counts is the purchasing power of her money. If meat prices go up more than her food allowance, she has to buy less meat. The real value (corrected for price increases) of an average worker's take-home pay was \$78.87 in 1961, \$88.06 in 1965 and \$87.27 in 1969. Before war, incomes were going up; after war, they went down. This trend continues into 1970.

Unemployment.—Unemployment dropped from 6.7% in 1961 to 4.5% in 1965. It showed every sign of continuing to go down without any war spending. After war spending began, the economy did at first employ more people—in 1969 the unemployment rate was 3.5%. This was not due to the war, but to the continuation of the pre-war trend. Soon the war overinflated the economy. At present in order to recover and slow down inflation, the government has had to adopt policies which cause the unemployment rate to go up. It was 4.8% in April and is rising. Bad times are ahead.

Prices.—Before the war, prices were practically even. From 1961-1965, they increased less than 1.5% per year. Since 1965 they have gone up 4% per year. They are continuing to increase in 1970 at an even faster rate of 6% a year.

Taxes.—Everybody knows that tax rates are going up. We complain about increasing school costs, surcharges, state taxes, and can only wonder what it will cost to clean up our air and water. The \$140 billion (by conservative estimate) for war costs is money taken away from schools, hospitals, and housing. So long as we spend as much money on Vietnam in a year as we spent for a decade to get a man on the moon, we can expect to be hit by higher taxes and worse government service.

Housing.—Rents are soaring today and mortgages are expensive and hard to get. The main reason for this is the war. It has caused inflation, and in an effort to fight inflation the interest rate has been increased. This has made it harder to build houses and apartments. Total housing starts were 1.6 million in 1963 and only 1.5 million in 1969. This level of activity is regarded as much too low, unless Americans will settle for substandard crowded housing.

The future.—Let's not kid ourselves. The next year or two will be rough. Prices will go up, people will be laid off. This is because of the mistakes we have already made. If we want to concentrate on our own problems, we can use the money we spend on bombs to put people to work. We can smooth the way ahead if we are smart enough to see that our own affairs need first priority. Wasting money abroad never was good sense and it isn't now.

SOURCES

Most of the figures presented here have come from the 1970 *Economic Report of the President*. The \$140 billion figure on the cost of the war can be calculated by taking the increase in defense spending from the pre-Vietnam period. As non-Vietnam items have been slashed, this is probably an underestimate. Tables on wages, prices, and unemployment are available in the appendix of the report. More recent data are available in the *Survey of Current Business*, issued by the Department of Commerce.

THE PARIS TALKS: WHY HAVE THEY STALLED?

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

From the outset of America's military involvement in Indochina, a negotiated end to

the war has been undermined by Washington's persistent attempts to impose a solution by heightened military activity rather than by diplomacy.

U.S. MILITARY ACTION DELAYED OPENING NEGOTIATIONS

Lyndon Johnson's attempt to "bring them to the conference table" by bombing failed. The Vietnamese Communists steadfastly refused to agree to negotiations during the period of U.S. bombing raids from 1965 to 1968. Instead, as in the case of the Nazi blitz of London, civilian morale rose and Hanoi's position hardened. Once the partial bombing halt took place in March 1968, the Vietnamese (according to former Undersecretary of the Air Force, Townsend Hoopes) responded quickly and affirmatively to Johnson's new call for negotiations. The talks began to deal with substantive issues after the U.S. announced a complete bombing halt, just in time for the U.S. Presidential election.

At this time even China, which had long pressured Hanoi to reject negotiations, appeared to credit Mr. Nixon's "plan to end the war" and his pledge to pull U.S. forces back from areas "where they are over-extended." As a result, Peking in the autumn of 1968 seemed ready to support Hanoi's decision to negotiate. But six months later this promising atmosphere had evaporated. Why?

U.S. COMMITMENT TO A MILITARY SOLUTION HAS STALLED THE TALKS

Mr. Nixon, who was on record as saying there can be no military solution, has insisted on trying to accomplish just that.

At the first substantive session of the Paris Talks (Jan. 25, 1969), the U.S. called for mutual withdrawal of U.S. and North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam. Vietnam is *de jure* one nation, and would be so in fact had Saigon not refused to hold free national elections in 1956 as provided in the Geneva Accord. Moreover, the great bulk of Vietnamese forces from the north did not enter the south until after the huge U.S. military buildup of 1965 and U.S. bombing of the north. Clearly, the Vietnamese Communists could not be expected to concede that they invaded their own country nor to ratify a justification of U.S. intervention.

But rather than treat the unrealistic U.S. position as negotiable, Mr. Nixon chose virtually to ignore the Paris Talks in favor of an old idea in a new format: "Vietnamization." "Vietnamization" amounts to a military solution and is therefore inconsistent with a negotiated end to the war. Washington is using the Paris Talks to gain time to strengthen the Saigon regime and army to a point where they are capable of going forward with the war. While tabling apparently generous offers at Paris we have exerted maximum pressure to enlarge the areas under Saigon's control and to destroy the forces of those who sit across the negotiating table from us. This is what lies behind the Vietnamese Communists' assertion that the U.S. is pursuing a "two-faced peace talk plot" or simultaneous "political deception and military adventure."

WHAT IS THE OTHER SIDE'S POSITION AT PARIS?

The Vietnamese Communists call for the establishment of a provisional democratic coalition government for South Vietnam, for the complete withdrawal of U.S. forces, and for free general elections. While Mr. Nixon says that withdrawal and elections are our aim, he has termed a coalition government wholly unacceptable. By so doing, Washington has rendered negotiations impossible—for after 25 years of struggle against outside intervention, how could the other side be expected to agree to a settlement which left them no future governmental role in their country?

U.S. RELIANCE ON ARMED FORCE CONTINUES TO OBSTRUCT A NEGOTIATED SOLUTION

Mr. Nixon has refused to replace Ambassador Lodge at Paris, leaving our delegation in the charge of middle-level officers who lack the authority to carry on serious negotiations.

Recognizing that the Paris Talks are deadlocked, the British recently attempted to reconvene the Geneva Conference on Indochina. Washington not only failed to lend support to this move, but the invasion of Cambodia has derailed the British attempt entirely.

Washington tried to justify the invasion of Cambodia as a means to force the other side to be "more forthcoming" at Paris. Instead, the Vietnamese Communists cancelled the latest session of the Talks. Mr. Nixon insists on going through the same painful learning process as Mr. Johnson.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University)

The Geneva Conference of 1954.—The conference met from April to July 1954. Participants were France, Great Britain, Russia, China, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam (Communist and non-Communist representatives). The U.S. participated in observer status.

The Agreement consisted of two parts: 1) *ceasefire accords* between France and the Viet Minh in relation to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Temporary zones for military regroupment were established at the 17th parallel. A ban was instituted on the introduction of military supplies or personnel, the establishment of military alliances or bases. 2) An unsigned declaration was issued noting the political conditions of the ceasefire: no permanent political division of Vietnam; elections to reunify the country in two years.

Comments.—The Viet Minh, on the verge of a military victory, accepted a political compromise forced on them by Russia and China with the understanding that reunification would come after elections. The U.S. disliked the conference results but pledged not to disrupt them by the threat or the use of force. Laos and Cambodia were recognized as independent, non-Communist, neutral states.

Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.—The treaty was signed in September 1954 by Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Britain and the U.S. Its purpose was to counter alleged threats of Communist aggression in Southeast Asia through collective self-defense. Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam were designated by SEATO as areas of concern where aggression would trigger response ("protocol states").

Comments.—Conceived by Dulles as a link in the chain of anti-Communist alliances, SEATO has long been moribund. The Treaty has served as a legal cover for American intervention in Southeast Asia.

The Geneva Conference on Laos, 1962.—The conference met from May 1961 to July 1962. Fourteen nations participated including the U.S., Russia, Britain, France, China, and Laos.

The *Agreements* consisted of two parts: 1) A *Declaration* respecting the independence and neutrality of Laos and pledging no military intervention. (This followed the establishment of a coalition government under Souvanna Phouma); 2) A *Protocol* regulating the withdrawal of foreign forces (U.S. and North Vietnamese) from Laos.

Comments. The settlement represented a great-power effort to defuse an explosive situation in Laos where internal factions were receiving foreign support (U.S., Soviet, North Vietnamese). The settlement was

abortive, however, because the coalition government was unstable and soon broke down. Political and military conflict resumed. The U.S. and North Vietnam soon became actively involved militarily in Laos.

Cambodia's International Relations.—Under Sihanouk from 1956 to March 1970, Cambodia sought to maintain its independence in a position of neutrality by balancing between the U.S. and its allies (Thailand and South Vietnam which were Cambodia's traditional enemies) and China and North Vietnam. Cambodia broke off relations with the U.S. in 1964 because of alleged American support for internal dissidents and the failure of U.S. allies to guarantee Cambodian independence and territorial integrity. Relations were resumed last year.

Cambodia tolerated the existence along its borders of Vietnamese Communist bases which did not pose a threat to internal peace. Since the March coup Cambodia has abandoned its neutrality and moved to align itself with the anti-Communist position in Southeast Asia. In response China has broken relations with the Lon Nol regime and recognized Sihanouk's government-in-exile. Russia is expected to follow. North Vietnam and the Viet Cong have also severed relations with the Lon Nol regime.

THE PATTERN OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN HISTORY

(A Fact Sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

THE TRADITIONAL PERIOD

"Southeast Asia" is not a place, it is a geographical expression—there are no unifying factors of race, religion, or language, and each of the present countries is made up of successive overlays of invasions and migrations which began before recorded history and continue down to the present day. The rugged terrain invites fragmentation, while cultural influences further divide the area. The Indian style of kingship, religion, art, and social organization exerted a profound gravitational pull on all of the peoples except the Vietnamese, who looked to China for their model of Confucian emperor, bureaucracy, and village government. Even Vietnamese Buddhism, although ultimately derived from India, was put through the strainer of Chinese civilization, and is different in many respects from the Buddhism of other Southeast Asian countries. After the Mongol invasions of the 13th century, the political geography of the area took roughly its present shape, with a wrangling triangle of "great powers," Burma, Vietnam (located in present-day North Vietnam), and Siam (Thailand), dominating the declining Khmer (Cambodian) and Laotian kingdoms. Thus these countries, like those of Europe, were and are not passive "dominoes," but active and politically sophisticated forces in their own destiny.

THE EARLY COLONIAL PERIOD

A period of European piracy and adventurism merged into a period of commercial expansion, only then followed, in the 18th and 19th centuries, by acquisition of extensive territory.

Burma. The Burmese, after a bloody but superficial unification in the 16th century, continued to hold up their end in the seemingly endless series of wars with their neighbors and occasional outside invaders. Unfortunately for the Burmese, however, their country lay between the British spheres of influence in India and Malaya. The British took over the kingdom, bit by bit, during the 19th century, with the final annexation coming in 1886. Since independence, the Burmese have cut off contact with the West, and maintained correct although not intimate relations with Peking.

Thailand (Siam). The Siamese have a long tradition of balancing strong but distant foreign powers against her own neigh-

bors—first the Chinese emperors, then the various European imperialists, then the Japanese, and most recently the Americans. Sandwiched between the Burmese and the Vietnamese, the Siamese have carried on wars with each. These were interrupted by the colonial powers. Thailand, however, is the only country in Southeast Asia never ruled by Europeans.

Laos and Cambodia. The Khmer kingdom, of which Cambodia is the heir, was one of the great powers in the area until the Mongol invasions. Like Laos, it was caught in a series of epic battles between the Siamese and the Vietnamese, although Laos could not maintain Cambodia's degree of unity and had only a transient existence. When the French took over the various states of Vietnam in the 19th century, they succeeded to traditional Vietnamese claims in Laos and Cambodia, and justified their control of these two countries on these grounds. Some Vietnamese still support these territorial claims.

Vietnam. The present territories of North and South Vietnam have never been politically united for any considerable length of time, although they have considered themselves culturally one. France established a foothold around the time of the American Revolution (the French ships which fought for American independence went next to fight in Vietnam), and during the following century the territories of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were brought piecemeal under varying degrees of French control.

THE EFFECTS OF COLONIALISM

Most people would accept the fact that the colonial governments existed for the glory and profit of the home countries, but many still do not realize the implications for the people these governments attempted to rule. At first the Europeans tried to make use of the existing political structure to rule indirectly, later assuming direct control in many areas. Thus, the traditional system was either destroyed or discredited as collaborationist. Rising generations of local leaders and ambitious youth, dazzled by the prestige of foreign power, were bought off or prevented from independent political activity on the popular level. Foreign education tended to Europeanize the student and to lead him to prefer bureaucratic advancement and the comforts of "modern" life in the cities to confrontation with the colonizers and development within his own tradition. In the economic field, the colonial governments fostered mainly extractive industries and foreign trade. There was a degree of economic development, but it took place outside the traditional sector, and did little good for most of the people.

The colonial powers never managed to control politics on the local level or the lives of the overwhelming majority of the people. Europeanized education and ideals instilled in some the message of liberty, equality, and fraternity. When the Japanese threw out the colonialists at the start of the Second World War, the aura of European invincibility was shattered beyond recovery. The resistance and nationalist movements organized on the local level and carried out widespread mobilization. The twin appeals of nationalism (independence and self-development) and revolution (in the sense of social and economic justice) prevented any return to either colonial status or traditional forms of government.

When independence came, the Asian nations were left with an array of essential but uncompleted tasks: the establishment of effective governments with legitimate popular bases; the development of traditional ways of life and thought to deal with new problems; the reform of unjust and inefficient traditional social and economic structures; and the agonizing process of moving peoples and boundaries so as to form viable national entities. In short colonization and imperial rule set up an irreversible process of in-

ternal and external nation formation but did not carry it very far. The completion of the process, now in full swing, is proving painful and prolonged.

COMMUNISM IN ASIA

(A Fact Sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

One of the main foundations of American public support for the government's war policies in Southeast Asia has been fear of aggressive communist expansionism in Asia. Is there any basis to the idea that we'll be in worse trouble "if we don't stop them here"? To answer this question we have to know just what we're talking about when we speak of communism.

COMMUNIST DIVISIONS

When Russia was the only communist state, it was the center of an international Communist movement which was held together through the Communist International and dominated by Stalin. After World War II the coming to power of communist parties in Eastern Europe as well as in China and parts of Korea and Vietnam signaled the beginning of the end of an international communist movement dominated by a single center. In 1948 Tito's Yugoslavia successfully defied Russia. After Stalin's death in 1953 Eastern Europe began to acquire greater independence vis-a-vis Russia. In Asia, with the exception of Korea, the various communist movements (notably in China and Vietnam) owed almost nothing to Moscow in their struggles for power.

The most striking evidence of the absence of a unified communist movement has been provided by the conflict between Russia and China. *Although both Moscow and Peking have supplied Hanoi with aid it has been in competition with each other rather than in cooperation.* From the very beginning of the escalation the Chinese Communists pointedly rejected Russian overtures to coordinate military aid to North Vietnam. As a result, Hanoi was placed in the unenviable position of having to balance carefully between the two powers. The strain which this caused was evidenced by the last testament of North Vietnamese leader Ho Chi Minh who died last September. He pleaded for the reconciliation of the two antagonistic communist states.

COMMUNISM AND NATIONALISM

The fear of monolithic communism fails to account for the incorporation of nationalistic aspirations into the programs of the various communist parties of Asia. These parties, having arisen in circumstances peculiar to different national experiences, have proven to be as defensive of their nation's autonomy as non-communist political groups have been.

In recent years, for example, China has encouraged "national liberation" or guerrilla movements in a number of Asian countries as part of its effort to eliminate American influence along its borders and thereby increase its own security. But the Chinese have not been able to control these movements nor have they committed military personnel or significant material aid. *The Chinese message to the national liberation movements, based on their own experience, has been "do it yourself."* Significantly, in the cases of China and Vietnam it was the ability of the communist parties to identify themselves with the aspiration for national independence that was the key factor in their success. If more communist revolutionary movements come to power in Asia there is no reason to believe they will accept domination from China or anywhere else. Both North Vietnam and North Korea, for example, have maintained their independence from both Moscow and Peking.

COMMUNISM AS A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE

Beyond the question of power lies the far deeper question of what the communist movements offer to Asian peoples. Democracy versus communism is not the issue, for in Asia, communist movements are often opposing corrupt and oppressive dictatorships which offer little freedom to their people.

Where communist parties have come to power (in China, North Korea and North Vietnam), the evidence is that they have begun the mobilization of resources necessary for national development. They have succeeded in ending the vast gulf between rich and poor and in eliminating the extreme deprivation of the majority. This indicates that communism, as a system of political, social, and economic organization, is a viable system in developing nations. Very often, in fact, the communists have responded to the needs of the Asian peoples better than the ruling classes which the U.S. supports. They often represent the better hope for the future.

"DEMOCRACY" IN SOUTH VIETNAM

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

VIETNAM

Traditional Local Democracy: Vietnam has not traditionally had democratic government on the national level, but on the local level village headmen have always been elected by the village. After consolidating power in 1955, Diem replaced these elected headmen with outsiders commissioned to carry out Saigon's programs of taxation, conscription, corvee, and relocation of people. These outsiders were ignorant of village ways, and by universally applying, for example, the 30% tax on crops without regard for varying local situations, they often put a heavy burden on the villagers. Former Viet Minh endeared themselves to the villagers by assassinating these outsiders and wresting control of the villages away from the Saigon government. (Such cases are prominent among the "terrorist assassinations" we heard about in the West.)

1954-1955.—With almost total control of Vietnam in 1954, the Viet Minh agreed to withdraw to the North in exchange for nation-wide elections in 1956 promised by the Geneva Convention to reunite Vietnam.

The U.S. was determined to preserve South Vietnam as a separate pro-U.S. state. After commitment and initiation of American support for such a state and the signing of the SEATO agreement for similar purposes, the U.S. moved to consolidate power by establishing Ngo Dinh Diem as head of the South Vietnamese government in Saigon. The U.S. told Diem to close off the DMZ and turn it into a border between two countries (a clear violation of the Geneva treaty). They then proceeded to stage an election between Diem and the last emperor Bao Dai, who had already been ejected from the country. Ballot gimmickry prevented secrecy in voting, and reprisals for wrong voting were widespread. Life Magazine on May 13, 1957 reported that American advisers had told Diem that a 60% "success" would have been quite sufficient, but Diem "insisted on 98%." In fact, Diem got 605,025 votes in Saigon from a total of 450,000 registered voters.

Over the next few years Ho Chi Minh appealed to Saigon and the Geneva powers at least seven times for carrying out of the nation-wide election promised at Geneva. As President Eisenhower recorded in his memoirs, however, the U.S. supported Diem's refusal to hold those elections; for we knew that at least 80% of the Vietnamese people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh.

1967 Elections.—The present Thieu-Ky government claims legitimacy on the basis of these widely-publicized elections. The scope of this election, the nature of the campaign, and even the voting itself lend little legitimacy to the results of the election.

1. It was highly restricted. The most popular competitor, Duong Van Minh (the man who overthrew Ngo Dinh Diem), was exiled to Thailand and forbidden to run for office. Parties advocating a neutralist solution were at times prohibited, and even the press was forbidden to voice neutralist opinions.

2. The Thieu-Ky regime made laws to restrict campaigning, and then broke those laws in its own all-out election campaign. Opposition candidates were harassed, detained, and delivered by the military to places miles away from their waiting audiences. Funds from the Vietnamese treasury and even from American aid were used in the massive effort to spread "Thieu and Ky" to thousands of peasants who did not know the names of the other people running.

3. Voting was restricted to those parts of South Vietnam considered "safe" by the Thieu-Ky government. The entire army—under Thieu and Ky—voted the army ticket, sometimes twice (where stationed and at home) or more. Villages and large refugee groups voted under the force of threatened starvation. Finally, reports of actual ballot frauds and miscounts were common. Even then, the Thieu-Ky ticket got only 35% of the vote. The runner-up Truong Dinh Dzu was put in prison (he remains there now) for talking about "peace" and "neutrality" in his campaign. South Vietnamese law prescribes death or a long-term jail sentence for discussing "peace" or "neutrality."

The National Assembly of South Vietnam established a special subcommittee to investigate the election. The committee found 11 types of "irregularities" committed at 5,105 polling stations. Under pressure the subcommittee ruled that only 2,531 of those stations had committed these violations intentionally. These 2,531 stations involved 1,695,558 votes, and the election law stipulated that if over 800,000 votes were involved the election should be ruled invalid. Nonetheless, the National Assembly, literally at gunpoint with Thieu's army in their Chamber, voted validation of the election results.

LAOS

Elections have been held in 1955, 1958, and 1960.

The 1955 Election was unilateral: the Royal Government and the Pathet Lao reached agreement in October of that year, but the filing date for the election was not extended to permit the Pathet Lao to place their candidates on the ballot. Thus only the government was able to participate.

In the 1958 Election leftist candidates were permitted on the ballot. American funds were used to provide \$10,000 "abstention bounties" to opposition candidates who would promise not to run against the U.S.-approved ticket. Additional "presents" were given to large numbers of village leaders in what the American mission called "Operation Booster Shot." In spite of such efforts, although only 21 of the 59 seats in the Assembly were put up for election, leftists won 13 of these seats. In view of the results, Pathet Lao leaders should have been invited to join the government, but the U.S. announced that no aid would be given to any country with Communists in its cabinet. Since the members of the Assembly, like the officers of the Army, received large monthly paychecks from U.S. funds, they responded by voting in a rightist government which abandoned neutrality, repudiated the Geneva agreements, and began arresting leftist politicians.

In 1959 a more extreme right-wing faction generally identified with the CIA staged a military coup. The new government sought electoral sanction; they proclaimed an election for 1960.

In 1960 Western journalists reported CIA agents passing out money in attempts to buy votes. During the campaign the U.S.-funded army was used in a "mopping up" operation against political opposition. The government counted the vote and announced a major victory. In one province they got 2,000 more votes than there were voters. In another province—long a stronghold of the Pathet Lao—the government won by a tally of 18,189 to 4 (the opposition candidate had five voters in his immediate family). This election has not been taken seriously in diplomatic circles.

Actually elections have not been the important political process in recent Laotian history. Throughout this period power rested with the Army and the National Assembly, both groups supported entirely by the U.S. Numerous times the U.S. threatened to hold back the monthly check—and each time the Assembly voted in a new government with policies favorable to the U.S.

CAMBODIA

Norodom Sihanouk's regime relied on a mass base. Sihanouk's political movement, the Sangkum, penetrated throughout the country. He remains immensely popular in the Cambodian countryside.

The current Lon Nol regime represents an effort of the bourgeoisie and aristocracy to regain traditional privileges from a ruler who had bypassed them to rule with the direct consent of the people.

LAOS

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

Area: 91,000 square miles, about the size of New York plus Pennsylvania. Bounded on the north by China, on the west by Thailand, the south by Cambodia, on the east by North and South Vietnam. Except for a narrow plain along the north side of the Mekong River, the terrain is rugged and mountainous.

Population: 2,825,000, consisting (in descending order of numbers) of ethnic Laos living in the lowlands, ethnic Thais living in the northern valleys, and tribal Meos and Khas living in the mountains.

Capital: Vientiane (pop. 200,000).

Military Forces: *Royal Lao Army*: 60,000 men. Largely a defensive force, not an affective aggressive force. *Armees Clandestine*: 12,000 men. CIA supported, led by General Vang Pao. Consists of Meo, Thai, Cambodian, and Burmese mercenaries. Used in harassing guerrilla-style operations. The existence of this army was uncovered by U.S. newspapers in late 1969. *Pathet Lao*: 20,000 men. These are Laotian communist forces, heavily supported by the Meo and Kha tribesmen. *North Vietnamese Army*: 40-50,000 men in Laos.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Laos is made up of many tribal groupings owing little allegiance to the central government. From the early 18th century, the country was divided into three kingdoms. It was united after the Second World War and attained independence in 1954. Laos had enjoyed peace and independence only when her two neighbors, Thailand and Vietnam, were in equilibrium or were too weak to extend into Laotian territory. The central government has never been effective—territory has been carved up among rival warlords.

The cold war imposed a pattern of left-right confrontation on the divided Laotian scene. From 1954, the U.S. built up a pro-American government and military force centered in Vientiane, based on the old Laotian nobility and a new military-commercial class oriented primarily toward U.S. aid.

The North Vietnamese gave aid and ad-

visors to the Pathet Lao, the leftist liberation movement formed in 1950 to combat the French attempt to reimpose colonial control in Indochina. The Pathet Lao organized mainly in the countryside. Combining a nationalist appeal with efforts to improve the quality of rural life, the Pathet Lao gained control over about half of Laos by the mid-1950's.

In 1962, the conflict between the two having reached a serious level, an agreement was reached at an international conference in Geneva guaranteeing the independence and neutrality of Laos. The Geneva Conference did not long interrupt the mutual build-up of pro- and anti-U.S. forces in Laos. The coalition government of rightist, neutralist and leftist factions installed in the wake of the Geneva Conference was increasingly dominated by the pro-U.S. elements under Souvanna Phouma. Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese forces grew each year.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

When the U.S. made its major troop commitments to Vietnam in 1965, it stepped up the bombing (begun in 1964) of both the Ho Chi Minh trail in eastern Laos and Pathet Lao territory in the north. After November, 1968, when the bombing of North Vietnam was ended, the U.S. sharply increased the amount of bombing within Laos, reaching at times as many as 20,000 sorties a month. The bombing was intended not only to interdict the Ho Chi Minh trail, but to force the residents of northern and eastern Laos to evacuate in order to deprive the North Vietnamese troops of rice and labor.

Throughout the Laotian War, the Plain of Jars has served as a buffer area between the Ho Chi Minh trail in the east and the pro-U.S. forces in the west, centered on Armees Clandestine headquarters at Long Cheng and on the capital, Vientiane. The Plain of Jars changed hands regularly, without great casualties to either side. In 1969, the Armees Clandestine attacked Pathet Lao troops and drove them to the eastern edge of the Plain of Jars. In a counter-offensive in early 1970, the Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese troops drove farther west than customary, taking Sam Thong, a U.S.-run refugee center and supply point, and threatening Long Cheng. Their purpose was apparently to try to protect their strategic interest in the Ho Chi Minh trail by forcing the Vientiane government to ask the U.S. to stop the bombing. The Pathet Lao offered to enter a new coalition on this condition but the offer was not accepted.

On March 6, as a result of the escalation of the war in Laos and newspaper revelations about the U.S. role there, President Nixon made a statement minimizing the extent of U.S. involvement in Laos. Corrections were later issued showing a greater U.S. presence than originally stated. Nixon stated the U.S. would not expand its involvement in Laos.

Throughout its recent history, Laos has been a pawn in the struggle between the U.S. and North Vietnam. North Vietnam would view control over Laos by a hostile foreign power as a serious strategic threat to her security.

NATURE OF AMERICAN POLICY

The U.S. policy over the last fifteen years has been to expand its own presence in Laos in order to threaten and contain North Vietnam and to protect Thailand from the threat which a communist neighbor would supposedly represent. In recent years, most counter-insurgency techniques used in Vietnam have been applied to Laos, with the exception of an actual U.S. combat troop commitment. The most intensive aerial bombardment in history has been the main military effort by the U.S. But on the ground, as in Vietnam, villagers have been put into controlled compounds to keep them from contact with the Pathet Lao. The Plain of Jars, once the home of 150,000 people, has been entirely evacuated.

THE COST OF THE WAR IN LAOS

The cost in lives and equipment to the U.S. has been great. Just under 400 men are listed as dead or missing in Laos and 300 to 400 planes have been destroyed.

To the Laotians the cost is much greater. Though there are no statistics on the Laotian dead, one can safely assume that the number will reach into the thousands. Moreover, according to Souvanna Phouma, the pro-U.S. Prime Minister, the war has generated 600,000 refugees, about 20% of the population.

Politically, the American intervention has destroyed the possibilities for Laotian neutrality. The American presence has exacerbated imbalances in Laotian political and has prevented indigenous political forces from coming to terms with one another. American support for the right wing has undermined tendencies to arrive at neutralist, coalition solutions. Instead the American presence has precipitated a bloody conflict among political factions.

BOMBING IN INDOCHINA: A MILITARY-POLITICAL ANALYSIS

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University).

There is now some controversy over the bombing policy of the United States in Indochina: Should the U.S. continue its present bombing in Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam? Should we resume the bombing of North Vietnam? Should we escalate our bombing to a higher level than before? In our first year we dropped more than a ton of bombs for every "enemy soldier" in Vietnam. By 1968 we had dropped twelve tons of bombs for every square mile in North and South Vietnam. How has it been rationalized?

TO THE CONFERENCE TABLE

Bombing North Vietnam was often described as putting pressure on that country to negotiate. The Vietnamese react to such pressure much as the British did in World War II. Rather than seeing this as a sign of strength, Ho Chi Minh called our bombing "the agony convulsions of a grievously wounded wild beast." The war is in the villages and jungles; taking to the air is seen as a frustrated turning away from the real battlefield.

Bombing is seen as an escalation that requires greater effort in opposition. Our President coupled peace offers with bombing escalation as a warning that the enemy had better talk on our terms. Hanoi saw the repeated coincidence of peace talks and escalation as an attempt to dampen the hostile reaction every escalation was sure to bring. For three years we escalated the bombing; not until our bombing was curtailed did negotiations begin.

TO THE STONE AGE

It has been suggested that total destruction of enemy war-production plants and supply depots would render the enemy incapable of making war. Actually the U.S. did destroy such targets in North Vietnam by August 1967 and found that the NLF could still wage war in the South quite effectively. At that time the only remaining industry in North Vietnam was either invulnerable (e.g. underground) or, according to Secretary McNamara, not worth bombing. Guerrilla warfare was no less effective in the Stone Age.

CUTTING THE SUPPLY LINES

Much argument has been based on the assumption that war in the South depends on constant large-scale supplies from the North—perhaps a projection of our own method of making war. Defense intelligence indicated in 1967 that forces in the South only needed 15 tons of supplies per day, and that the pipeline capacity is over 200 tons per day. Since transport is often by sampan or modified bicycle (600 lbs/bike), it is unlikely that saturation bombing could close

off the war in the South. The negative results of U.S. bombing between 1965-68 bear this out.

TO THE CITIES

Since the countryside belongs to our enemy, we have long tried saturation bombing of the countryside (Laos and South Vietnam) both to destroy the enemy's territory and to force the people into the cities. In this manner the Plain of Jars has been depopulated. Since urbanization is assumed to be an index of modernization, the resulting statistics have been used to demonstrate U.S. success in "developing" South Vietnam. This policy has the tendency to politicize previously uninvolved young peasants who suddenly see reason to fight for the liberation of their country. Pentagon figures show a tripling of the number of Southerners recruited by the NFL following the initiation of U.S. bombing in 1965.

In Laos and South Vietnam some 20-25% of the population—now numbering in the millions—have been uprooted. The refugee problem may be the most serious both during and after the war.

INTO A MUD PUDDLE

Barry Goldwater's suggestion that we bomb Haiphong into a mud puddle is not a new one. Congress asked Secretary McNamara about bombing the harbor back in 1967, and he demonstrated statistically that offshore landings could easily and invulnerably handle the load now being shipped to Haiphong.

There would of course be the danger of bombing a Russian or Chinese ship. Remember the *Maine*.

SOME NEGATIVE EFFECTS

Its own economy disrupted, North Vietnam is now much more firmly wedded to the support and the policies of the Soviet Union and more especially the Peoples' Republic of China.

Escalation is risked in 1) accidental bombings in China (some planes have been shot down over Chinese territory), 2) threatening total destruction of a buffer state necessary to China's security, and 3) involving other countries like Thailand, currently used as bases for our bombing missions.

The simple cost of the material we've lost in North Vietnam is, according to Secretary MacNamara, five times the value of the targets we've destroyed.

Mass destruction of a people and their land turns that people and the whole world against us. General Gavin, now a businessman, testifies that this has now reached the point where it even hurts American trade in Europe.

Even in crass military and political terms, bombing fails to accomplish its alleged ends. In humanitarian terms, it represents a policy of deliberate, concentrated destruction unparalleled in history—a policy which threatens to destroy both the land and its people.

TO THE ABSURD

There is no doubt that the United States could do major damage to the people and the country of North Vietnam. Such civilian-directed measures as the use of nuclear weapons or bombing the Red River dikes would betray an unrestrained policy or purely military conquest, in clear disregard for international law. It would unquestionably jolt the world into active opposition to the U.S., and would quite possibly bring Russia and China into the war. In any event, this is but one more strategy based on the assumption that destroying the North would somehow disable the Southerners from continuing their struggle.

REFERENCES

1. Hearings of the Armed Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Armed Services, August 1967.

2. Harrison Salisbury, *Behind the Lines: Hanoi*.

ALTERNATIVES FOR U.S. MILITARY POLICY IN VIETNAM

(A fact sheet issued by the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, Harvard University.)

What are the alternatives for the U.S. in Indochina today? What are the pros and cons of the various alternatives?

1. Step up military pressure on the Communists, bombing or invading their sanctuaries to force them to respect South Vietnam's territorial integrity.

Pro. The U.S. should not accept a military defeat. We have overwhelming power which can be brought to bear in order to save our world prestige. Anything less than victory will encourage communists around the world to attempt aggression and subversion.

Con. The U.S. has no national interest in Vietnam. The only reason to step up military investment in that area is to save face. The cost in lives and money, in domestic dissent and inflation is too great when the purpose is so minor. Bombing has proved to harden rather than weaken the resolve of the North Vietnamese while an invasion of the north is likely to cause China to enter the war against us, a war we could never win. It is not true that our withdrawal from Vietnam would cause other nations to lose respect for us; rather our present policy is losing us friends throughout the world. The loss of Vietnam or all of Indochina does not affect one way or another the problem of aggression and subversion elsewhere in the world.

2. Withdraw most of the U.S. forces in Vietnam, leaving about 200,000 U.S. troops to support the South Vietnamese Army to fight the Communists (Vietnamization).

Pro. This will prevent a communist takeover of South Vietnam. It will demonstrate the U.S. determination to keep its commitments around the world and will enhance our national prestige.

Con. This policy will simply mean an indefinite continuation of the war in Vietnam. Despite U.S. government propaganda, Vietnamization has been shown to be a failure by the use of U.S. troops to invade Cambodia even though the III Corps area from which the invasion was launched was supposedly fully Vietnamized. The South Vietnamese army has proven incapable of defeating the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese with U.S. help and so could hardly do so without it. The continued U.S. presence will simply add to the Viet Cong's nationalist appeal. The open-ended involvement will constitute a continuing drain on our national resources and will continue to cause domestic dissent. Furthermore, the 200,000 young Americans in Vietnam will be hostages to the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese army, who might eventually outnumber and surround them.

3. Withdraw slowly (over two years or so) and completely.

Pro. This will give the South Vietnamese an adequate opportunity to pull themselves together and thus demonstrate that the U.S. will keep its commitments to its allies. By withdrawing slowly, we can plan our moves in such a way as to guarantee the safety of the U.S. troops who remain near the end. Even if the National Liberation Front does win as a result of this policy, it will not harm the national interest. Fears of a bloodbath are highly exaggerated since there was no bloodbath when the Viet Minh took over North Vietnam, rumors to the contrary notwithstanding. If South Vietnam cannot stand on its own within two years, the U.S. cannot do anything about it.

Con. 1. The ultimate result of this policy will be a communist takeover and a bloodbath of those South Vietnamese who associated themselves with us. This will harm U.S. prestige around the world.

2. There is no point delaying our withdrawal for another two years. Vietnamiza-

tion is a sham. The South Vietnamese have had their chance and they obviously are not interested enough in defeating the Viet Cong to get together and do it. Meanwhile the cost in lives and dollars continues to mount. (See also *Pro* argument for alternative 4.)

4. Withdraw immediately.

Pro. We lost the war in Vietnam long ago and there is no way to win it now. It is not worth a single life to prolong our presence there as a way of trying to paper over the fact that we have lost. The Vietnamization policy simply prolongs the destruction of Vietnam's society and people which has been the result of U.S. policy all along. The primary desire of the South Vietnamese people now is for a regime which brings peace and security and which does not ally itself with foreigners. China's view of the U.S. bases in South Vietnam as a threat to her security, and Hanoi's desire to see Vietnam unified are legitimate, while U.S. intervention has always been unjustified.

Con. The U.S. will suffer a severe loss of face if it withdraws from South Vietnam immediately, and our friends in that country will be purged by the Communists.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Essential

Schell, Jonathan, *Village of Ben Suc* (Vintage, 1967, \$1.65). *The Military Half* (Vintage, 1968, \$1.65).

Draper, Theodore, *Abuse of Power* (Viking, 1966, \$1.95). No one should vote or even take a position on this war without first reading these three books. The Schell books can be read in a couple of hours, and give an excellent picture of the ground war (Ben Suc) and the war in the air (Military Half). Draper gives a narrative history of our involvement, focusing on America's expressed rationale for its activities.

Sources

Gettleman, Marvin, *Vietnam*, (Fawcett Crest, 1965, \$95).

Raskin, Marcus, and Fall, Bernard, *Vietnam Reader* (Vintage, 1965, \$2.45). Both excellent. Gettleman deals more extensively with narration of Vietnamese history. Raskin and Fall concentrate on government Documents and Statements, especially United States.

General

Shaplen, Robert, *Time Out of Hand*; (Harper Colophon, 1969, \$2.95).

Kahin, George McT., *The Government and Politics of S.E. Asia*, Cornell University Press, 1959.

Hall, D. G. E., *A History of Southeast Asia*, N.Y.: St. Martin's Press, 1955.

Vietnam

Lewis, John and Kahin, George, *The United States in Vietnam*, (Delta, 1967, 1969, \$2.95).

Fall, *The Two Vietnams*, (2nd Rev. ed., Praeger, 1967).

Lacouture, Jean, *Vietnam: Between Two Truces*, (Vintage, 1966, \$1.95). Lewis and Kahin is best for the general reader, includes Appendix of most important documents.

The Americans

Schoenbrun, David, *How We Got In, How To Get Out—General Explanation by former CBS newsmen*, (Atheneum, 1968).

Schlesinger, Arthur, *The Bitter Heritage*, (Fawcett Premier, 1966, 7, 8, \$75). Brief narration of U.S. involvement.

Pfeffer, Richard M., *No More Vietnam?* (Harper Colophon, 1968, \$1.95). A number of prominent scholars of Asian and U.S. government affairs discuss mechanics of U.S. decision to intervene and implications for the future.

Schurmann, Scott and Zelnick, *Politics of Escalation in Vietnam*, (Fawcett Premier, 1969, \$60). Thorough analysis of U.S. escalation, U.S. peace moves and their coincidence.

White, Ralph, *Nobody Wanted War*, (Doubleday Anchor, 1968, 1970, \$1.95). A discussion of misperceptions that led to war.

Goulden, Joseph, *Truth is the First Casualty*. The history of misinformation.

Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America* (Dutton and Co., 1968, \$2.95). U.S. war atrocities.

Russell, Bertrand, *War Crimes in Vietnam*, (Monthly Review Press, 1967, \$.95). Initiator of War Crime Tribunal.

Zinn, Howard, *Vietnam: the logic of Withdrawal* (Beacon Press, 1967).

Vietnamese

Pike, Douglas, *Viet Cong* (MIT Press, 1966, \$2.95). A USIS official with many unfounded conclusions, hostile, but detailed account. Facts are reliable, but interpretations are open to question. Still a good source on NLF policies and programs.

Meyerson, Harvey, *Vinh Long* (Houghton Mifflin, 1970, \$5.95). Vinh Long is a village as little affected by the war as any. With Ben Suc, a good picture of the range of local situations in South Vietnam.

Burchett, Wilfred, *Vietnam: Inside Story* (International, 1965), \$1.95. Unique experience in NLF controlled areas and North Vietnam. Also author of numerous other books on Indochina.

Salisbury, Harrison, *Behind the Lines: Hanoi* (Bantam, 1967, \$.95).

Ashmore, Harry S. and Baggs, William C., *Mission to Hanoi* (Berkeley, 1968, \$.95). Reports on effects of bombing and on North Vietnamese positions and attitudes. All are editors of prominent American newspapers.

Fall, Bernard, ed., *Ho Chi Minh: On Revolution* (Praeger, 1967). An anthology of Ho's writings.

Lacouture, Jean, *Ho Chi Minh: A Political Biography* (Vintage, 1968). A biography.

Laos

Dommen, Arthur, *Conflict in Laos*, (Praeger, 1965, \$5.95).

Fall, Bernard, *Anatomy of a Crisis*, (Doubleday, 1969, \$6.95).

Toye, Hugh, *Laos: Buffer State or Battleground*, Oxford University Press, 1968.

Peter Dale Scott in *New York Review of Books*, May 9, 1970.

Cambodia

Lelfer, M., *Cambodia: The Search for Security* (N.Y.: Praeger, 1967).

Herz, M., *A Short History of Cambodia*, (N.Y.: Praeger, 1958).

Smith, Roger M., *Cambodia's Foreign Policy*, (Ithaca: Cornell Press, 1965).

Armstrong, John P., *Sihanouk Speaks*, (N.Y.: Walker & Co., 1964).

Burchett, W. G., *Mekong Upstream*, (Hanoi: Red River Publishing House, 1957).

Devillers, P., "Cambodia" in Saul Rose, ed., *Politics in S.E. Asia*, (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1963).

Smith, R. M., "Cambodia" in George McT. Kahin's *Governments and Politics of S.E. Asia* (2nd ed., Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1964).

Osborne, Milton, *The French Presence in Cochinchina and Cambodia*, (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1969).

NEW GLORY FOR OLD GLORY

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the National Institute of Drycleaning will this year again sponsor a "New Glory for Old Glory" campaign. During this cam-

aign, cleaners are urged to clean American flags at no charge. The institute will provide special posters for participating cleaners to display in their windows stating that flags will be cleaned free from June 1 to 12.

On June 14, 1777, the Congress of the United States resolved "that the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the Union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation." This was the origin of the national flag.

Today, 193 years later, Americans continue to revere their flag. Old Glory, the symbol of a fledgling Republic, has come to be synonymous with freedom wherever the flag and the men who fight for it may be.

Encouraging the flying of the flag has become an annual project for drycleaners in conjunction with the American Legion. This year is the 17th year of the "New Glory for Old Glory" campaign.

During the 2-week period prior to Flag Day, June 14, drycleaners are being urged to encourage their customers to keep Old Glory waving more proudly than ever, not only on its birthday but throughout the year.

This campaign has blossomed into prominence in many communities in recent years. The American Legion has been most cooperative and annually asks its local posts to cooperate with local drycleaners who are willing to dryclean the flag free during the 2 weeks prior to Flag Day.

The program was first conducted jointly in 1954 by the Detrex Corp.—a manufacturer of drycleaning equipment—and the American Legion. The corporation sent letters to drycleaners urging them to cooperate with American Legion posts in their communities by cleaning American flags free of charge during the period June 1-12, prior to Flag Day, June 14. The object of the program was to obtain maximum display of the flag on June 14.

Cleaners are being urged to contact their local papers to inform them of the "New Glory" campaign, and to work with local American Legion officials to obtain proclamations from local officials recognizing Flag Day, and asking local citizens to participate by displaying flags.

U.S. AIDES IN SAIGON QUESTION POLICY

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, despite the statement of the President last night that recent U.S. activities in Cambodia have been "the most successful operation of this long and difficult war, there remains a good deal of questioning on the part of concerned citizens and experienced American observers as to whether the new forays into a previously neutral country will contribute at all to a peace.

The President told the American people that all our military objectives have

been achieved. This is most doubtful since there was no mention in the President's talk about the Communist headquarters that the President had previously indicated was a prime target. But beyond the immediate tactical consideration it has become increasingly clear that the war in Indochina is not subject to a military solution.

It is highly probable that our forays into Cambodia will not guarantee a swifter peace; indeed, peace and our withdrawal from the area may both receive a setback.

Terence Smith, chief of the Saigon bureau of the New York Times, who has just completed a 15-month assignment in South Vietnam addresses himself to just this problem in an article appearing in the New York Times, Wednesday, June 3. I include that article in the RECORD so that my colleagues might have the benefit of Mr. Smith's thoughts on this critical matter:

U.S. AIDES IN SAIGON QUESTION POLICY

(By Terence Smith)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 1.—There is widespread doubt among the most experienced American observers in South Vietnam that current United States policies will bring lasting peace.

Although 110,000 American troops have been withdrawn from Vietnam and enormous strides have been made in pacification in the last 18 months, the United States still faces vast problems in extricating itself.

At the root of the pessimistic outlook are serious and widely held doubts about the following:

The efficacy of the Vietnamization program, which has yet to face major challenges.

The wisdom of the extension of the war into Cambodia, which, despite the immediate military gains it may achieve, seems likely to complicate American efforts to disengage and may eventually involve the United States—step by painful step—in the defense of yet another weak and uncertain government.

The effectiveness of the Saigon Government in dealing with increasingly serious economic and political problems in South Vietnam.

The nature of the progress achieved in the pacification program, which remains fragile and subject to the enemy's will.

Finally, there is a conviction that United States policies fail to come to grips with the central element in the Vietnam puzzle: the need for a negotiated political settlement that reflects the true balance of power among the Vietnamese people.

"We won't solve this war by cleaning out the base areas in Cambodia, or even by replacing American troops with South Vietnamese," an American who has spent five years in Vietnam said the other day.

"We have to go to the heart of the matter and find an acceptable way of distributing political power among the Vietnamese. That's what the fighting is all about, and it won't stop until we solve it."

The skepticism about American policy is shared in many quarters in Vietnam—by young, dedicated Americans working at the province and district level, and by independent observers, including journalists and foreign diplomats. It is greatest among those whose jobs permit them to travel around Vietnam.

The attitude is also evident among educated, independent South Vietnamese, people outside the Government who are deeply concerned about the future of their country after the American disengagement.

A TRACE OF BITTERNESS

Through the remarks of all those people runs a common theme: No lasting peace is possible without a political solution.

"Vietnamization, by itself, won't produce any kind of peace in this country, just or otherwise," a 31-year-old major who works as a district adviser in the pacification program said recently with more than a trace of bitterness.

"Unless it is matched by some sort of political settlement, Vietnamization just means that the fighting will go on and on. But instead of Americans killing Vietnamese, you'll have Vietnamese killing Vietnamese."

Many people here, like the major, acknowledge that Vietnamization will eventually get American soldiers off the battlefield—though not necessarily out of the country—but they insist that it will not end the war or produce a just peace.

Behind that belief is the conviction that the enemy continues to have the necessary strength, spirit, manpower and determination to continue the struggle in South Vietnam—and Laos and Cambodia for the foreseeable future. Few military men here dispute that assessment of the Communists' capability.

LOST IN THE FUROR

President Nixon's offer, in his address April 20, to discuss at the Paris peace talks "a fair political solution [reflecting] the existing relationship of political forces in South Vietnam" had barely begun to sink in when it was lost in the furor cause by the invasion of Cambodia 10 days later. It may have been, as one American here described it, "the first casualty of Nixon's decision to go into Cambodia."

The senior members of the American military command are visibly defensive about the Cambodian operation and the controversy it has caused. They insist that it was a military justifiable tactical operation that got caught up in larger strategic and political questions.

Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, commander of United States forces in Vietnam, has indicated to friends that he feels that President Nixon drastically oversold the operation and enlarged its goals beyond realization dimensions.

The general has said that the real purpose was to put a dent in the enemy's supply system and not, as Mr. Nixon suggested, to overrun and clean out the Communist headquarters.

The greatest peril in the Cambodian venture seems to lie in the period after June 30, when the Americans have withdrawn and the South Vietnamese are likely to continue their operations. The consensus here is that the President is going to find it far harder to get Americans out of Cambodia than it was to send them in.

CHOICE FOR AMERICANS

In the short run the Americans may be faced with the choice of either going to the aid of the South Vietnamese or watching them flounder if they come under heavy pressure. In the long run the United States could find itself committed by proxy, as a result of South Vietnamese pledges and actions, to the defense of the shaky Government headed by Premier Lon Nol, which displaced Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

If the South Vietnamese become overextended in Cambodia, the Americans are going to find it correspondingly difficult to carry out their withdrawals from Vietnam on schedule.

Apart from the complications of the Cambodian venture, Vietnamization faces other serious problems. So far a total of 110,000 Americans have been pulled out of Vietnam, leaving 429,000 behind. The real test will come in the next year, during which 150,000

more will have been withdrawn and the South Vietnamese are to take on the heavy fighting.

The first and most obvious danger is military. For the last four years the large American combat divisions have effectively manned the front lines. They have pursued the main North Vietnamese and Vietcong units relentlessly, gradually driving them from populated areas into the jungles and mountains along the Laotian and Cambodian borders.

As Vietnamization advances, the South Vietnamese divisions will take on the task while the remaining American units fall back into something approaching garrison duty. Their safety and that of an additional 250,000 or more Americans providing combat and logistical support will depend on the South Vietnamese.

HIGHER TOLL FORESEEN

Even conceding substantial improvement in the quality of the South Vietnamese armed forces, it is hard to imagine them coping with divisions of North Vietnamese regulars as effectively as the Americans did. The result may be significantly increased casualties—American as well as South Vietnamese—in the later stages of the withdrawal process.

Another consequence may be strikingly reduced security in certain areas of the countryside, most notably in the northern half of the country.

In the northernmost area, I Corps, the enemy has more than 20 battalions of fresh, well-equipped regulars in the vicinity of the demilitarized zone, and it has the capacity to reinforce them with up to three divisions at any time.

When the three divisions of Americans that are stationed there are withdrawn, the South Vietnamese will have to take on the job of patrolling along the demilitarized zone and protecting the coastal cities of Quangtri, Hue and Danang. At the very least, they will require reinforcements, and it is not clear from where additional troops would come.

There is a parallel situation in II Corps, the area south of the border region, where mountainous terrain and bad communications are a tangible asset for the enemy.

As a result of years of intensive allied operations, the Communists have been pushed from the heavily populated coastal plain into the mountains. Once the Americans are gone the South Vietnamese may be hard-pressed to keep them there.

IMPACT ON SHAKY ECONOMY

Vietnamization will also have a drastic impact on South Vietnam's already shaky economic structure. The country earns more than 90 per cent of its foreign currency from Defense Department outlays and private spending by American soldiers. As the withdrawal proceeds the supply of dollars will be cut back just when they are most needed to bolster a sorely weakened economy.

In addition, the approximately 145,000 Vietnamese who are directly employed by United States agencies and companies will have to find jobs.

Those bleak prospects are considered by knowledgeable people here to be a principal threat to the stability of the Government of President Ngu-yen Van Thieu.

The domestic political and economic situation has deteriorated dramatically in recent months. While the attention of the world has been riveted on Cambodia, Mr. Thieu has been coping with just about the noisiest political crisis since his election.

Rather than working to rally his non-Communist political opposition behind him, as the United States Embassy has been urging him to do lately, President Thieu has come

down hard on any group that has challenged his authority or criticized his regime. Individuals with the temerity to speak out have been prosecuted and jailed. Groups that have expressed their complaints in public demonstrations have been tear-gassed and beaten by riot policemen.

Now there is a rising tide of criticism of the Government in newspapers and the National Assembly that can only be expected to increase during the Senate election this fall and the presidential contest next year.

In addition, Mr. Thieu has failed to create anything approximating a national party might be capable of mobilizing the country in preparation for a political battle with the Communists. Instead, his basic distrust of politicians—he was a general—and his reluctance to share power remain as great as ever. As for the pacification program, there can be no question that enormous strides have been made during the last 18 months in the effort to extend the Government's control into the countryside. There is general agreement that the current program, which is the result of years of experimentation, mistakes and disappointments, is functioning better than any of its hapless forerunners.

But the progress in certain provinces has been counterbalanced by setbacks in others. A proper pacification map of Vietnam would resemble a patchwork quilt, a mixture of bright and dark patches that produce a mottled impression over all.

The combination of problems—military, economic and political—guarantees that the American disengagement, particularly during the next year, will be a painful and troubled process.

UNITED STATES TALKING BILLIONS, BUT SPENDING PENNIES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the June 1970 issue of the Mid-Atlantic Sportsman carried an article which was headlined, "United States Talking Billions, But Spending Pennies." The article, by Wheeler Johnson, goes on to discuss the grossly inadequate funding requests for various environmentally related programs.

So that my colleagues will have an opportunity to read this excellent article, I include its text at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

UNITED STATES TALKING BILLIONS, BUT SPENDING PENNIES

(By Wheeler Johnson)

Exactly one year ago this Mid-Atlantic Sportsman column complained . . . "evidence begins to mount that this administration hardly will be listed as the great friend of the conservationist."

We went on to point out that the administration was recommending a \$30 million whack in the Federal share of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, bringing its portion down to \$124 million. The fund provides matching aid to states and localities in building waste treatment plants.

We also pointed out that there was a big backlog of authorizations under the fund including about \$6 million for Maryland, and none of the local governments had seen more than a minor part of the Federal Government's promised share.

Only two months later, August, 1969, we

reinforced the prophecy that the Nixon administration wouldn't win many paeans on its positive actions to save the environment. This was in connection with Assistant Secretary of the Interior Carl L. Klein's statement that states and localities must clean up their own waste because the administration's war on inflation left no money for pollution control.

FORECAST IS TOO GOOD

We wish we hadn't been such good prophets. In the ensuing months the administration has been talking a helluva game on saving the environment. Conservationally they've been tossing more billions around for corrective projects than one can count. But when it comes time to actually put the money up, this hot air cash disappears like most hot air—polluted hot air at that.

So here we are back to the clean water thing again.

The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 calls for an expenditure of \$1.25 billion during fiscal 1971. Great, but the Nixon administration has not asked for one thin dime under this legislation for the fiscal year. It has its own plans and that's right where the ball game is going to be lost, unless great pressure is brought to bear to see that, at least, the money already authorized is turned loose.

\$4 BILLION BILL OFFERED

The administration has introduced a bill that would provide \$4 billion over four years to be allocated on the basis of \$1 billion per year. This would be \$250 million less for 1971 than the original authorization.

Many observers agree that there is much to be said for four or five year advance federal commitments to states and localities for funds to construct badly needed waste treatment plants.

But they think of several things. They remember that this same administration asked for only \$200 million for this program for fiscal 1970 when Congress had authorized \$1 billion. They recall that this is an election year and they seriously doubt that anyone could get an extended funding bill through Congress in an election year.

PROGRAM COULD END

If all the eggs are placed in the administration's \$4-billion-for-the-future basket, the entire funding program could come to a halt. If Congress fails to clear a Public Works Appropriations bill by the beginning of the new fiscal year, July 1, 1970, it must approve a continuing resolution to appropriate at the level of the preceding year, or at the proposed figure for 1971, whichever is least.

Last year, when the administration asked only \$200 million for the program out of an authorized billion, some members of Congress and environmental groups throughout the country were so upset it led to formation of the Citizens' Crusade for Clean Waters. They managed to put on such pressure that Congress finally appropriated \$800 million.

Now the Crusade is back in business in an effort to see that the full \$1.25 billion is appropriated for fiscal 1971. The Crusade is a coalition of 34 non-governmental organizations concerned about water pollution control, with Louis S. Clapper, conservation director for the National Wildlife Federation, as coordinator.

Clapper reports that his group had written President Nixon on March 30, urging full funding of the Federal Construction Grants Program. The reply came from a Budget Bureau spokesman on April 9, which said that the President's proposed four-year commitment of \$4 billion "is the best means for the Federal Government to demonstrate that it is serious about meeting our water pollution control needs."

In the light of the Nixon administration's past performances in this direction, some of us doubt that this is so.

RICHARD K. MELLON: PITTSBURGH
RENAISSANCE LEADER

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have lost a strong and progressive leader, Richard K. Mellon. The son of Richard Beatty Mellon and the nephew of Secretary of the Treasury Andrew W. Mellon, Dick Mellon devoted a great part of his time and energy to the civic development and renaissance of the city of Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania. He was a great assistance to our educational institutions and the fine arts.

Born and raised in Pittsburgh, Dick Mellon attended the Shady Side Academy in Pittsburgh and Culver Military Academy in Indiana. He entered Princeton University, but his education there was cut short by his service in World War I.

Following the death of his father in 1934, Dick Mellon was elected president of the Mellon National Bank of Pittsburgh. By 1937 he held directorships in 34 corporations, and his fine abilities in finance, management, and business are recognized nationwide. He was active in T. Mellon and Sons, Mellon National Bank, Gulf Oil Corp., Aluminum Company of America to mention a few.

Dick Mellon returned to U.S. military service during World War II as a major. He advanced to the rank of lieutenant colonel and was Assistant Chief of Staff of the War Department's International Division in Washington, D.C. For performance of his duties in that office he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. Discharged in 1945 with the rank of colonel he continued as an officer in the Army Reserve Corps, and earned promotions. In 1961 he retired from the Reserves with the rank of lieutenant general.

Following World War II military service, Dick Mellon returned to Pittsburgh and gave the outstanding leadership on the programs which brought about the renaissance of the city of Pittsburgh. Under his leadership, legislation on smoke control, sewage disposal, and better highways passed the State legislature and within 2 years the smog ridden city of Pittsburgh saw the dawn of clean, clear days, which exist to this day.

New buildings sprang up from old railroad yards, open squares with trees and flowers flourished, and Pittsburgh has become a beautiful and successful city. Along with renaissance came civic pride, and many individuals and corporations have joined in the revitalization of the city and western Pennsylvania.

A friendly and quiet man, Dick Mellon did not seek publicity or praise. He made his home in the beautiful and historic Ligonier Valley, among the mountains, horses, and fishing streams he loved.

Dick Mellon leaves his family, and indeed all the citizens of Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania a wonderful legacy of public service and civic responsibility. As a long time admirer and friend, I join with my fellow Pennsylvanians in extending to Mrs. Mellon and the whole Mellon family my deep sympathy in their loss which is shared by us all.

AD HOC COMMITTEE OF NONACADEMIC ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS AGAINST THE WAR

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today approximately 250 eminent industrial and other nonacademic engineers and scientists visited Washington to express their deep concern about the war in Vietnam and Cambodia, as well as the administration's policy toward scientific research and development. This effort was organized in 10 days by concerned professionals employed in such large industrial firms as IBM, General Electric, and RCA, as well as Brookhaven National Laboratory, as a spontaneous reflection of their distress about the direction of our country.

Among the participants in their panel which, along with the rest of the delegation, met with Members of Congress were the following: Dr. Edward Ramberg, research physicist, RCA Research Laboratory, Princeton, N.J.; Dr. Ralph Alpher and Dr. M. Fiske, physicists, General Electric Research and Development Center, Schenectady, N.Y.; Dr. R. Hanne-man, research staff, General Electric; Dr. Seymour Koenig, director, IBM Watson Laboratory, New York City; Dr. Donald Streeter, director, computing systems department, IBM Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, N.Y.; Dr. Harry Palevsky, senior physicist and group leader, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, N.Y.; Dr. Alice Mary Hilton, author and consultant on computing machines; Dr. J. Tie-man, electrical engineer, General Electric.

I should like to commend all of those who participated in this visit to Washington for their significant contribution to the dialog which is taking place all over our country. This action of a responsible group of senior scientists should remind Members of Congress that the opposition to our continuing involvement in Indochina and the demand for a re-ordering of our national priorities is widespread, existing in all segments of our society. I urge my colleagues to read and reread the following statement which was presented today by Dr. Harry Palev-

sky, senior physicist at Brookhaven National Laboratory, on behalf of the delegation of scientists and engineers for peace:

STATEMENT BY DR. HARRY POLEVSKY

We are here today as concerned human beings, citizens and engineers and scientists, to call on Congress, on the President, and on all Americans to join in ending the war in Indochina. In particular, we urge Congress to adopt the "Amendment to End the War" introduced by Senators Hatfield, McGovern, Goodell, Hughes, and Cranston.

We are deeply troubled. We see our nation diverted in its drive toward social justice and general economic well being. We see students and our fellow workers losing faith in the ultimate value of the application of their skills. We see many promising young people turning from our professions in disillusionment.

We see our country, once the major advocate of peace on earth, turning more and more to force to achieve its objectives.

As professionals, whose careers are dedicated to reason and the power of the human mind, we decry the atmosphere of hysteria and anti-intellectualism that the war has engendered.

With our country in a tragic crisis, we deem it our moral duty as thoughtful citizens to speak our minds on the Indochina war.

The weakened Constitutional checks and balances between the Legislative and Executive Branches of government, made possible an imprudent involvement in the Vietnam war and its escalation throughout Indochina.

Personal lives have been torn by the moral decay and polarization caused by the war. Our indiscriminate use of violence on an international level has fostered a domestic reliance on force which is destroying the fabric of our society.

As a first step toward improving this serious situation, Congress must reassert its Constitutional Rights and Powers by immediate adoption of the Amendment to End the War. Moreover, reduction of military expenditures is necessary so that engineers and scientists can attack the problems of the environment, not military problems; so that skilled craftsmen can build homes instead of missile sites; so that doctors can tend the sick instead of more wounded; so that all people can turn their talents and energies to constructive rather than destructive ends.

The problems of our cities, our economy, and our environment, and the alienation of our youth can be dealt with only if we turn from making war to building peace. We believe that moderation and moral leadership on the part of the United States Government will lead to moderation and morality at home and in the world.

CLARENCE A. BARNES

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Clarence A. Barnes, who served as attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from 1945 to 1948, leaves a great void in Massachusetts political and legal circles. He was a brilliant lawyer, an advocate and defender of both popular and controversial causes toward which he generally had strong and deep-felt convictions. As the Attleboro Sun asserts, he

was "a man of positive opinion, political acumen, and legal keenness." He was much more.

He was a power in Republican Party politics, both in the State and nationally, for more than 50 years. He lived most of his life in Mansfield, in the 10th Congressional District which I serve, where his political career began in 1907 when he was elected to the board of selectmen. He was later a State representative.

He served on the Governor's council, as I did also, before his election to two terms as attorney general. He was one of the members of the Governor's council to whom I could point with great pride.

I think Clarence Barnes was a truly remarkable man, and I want to extend my condolences to his wife, Doreen, his surviving eight children, his grandchildren, and to other members of the family.

I think it appropriate that the Attleboro Sun's editorial, which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, takes note of some of his outstanding political and legal accomplishments and adds the fact that "he was equally as astute in defending a fellow townsman, if he were called upon."

Clarence Barnes was a great legal defender of individual rights. He was best known for his successful defense of a Boston police commissioner, Eugene C. Hultman, who then-Governor Curley tried to remove from office. But he was always ready to defend the little man, and his clients included the ordinary citizen and his Mansfield neighbors.

For more than 30 years he was active in Mansfield's civic, political and legal affairs, serving as town moderator and town counsel as well as on the board of selectmen. The editorial makes clear the respect he enjoyed.

While many fascinating aspects of his life could be related, his interest in sports deserves special mention. He was nicknamed "Home Run" Barnes when he broke up a Yale-Harvard baseball game to give Yale a ninth-inning victory. He was named to Walter Camp's All America baseball team in 1905, but he turned down a contract with the Boston Red Sox.

He began a career in law, but sports remained prominent in his life. In fact, he first drew national attention in 1928 when, at the request of New York Gov. Alfred E. Smith, he established an office in Albany, N.Y., where he investigated the rigging of an Albany baseball pool by racketeers and succeeded in convicting several manipulators of the pool.

In 1952 he helped to coordinate the campaign of the late Senator Robert A. Taft for President, and led the pro-Taft Massachusetts delegation to the 1952 Republican National Convention where Senator Taft lost the nomination to Dwight Eisenhower. Clarence Barnes also ran unsuccessfully for Governor of Massachusetts in 1950.

I believe that the editorial expresses well my own thoughts regarding the death of Clarence Barnes—indeed, it also refers to this "void that will never be filled." The text of the editorial follows:

CLARENCE A. BARNES

Politically, at least, Clarence A. Barnes was Mansfield's most illustrious citizen; having served the town as moderator and selectman, and the state as a representative, governor's councillor and attorney general.

It would require considerable space just to list the accomplishments in those offices and the many other activities of Clare Barnes, but for those privileged to call him friend, no detailed summary of his long life is necessary. Sufficient that he was always a joy to meet, keenly interested in his community, his state and the nation. He was a man of positive opinion, political acumen, and legal keenness.

There is plenty of witness to all of these qualities. Of the latter, however, the brilliant defense of the late Eugene C. Hultman who the then governor James M. Curley tried to remove as Boston police commissioner, is best remembered. But he was equally as astute in defending a fellow townsman, if he were called upon.

By today's standards, Clare Barnes was an ultra conservative Republican and often branded as a foe of labor. This was not so; he sought only for an equipollent standard for business and labor and he never gave up his fight. Less than three months ago he sat in this editor's office and discoursed at length on the matter. While he may have mellowed on many matters, he did not on that one.

Clare Barnes' athletic career may have been climaxed with a home run that beat Harvard and became Yale legend but his interest in the sport remained intact and he was the anonymous "savior" of many a semi-pro team in Mansfield. Golf became his personal sport in later years and he was a member of the Highland Country Club and also served Attleboro as a member of the board of trustees of Sturdy Memorial Hospital. He lived a long, active life and a full one; that was his joy and his reward.

His death at his beloved Oak Bluffs leaves a void that will never be filled.

A EULOGY TO SUSAN JAMESON

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, each of us have days in our respective lives that leave lasting and marked impressions, indelibly inscribing a joyous occasion or, in some cases, a tragic incident, that, to most of us is unexplainable.

On Thursday, May 28, I experienced two such contrasting events in one day—separated by some 2,600 air miles, as I flew from our Nation's Capitol to our First Congressional District.

At 0800, Washington time, it was my privilege to attend a joint Senate-House prayer breakfast, with a very distinguished and important international leader, President Suharto, of the Republic of Indonesia, as our guest of honor and principal speaker.

I was filled with enthusiasm, elation, and a renewed sense of confidence, regarding the Southeast Asian problems and current events, as I talked to him privately on two occasions and listened to his very eloquent and reassuring address to our congressional prayer break-

fast group. Later in the day, as I arrived at San Francisco airport, I was told of the tragic news regarding the death of a lovely young lady, Susan Jameson, of Petaluma, Calif.

Understandably, my enthusiasm of the morning was dampened by the tragedy of the afternoon news—the news media told the story that was as shocking to me as though I had been told that one of my own daughters was suddenly taken from our midst.

Sue Jameson had served as a secretary in our First Congressional District office in Santa Rosa. She had served me, our staff, and the people of the Redwood Empire with extraordinary talent, loyalty, and dedicated service—she was efficiency personified—she was everything one could ask for in a qualified staff member.

So great were her talents, I offered her a position of increased responsibilities in our Washington office—it had been my plan to build her to the position of personal secretary because of the trustworthy ability displayed, her perceptive judgment, and most importantly, her total dedication to any cause she truly believed in. Sue decided to dedicate her life to a specific cause, wherein she felt she could do the most good for mankind—the education and teaching profession.

It is somewhat ironic, in light of what has happened, that I did not press her to accept the Washington position, because of my personal concern for her safety and well-being in the then riotous and crime-ridden city of Washington, D.C.

One might wonder why, in a eulogy, I would refer to these seemingly very contrasting events.

Life is filled with many contracts and each day brings forth many challenging and rewarding experiences, and yet by nightfall, the world seems to be coming apart at the seams. On Thursday morning, May 28, I had the strong feeling that I had been a participant in an historical event that could and would make far-reaching and constructive contributions to the ultimate peace and stability we all seek in Southeast Asia, because of President Suharto and because of Indonesia's potential leadership and diplomatic initiative role she is playing in seeking free-Asian accord on the neutrality of Cambodia, or regional economic and security integration, leading to the stabilization of Indochina and Southeast Asia.

Sue Jameson had that same quality and determination to do her bit to bring peace on earth by extending good will to all who knew her.

She, like President Suharto, had deep religious convictions—differing in faith or specific denominational objectives, but both unwavering in their desire to see that God's will and His work would be done.

It seems appropriate that I close this eulogy to Sue Jameson by quoting, partially, from President Suharto's address:

I come from a nation deeply devoted to religion—110 million Indonesians. It is this religious character, which imparts man and society; harmony between man and the universe, harmony between worldly life and the hereafter.

Another essence of the teachings is the

unity of mankind, which is a vital force for strengthening the Nations' sense of unity, and a prerequisite for the growth of young Nations.

As a teacher, Sue Jameson would have paraphrased these remarks by saying, "Unity of mankind will only come when our Nation's strength establishes as a prerequisite the educational and spiritual growth of all young people—at home and abroad."

Susan Jameson gave her life to that cause and to those teachings. She will be remembered as one who lived a life of harmony in her worldly life, thereby assuring her a richly endowed hereafter.

PUBLIC LAW 91-190 PROTECTS
AND ENHANCES THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Public Law 91-190, is rapidly proving itself to be most helpful in the drive to protect and enhance the quality of our environment. A significant benefit flowing from the act derives from the provision requiring all Federal agencies to file with the Council on Environmental Quality and others a statement as to the environmental impact of legislative proposals and actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. A longer range benefit will flow from another provision of the act requiring each agency to review their present statutory authority, administrative regulations, and current policies and procedures for the purpose of determining whether there are deficiencies or inconsistencies therein which prohibit full compliance with the act and, if such are found, to propose to the President not later than July 1, 1971, such measures as may be necessary to bring their authority and policies into conformity with the act.

While I am optimistic about the worth of Public Law 91-190 as a device to protect and enhance the environment, I do have some concern about the degree of understanding which some agencies have as to the intent of the act. As the original sponsor of the legislation which became Public Law 91-190, I wish to make it clear that insofar as my understanding is concerned the provisions of Public Law 91-190 apply to all legislative proposals and all actions of all Federal agencies which have or will have an impact on the environment of any significance, whether that impact is local in its scope or of wider range.

To illustrate my point, I would like to advise my colleagues of action I took in response to a letter which I received from a resident of New Hampshire complaining of the use of chemical defoliants along the United States-Canadian border. As will be noted in the correspondence, I shall include as a part of these remarks, the land area involved in

this matter was not large and there is no significant number of persons residing in the area.

However, the matter was pursued and I am pleased to report that Richard L. Herman, U.S. Commissioner, International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, has responded in what I find to be an exemplary manner. His letter to me of May 28, 1970, shows that he understands the provisions of Public Law 91-190 and his obligations to come into compliance with said provisions. I expect other officials of all Federal agencies to proceed in the same manner.

In accordance with my earlier request, I insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of correspondence related to the matter which I have been discussing:

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1970.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 12, 1970. I sincerely regret that you found my letter of April 20 unresponsive to your inquiry regarding compliance by the International Boundary Commission with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 in its use of herbicides.

In conformity with Executive Order 11514 and the interim Guidelines distributed pursuant thereto on April 30, 1970, we have prepared a report on the methods used by the Commission in maintaining boundary vistas. This report considered each of the five areas required to be considered in the detailed statement to be published pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the Act. This report has been submitted to the Working Group of the Subcommittee on Pesticides of the Cabinet Committee on the Environment, which is composed of representatives of the various interested federal departments.

We plan to meet with the Subcommittee on Pesticides at its requests, and are prepared to agree to modifications in our operations that the Subcommittee may recommend, which are consistent with our obligations under the 1925 Treaty.

Upon approval of the report by the Subcommittee on Pesticides, we plan then to publish notice in the Federal Register, to give affected states notice of, and opportunity to submit objections to, our operations.

After consideration has been given to the views submitted, we plan then to submit the detailed statement of our operations to the Council on Environmental Quality, as required by the Act.

With respect to our obligation under Section 103 of the Act, we have had under consideration for some time submission of proposed legislation to clarify the powers of the Commission under the Treaty. We expect to complete our consideration of possible legislative proposals by September 1, 1970, and will be giving thorough attention to the purposes and provisions of the Environmental Policy Act in making these proposals.

It has long been the objective of the Commission, as well as that of its Canadian counterpart, to maintain the international boundary in a manner which not only makes its location apparent, but which also preserves and enhances the scenic beauty and lining resources of the wilderness areas through which much of this boundary passes. You may be assured that we share your concern that the environmental resources of this area not be impaired by our activities, and that your ideas and suggestions to this end will always be welcomed and considered.

I would be happy to meet with you and discuss the operations of the Commission at any time.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. HERMAN,
U.S. Commissioner.

MAY 12, 1970.

HON. RICHARD L. HERMAN,
U.S. Commissioner, International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERMAN: Your letter of April 20, 1970 is entirely unresponsive to my earlier communication dated April 9, 1970 which it purports to answer.

In my letter of April 9, a copy of which is enclosed, I specifically called your attention to Public Law 91-190, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, with regard to a new national policy on environmental matters and asked specifically what action your agency has taken to bring its operation into conformity with Public Law 91-190. In response I received a rather general reply totally lacking in specificity and in comment on implementation of the statute alluded to.

That statute and an executive order issued by the President impose a number of requirements on your agency in utilization of herbicides and similar substances.

I call your attention to the following sections in Title I of Public Law 91-190:

Section 102(C) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on—

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,

(ii) any adverse environmental efforts which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented.

(iii) alternatives to the proposed action, the relationship between local short-term uses of men's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

(iv) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the President, the Council on Environmental Quality and to the public as provided by section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes;

Section 103. All agencies of the Federal Government shall review their present statutory authority, administrative regulations, and current policies and procedures for the purpose of determining whether there are any deficiencies or inconsistencies therein which prohibit full compliance with the purposes and provisions of this Act and shall propose to the President not later than July 1, 1972, such measures as may be necessary to bring their authority and policies into conformity with the intent, purposes, and procedures set forth in this Act."

If your agency cannot give me a responsive reply to my inquiry on this matter, it may be necessary to have your agency before my Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Con-

servation, which originated the legislation from whence I have been quoting, to more fully outline your behavior and responsibility in the light of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1970.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In reply to your letter of April 9, 1970, this Commission has always endeavored to fulfill its obligations in maintaining the boundary line in accordance with existing laws and regulations. With regard to the 20-foot wooded boundary vista areas, the overall aim is to establish a park like appearance which would eliminate the brush growth and encourage the development of grasses and wild herbaceous plants. Once this low growth is established, brush control would be easier and more time could be devoted to the other phases of boundary maintenance work.

Cutting the brush alone will not achieve this aim, as we observed from the results of many years of hand cutting the trees and other growth. The felled growth certainly did not enhance the appearance of the boundary vista. In fact, this made subsequent clearing even more difficult due to suckering of brush plants and trees. The Commission, therefore, sought the assistance of the Dept. of Agriculture of both countries in using selective chemicals approved and recommended for right-of-way brush control. In applying these chemicals, we have used all recommended safeguards near orchards, gardens and water areas.

Tordon 101 mixed with a thickening solution of Norbak, to prevent drift, has been applied by helicopter equipped for this type of work, in the maintenance of the wooded vista along the 49th Parallel, Washington-Montana-Idaho-British Columbia-Alberta boundary, 27 miles of the Southeast Alaska Boundary and 208 miles of the 141st Meridian Alaska Boundary. In the northeast boundary, Tordon 101 mixed with water was applied on the Vermont-Quebec, Maine-Quebec and Maine-New Brunswick boundary vistas, only in the wooded areas. This maintenance work was done by parties from both sections of the Commission, supervised by engineers from the Commission.

In several sections of the northeast boundary, the vista has already achieved a low growth appearance which makes the boundary monuments visible, as you will see from the enclosed photo taken along the Vermont-Quebec boundary in July 1969. It has also been noted that birds and small game use this low growth vista area for food and shelter as there is an abundance of berry bushes.

The Commission has also endeavored to cooperate with the property owners along the boundary areas, and we have enjoyed a very good relationship with these people by explaining our maintenance work and answering any questions they may have.

In continuing the maintenance of the wooded boundary vistas, the Commission will only use products permitted by the Department of Agriculture of both countries, and abide by regulations and recommendations for their use. The Commission has always followed this guideline and we believe it is consistent with the recommendations of Public Law 91-190, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

With personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. HERMAN,
U.S. Commissioner.

APRIL 9, 1970.

HON. RICHARD L. HERMAN,
U.S. Commissioner; International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER HERMAN: This is in reference to your letter of March 6, 1970, with enclosures, regarding my request for information on the use of defoliant along the border of the United States and Canada.

I realize your obligation under the 1925 treaty to maintain an open area or vista along the land boundary. However, I am sure that we both realize that there is more than one way in which to maintain such vista and I question the validity of the proposition that the use of herbicides is the proper way in which to maintain a vista.

There is a growing awareness of the many dangers inherent in the use of chemicals to manipulate the environment. While the quantities of Tordon 101 which were used along the Vermont-Quebec boundary line may not have been sufficient to have had a substantial adverse ecological impact, I am convinced that the International Boundary Commission would not contend that the use of this chemical enhanced the environment.

I call your attention to Public Law 91-190, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, signed by President Nixon on January 1, 1970, with appropriate statements of concern about the need for environmental quality. This statute sets a new national policy with regard to environmental matters and may very well make those complaints which the Commission found to be lacking in legitimacy to be quite legitimate, indeed.

I would appreciate being advised as to the steps which the Commission has taken or plans to take to bring its operations into conformity with Public Law 91-190.

Additionally, in your letter you make reference to the some 63 miles of vista between Vermont and Quebec which was treated with Tordon 101 last summer. I would appreciate being advised as to any other portions of the United States boundary on which Tordon 101 or any other herbicide has been used or upon which it is planned to use such substances.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1970.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The Attorney General has forwarded to us your letter of February 25 requesting information on the maintenance of the boundary between the United States and Canada.

There is enclosed an article by a former Commissioner which gives the history of the boundary and explains the work of this Commission. Enclosed is also a statement on the use of herbicide in vista maintenance work as many periodicals have written untrue and inaccurate accounts about this work.

This Commission has used only Department of Agriculture approved herbicides for control of unwanted growth in the various wooded sections of the boundary. These have been carefully applied in accordance with prevailing instructions and requirements under supervision of engineers from this Commission. We have at all times taken every precaution in applying any herbicides, especially near streams, farms or gardens. Our crews have had the cooperation of local property owners and during the fifteen years we have used herbicides, we have not had one legitimate complaint.

As we abide by the recommendations of

the Departments of Agriculture of both countries, anything that would be restricted for use in our type of work in maintaining the wooded vista certainly would not be used.

In maintaining the boundary last summer, we used Tordon 101 mixed 1 gallon with 99 gallons of water, and this was applied along 63 miles of the wooded 20-foot vista between Vermont and Quebec, using 270 gallons of Tordon 101.

If we can be of further assistance to you, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. HERMAN,
United States Commissioner.

FEBRUARY 25, 1970.

HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: It has come to my attention that defoliants are being used along the United States-Canadian border to mark the boundaries.

I wish to be informed whether your agency administers this program and, if so, what defoliants are used, when, and in what amounts. I wish to have you state to me with considerable precision the safeguards which are applied to prevent pollution of air and water and other environmental hazard from this use.

Thank you for your attention to my request.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IM-
MIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION
SERVICE,

Washington, D.C.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Reference is made to your letter addressed to the Attorney General dated February 25, 1970, concerning use of defoliants along the United States-Canadian border to mark the boundaries.

Responsibility for defining, marking, and maintaining the demarcation of the international boundary line between the United States and Canada is within the purview of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada. Your letter has been referred to that office for response.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. FARRELL,
Commissioner.

NATIONAL AIRLINES INAUGURATES NONSTOP DC-8 SERVICE BETWEEN MIAMI, FLA., AND LONDON, ENG- LAND

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1970, National Airlines plans to inaugurate its daily round trip nonstop DC-8 service between Miami, Fla., and London, England.

Mr. Frank Callahan, president-elect of the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, recently issued a public statement in which he foresaw a fantastic opportunity to make Miami the No. 1 entrance to the Continent.

I share Mr. Callahan's enthusiasm for the future of Miami and the State of Florida, based on the opening of a new gateway between Miami, Fla., and London, England, with nonstop air service between the two cities.

The planned service, however, had been crippled due to a lengthy strike which prevented flights by National Airlines, the U.S.-flag carrier chosen to fly the route. The strike is now over and we look forward to new opportunities for Florida. In reaching agreement, leaders of both labor and management have made a major contribution to efforts to expand the Miami International Gateway.

Frank Callahan expressed the Greater Miami community's relief upon learning that the strike was settled and commended National Airlines' president, "Bud" Maytag, for taking back all employees, adding that "this has to represent a new essence in corporate responsibility. This climate of harmony helped heal a tough situation."

Mr. Callahan concluded his statement:

This fantastic opportunity to make Miami the number one entrance to the continent, can now progress. Our home town airline, with its local employees are now together. This we appreciate and sincerely hope both parties can pick up their great work where they left off and continue on to even more significant accomplishments.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION SEEKS EXPANDED MEDICAL PROFESSION

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical News issue of May 18 carries a most interesting editorial describing the Nixon administration's physician augmentation program. This student medical schools grant program will certainly result in more and better trained professional doctors, and they are greatly needed throughout the Nation, particularly in rural America. I am pleased to call this progressive program to the attention of my colleagues, and insert the editorial in full at this point in my remarks:

MORE STUDENTS

The \$7.6 million in federal grants to medical schools under the Physician Augmentation Program (AMN, May 11, 1970), is welcome news to everyone concerned with increasing the physician population.

The grants, to 25 medical schools and two schools of osteopathy, will enable the schools to increase their freshman enrollments by 395 students this fall, making the total first-year class nearly 10,900.

This figure is not high enough, of course, but it should be remembered that four years ago, the first-year enrollment was 8,964.

The Physician Augmentation Program was developed in 1969 by HEW Secretary Robert Finch, and was backed by the Nixon Administration. Its original goal was to raise enroll-

ments 1,000 a year for four years, although it seems doubtful that such a rapid increase can be attained. Nevertheless, most experts agree that by 1975, there will be at least 11,000 medical school graduates each year; last year, 8,059 new MDs were graduated.

Recipients of the grants were chosen on the basis of national competition conducted by the National Institutes of Health's Bureau of Health Professions Education and Manpower Training. A major factor was intent to develop three programs: clinical training in outpatient and ambulatory facilities; experience aimed at encouraging students to enter family practice; and improving distribution of physicians geographically and among various socioeconomic groups. Schools agreeing to conduct programs aimed at reducing the cost and length of medical education also received special consideration.

Awarding of these grants is a significant step toward the solution of what may well be the nation's most pressing health problem; however, it is only a single step out of many that must be taken.

More than two years ago, the AMA and the Assn. of American Medical Colleges joined in emphasizing the "urgent and critical need for more physicians if national expectations for health services are to be realized." That statement stressed expansion of the enrollment of existing schools, and said governmental and private financial support would be necessary for success.

This statement, and others issued by the two groups, obviously had a significant influence on HEW, which commented that "With such enthusiasm and declaration of purpose, it is imperative that the opportunity be fully met."

HEW's action is not the complete answer to the physician shortage, although it is a highly encouraging move. But 11,000 physician graduates a year will not meet the country's growing demand for physicians' services. The medical profession, the government, medical schools, and private sources must unite to develop imaginative and innovative programs to boost enrollments still further.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the long and distinguished service of our respected Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK of Massachusetts, who will retire at the end of this session after having served continuously as Speaker longer than any previous occupant of that high office.

JOHN McCORMACK served in the highest traditions of that office and always exhibited a keen insight into the motions of the House and knew when individual Members were interested in a particular piece of legislation and has rendered throughout his career a great service to his constituents from his district and to our country.

The spontaneous and heartfelt tribute the Members are paying to the Speaker demonstrate our recognition of his leadership, admiration, and his devotion to the legislative branch of Government

which represents the most effective branch in interpreting its service to the people of America.

Personally, I have appreciated the Speaker's willingness to meet and confer with parliamentarians from foreign lands on the many occasions that I have escorted individuals and groups from foreign legislative bodies into his office and in speaking to them he always very vigorously emphasized the role of parliamentarians in serving the public. His knowledge of history, his tremendous grasp of world affairs with the threat to freedom from communism and his belief in our American system are very properly recognized by all of us.

WHITHER WE GOETH?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine while traveling in Florida recently sent me an editorial from the May 6 Englewood, Fla., Herald with the request that I introduce it into the RECORD. This particular editorial is certainly sharp, penetrating commentary on issues which now face the Nation and it is unusual in that it is a straight-from-the-shoulder message which I recognize should properly stimulate our thoughts on the future path of our Nation. It follows:

WHITHER WE GOETH?

Have you asked yourself lately, "Where in the world are we headed?" Are you concerned with what is going on in America today—what with the campus rebellions, malicious destruction of property, armed militants both black and white, the youthful turn to drugs for either kicks or escape?

Sure we all are, but we don't seem to be coming up with any answer—just more questions.

The staid old answer used to be, "ignore this phenomenon. It involves just a small minority". But that isn't true any more. There are more and more so-called Americans getting wrapped up in the "in thing" of fighting the establishment. They are out to literally destroy the very foundation which gives them the right to self destruct. Why?

Have you considered the fact that America is in its third generation of affluency? Our children of these generations have not, with certain exceptions, wanted really for anything. They have had comfy, cozy room and board. They have had everything from Tinker Toys to Corvette convertibles before the age of 18.

The blacks of today even are better off than those who remember the Great Depression of the 1930's. Of course, the youth of today don't want us to mention that Depression. It is old hat to them. But why sweep it under the rug, when it was just as much a part of the American way of life as the rockets to the moon. It made weak men and women strong and strong men and women stronger. It welded families together in a bond of pure survival.

We don't espouse another Depression—certainly not. But we do warn that hard times can befall any or all of us at any moment.

It is this that we must always brace ourselves for. What happens if such a fate befalls us now? Do we panic after 10 these many years of affluency? Or do we pull ourselves up by the bootstraps and hang in there together and survive it? We certainly have our doubts at the present time.

A minister remarked to us the other day that the nation and world "are in a mess." We agree, Reverend, but it irritates us no end that in too many cases on national TV ministers and priests of varying faiths are out in front leading and preaching violence and defiance of the law. Why? Is this their true belief? Is this what they are preaching from their pulpits? If they are not, then they are the most hypocritical of all hypocrites.

Getting back to the college campuses of America, many have reservations about sending decent, honest, law abiding children onto these campuses. When buildings are stormed, burned, bombed or otherwise desecrated, we ask, "Send my daughter or son there?" Hell no. Corrupting a young mind is an easy task if a pro is doing the corrupting. And these are pros—we kid you not.

A pamphlet passed out at the University of California Campus at Berkeley preaches the following:

1. We will make Telegraph Avenue and the south campus a strategic free territory for revolution.
 2. We will create our revolutionary culture everywhere.
 3. We will turn the schools into training grounds for liberation.
 4. We will destroy the university unless it serves the people.
 5. We will struggle for the full liberation of women as a necessary part of the revolutionary movement.
 6. We will take communal responsibility for basic human needs.
 7. We will protect and expand our drug culture.
 8. We will break the power of the landlords and provide beautiful housing for everyone.
 9. We will tax the corporations and not the working people.
 10. We will defend ourselves against law and order.
 11. We will create a soulful socialism in Berkeley.
 12. We will create a people's government.
- There, Mr. and Mrs. Charlotte County and America, are 12 reasons to get alarmed about the strange turn of events. Don't kiss it off as another "goldfish swallowing" fad on these campuses. It isn't. It truly is a planned and well financed attempt on the part of certain forces to overthrow our government. And, unfortunately, they are suckering far too many innocents into their way of thinking.

This affluent society has almost made it mandatory that Johnny or Suzie go to college, regardless of whether they are college material or not. So off they go to the big university in the sky, arriving as malcontents in many cases and remaining malcontents as they plod from freshman to sophomore. When asked why they are going to college, they reply, "My Old Man made me." And he did. So misery loves company and that is where the trained and dedicated revolutionists step in quickly and adroitly. Don't sell them short. They are shrewd and knowledgeable in this field.

So a few hundred mounts to a few thousand, and soon several million—ad infinitum.

Wake up silent majority—those of you who hated the thoughts of fighting World War I, World War II, the Korean War and equally the Vietnam War. No war has been fun. They all have brought heartache to millions of us through the loss of loved ones.

The hearts of our young today are no different than the hearts were a couple of generations back. Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower hated war and killing equally. So does Richard Nixon. But they all faced it.

Unless the truly concerned Americans stand up soon and demand that this democracy be saved from a boring from within, then it will be too late.

The money being spent through certain Federal agencies and private foundations to support rebellion are your dollars. Who pays to keep the questionable OEO and HEW projects going? Who feeds money into the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations? You do through taxes and purchasing from these vast industrial empires.

The road from affluence to slavery under socialism is not too long. Wake up Americans. Time is growing short.

NINETY CONGRESSMEN SEND BIPARTISAN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON URGING NEW INITIATIVES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the forwarding of a letter to the President on June 4 by 90 Members of Congress, urging the sale of additional jets to Israel and increased efforts to establish a cease-fire in the Middle East. This letter was the culmination of a bipartisan effort in which I participated with Representatives OGDEN REID of New York, JOHN BRADEMANS of Indiana, and GILBERT GUDE of Maryland, in gathering support from colleagues on both sides of the aisle who wished to join us in expressing our concern to the President. The text of the letter and the signatories follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1970.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to express our deep concern over the shift in the balance of power in the Near East adverse to Israel which has occurred recently as a result of the introduction of Soviet pilots and SAM sites in the United Arab Republic.

The United States has long viewed an arms imbalance in the area as being a prescription for widespread hostilities. In addition, these new developments represent a challenge to NATO's southeastern flank. As you noted in your report to the Congress, "The U.S. would view any effort by the Soviet Union to seek predominance in the Middle East as a matter of grave concern."

It would appear that your action in holding in abeyance the sale of the additional Phantoms and Skyhawks requested by Prime Minister Golda Meir has not been met by similar restraint on the part of the Soviet Union. Indeed, the introduction of Soviet combat pilots is unprecedented in the Near East with the brief exception of Yemen.

Accordingly, we hope that you will now, following the Administration's review of this question, make an early and affirmative decision to provide Israel with the additional Skyhawks and Phantoms essential to her deterrent strength. We believe that this would serve to make clear to the Soviets the seriousness with which we view their action

and would be the best guarantee against the outbreak of major hostilities.

Concomitant with this action, we hope that you will continue to pursue serious arms limitation talks with the Soviets on the Near East which could be effective only when there is a relative arms balance, not an arms imbalance. We believe these steps could facilitate progress toward direct negotiations on the Rhodes formula, consistent with the Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967.

We also suggest prompt consultation with our NATO allies because of the dangers posed to their own security by the Soviet build-up in the Near East. We urge that you exert your influence to re-establish the cease-fire as a preliminary step to eventual peace negotiations. These steps would demonstrate to the Soviet Union that we do not intend to abdicate our responsibilities in the Near East, as well as our earnest desire for peace.

Sincerely yours,

OGDEN R. REID,
Member of Congress, New York.
GILBERT GUDE,
Member of Congress, Maryland.
JOHN BRADEMAS,
Member of Congress, Indiana.
RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Member of Congress, New York.

This letter has also been signed by the Members of Congress whose names follow:

Watkins Abbitt of Virginia, Joseph Addabbo of New York, William Barrett of Pennsylvania, Jonathan Bingham of New York, Edward Boland of Massachusetts, Frank Brasco of New York, William Broomfield of Michigan, John Buchanan of Alabama, Jack Brinkley of Georgia.

James Burke of Massachusetts, Laurence Burton of Utah, Philip Burton of California, George Bush of Texas, Daniel Button of New York, Bob Casey of Texas, William Clay of Missouri, James Cleveland of New Hampshire, Barber Conable of New York.

Silvio Conte of Massachusetts, John Conyers of Michigan, Lawrence Coughlin of Pennsylvania, William Cramer of Florida, Philip Crane of Illinois, Emilio Daddario of Connecticut, John Dingell of Michigan, Don Edwards of California, Joshua Eilberg of Pennsylvania.

O. C. Fisher of Texas, Donald Fraser of Minnesota, James Fulton of Pennsylvania, Richard Fulton of Tennessee, Martha Griffiths of Michigan, James Hanley of New York, Orval Hansen of Idaho, William Hathaway of Maine.

Margaret Hechler of Massachusetts, Henry Helstoski of New Jersey, Floyd Hicks of Washington, James Howard of New Jersey, William Hull of Missouri, Joseph Karth of Minnesota, James C. Corman of California, Samuel S. Stratton of New York.

Edward Koch of New York, Peter Kyros of Maine, Allard Lowenstein of New York, Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, Clark MacGregor of Minnesota, Thomas Meskill of Connecticut, Joseph Minish of New Jersey, Robert Mollohan of West Virginia, William Moorhead of Pennsylvania.

F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, John Moss of California, John Murphy of New York, Robert Nix of Pennsylvania, Thomas O'Neill of Massachusetts, Thomas Pelly of Washington, Claude Pepper of Florida, Otis Pike of New York, Alexander Pirnie of New York.

Melvin Price of Illinois, Thomas Rees of California, Peter Rodino of New Jersey, Benjamin Rosenthal of New York, Edward Roybal of California, William F. Ryan of New York, David Satterfield of Virginia, James Scheuer of New York, B. F. Sisk of California.

CXVI—1169—Part 14

Louis Stokes of Ohio, Robert Taft of Ohio, Fletcher Thompson of Georgia, Frank Thompson of New Jersey, John Tunney of California, Charles Vanik of Ohio, Lowell Weicker of Connecticut, William Whitehurst of Virginia.

Lawrence Williams of Pennsylvania, Charles Wilson of California, Lester Wolf of New York, John Wylder of New York, Gus Yatron of Pennsylvania, Paul McCloskey of California, Harold Donohue of Massachusetts, Seymour Halpern of New York.

A STUDENT SPEAKS OUT

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is a Member of Congress in either the House or Senate who has not been visited by or received correspondence from students relating to the unrest on the campuses, the war in Vietnam, our environmental problems, and you-name-it. Scott Michel, a 19-year-old Yale sophomore and son of our colleague, BOB MICHEL, from Peoria, was asked by his hometown paper, the Peoria Journal Star, to express his views on the campus problems. Scott is a young man any parent would be proud to claim and has exhibited maturity and responsibility in the statements he has made. His article in the substantial part follows:

(EDITORS NOTE.—Although at last report Yale University was peaceful, and normal classwork had been resumed, earlier this month the campus was torn with dissent which spilled over into the New Haven community.)

(The Journal Star asked Scott Michel, a Yale sophomore from Peoria, to write his views of the unrest, and this is his report.

(Scott, 19, is the son of U.S. Rep. and Mrs. Robert H. Michel. He is both a scholar and an athlete. A 1968 Sterling Merit award graduate of Peoria High School, where he was the leading scorer on the basketball team, Scott played this year as a member of the Yale varsity.)

(By Scott Michel)

NEW HAVEN, CONN.—The student strike here at Yale University has left me both disturbed and dismayed.

Originally called by the Black Panther Bobby Seale, the strike seemed to lack direction, purpose, and definite goals.

For one thing the three demands were soon revised and five new ones appeared.

At one point 75 per cent of the student body was out of class, the strikers ranging from guilt-ridden liberals to the Weatherman faction of SDS.

The strike was supposed to be non-coercive, with those students wishing to continue with classes able to do so. But when I tried attending classes my professors didn't show up; when they did, they said classes would be cancelled in support of the strike. This action was due to a Yale faculty meeting at which members voted to support the student strike.

To me this is fine, and I respect each individual faculty member's opinion—they have just as much right as anyone to their point of view, and just as much right to express that view.

But I also feel that the professors and teachers are educators first, and therein lies their first priority.

It seems to me that they have an obligation to students who want to attend class and are paying astronomical fees for that right. The faculty's primary responsibility is to academics, not politics.

Further, by suspending classes and the normal activities of the university, the faculty deprived us of our most effective means of examining the issues, and of our justification for being here in the first place.

The academic structure of the university coupled with the social atmosphere of the residential colleges is a remarkably effective way of communicating knowledge. By ending this process our ability to examine anything objectively was severely crippled and our capacity for rational discussion practically destroyed.

It is the common commitment to the academic process that unifies our student body. If this is brought to a halt, we lose our ability to relate to this community as individuals and to function in the outside world as a community.

If the shutdown is indeed justified by the belief that academics is honestly irrelevant, then we should disband this institution altogether.

However, this is not the case. The problem rests with those who are unable or unwilling to relate academics to "real" problems to the extent that they abandon their commitment to the academic process.

The massive demonstration billed as a "blood-bath for pigs" and devastating for the Yale campus turned out to be quite a peaceful weekend.

The only exception was a brief confrontation with police involving several hundred students, who were quickly dispersed with tear gas.

The Black Panther sponsors pulled a last-minute about face and called for a non-violent demonstration. This, coupled with the outstanding job done by student marshals, police, and military officials kept things calm in an atmosphere of tension and fear.

The sudden reversal of the Black Panther Party in calling for non-violence came at their realization that violence would be suicidal. They said that planned, cold-blooded violence was a better tactic than hot-headed lash-out at those in power.

Doug Miranda, a New Haven Black Panther chieftan, suggested that "people" move in small groups of two or three at night to "off the pigs."

The one issue of which the Black Panther Party has not equivocated is killing police. They have been both for and against race war and violence, as the situation demanded. They will restrain their violence against police and whites until a more opportune moment comes.

If the Black Panther Party is to come to power, it must have white liberal support—therefore it can preach neither violence nor race war now, since white liberals oppose both.

One thing is clear: the Panthers may be sincere in their commitment to the defense of the black community, and to their social program, but they are opportunistic in their drive to power and are willing to use violence against all who oppose them.

Probably the person most influential in keeping New Haven cool on May first was Kingman Brewster, Yale's president.

In addition to the already tense situation, the Nixon announcement that troops were moving into Cambodia further inflamed and frustrated students.

Mr. Brewster's open expression of sympathy for their frustration, his sensitivity to students' attitudes and feelings, his ability to communicate with the faculty, and his delegation of much power to groups of students all helped produce student action which was non-violent.

Although he deserves all the praise he received, I think Mr. Brewster fell down when he said that he was skeptical that Black revolutionaries could get a fair trial anywhere in the United States.

I cannot really abide his apparent lack of faith in our judicial system. The fact that he voiced his opinion as a private citizen and not as head of a university is no justification whatsoever.

The be a University President and a private citizen are not mutually exclusive and at such a high level of responsibility he should realize that to attempt to differentiate between the two is absurd.

The events of the past several weeks have emphasized once again how polarized our society has become.

The action in Cambodia rekindled the already burning frustration felt by students resulting from their seeming inability to find any way of affecting the political system.

The National Student Strike is an outlet for this frustration, but it seems to me that to curtail education is the least effective of all methods to express dissent and effect political action.

A program of student communication with congressional leaders and other government officials, like that which took place in Washington, serves a much more constructive purpose. I therefore do not support the National Student Strike.

I not only disapprove of the methods, but also of the national demands. I can understand the concern and fear generated by haunting similarities to President Johnson's escalation of the Vietnam war, but it appears that Nixon's plan of Vietnamization is working and the gamble has thus far been successful.

I see no reason to doubt, with the continued withdrawal of American troops, the added time bought with the Cambodian excursion, and all the preliminary deadlines that have been set and kept, that our involvement in Southeast Asia will come to an end. The policy initiated by the President seems to be the proper alternative, rather than an immediate pullout.

Having spent the last two years in an institution replete with liberal thought after being raised in the conservative Midwest, I have had a unique opportunity to examine and be exposed to both poles of the political spectrum.

I thus had the privilege of judging for myself what views fit my conscience. I hope my viewpoint as a student will give some insights into today's campus problems.

LETTER FROM A DEAD SON

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. Keith Franklin of Salamanca, N.Y., left a letter for his parents on his last day of leave before going to Vietnam. The letter was to be opened only in the event that he be killed.

On May 12, Corporal Franklin died—the victim of "hostile action" in Cambodia.

His letter tells of his vehement opposition to the war, and his feeling that his death and the deaths of other young Americans have been in vain.

I am including in the RECORD a copy of Keith Franklin's letter to his parents for my colleagues to read I think it speaks for itself.

FEBRUARY 24, 1970.

DEAR MOM AND DAD: As I sit here writing this letter, the hours are ticking away until my departure for Vietnam. But if you are reading this letter, you will never see me again. The reason being that if you are reading this it means that I have died.

The question now is whether or not my death has been in vain. My answer is yes. The war that has taken my life and many thousands of others before me is immoral, unlawful and an atrocity unlike any misfit of good sense and justice known to man.

I have opposed the war since the time when my mind was able to truly comprehend and weigh its pros and cons. However the powers-to-be handed down the decision that my friends and I should go and fight it.

We will go and we will fight, and I have died. But there is still a blank space in the mind as to why.

President Nixon and President Johnson before him have told the American public time and time again that it was our obligation to the people of South Vietnam to save them from the surging wave of communism which has plotted to engulf them. This is a lie, the magnitude of which is witnessed only by the hundreds of thousands of GIs in South Vietnam. The inhabitants of this bug-infested, backward, god-forsaken, hell-on-earth want no part of the American war machine. But they have no choice. Their fate is determined not by their own wills but by the political monsters of the so-called free world and those of the Communist bloc.

I, too, had no choice as to my fate. But rather it was pre-determined by the war mongering hypocrites in Washington.

So as I lie dead, please grant my last request. Help me to inform the American people, the silent majority who have not yet voiced their opinions. Help me let them know that their silence is permitting this atrocity to go on and on, and that my death will not be in vain if by prompting them to act I can in some way help to bring an end to the war that brought an end to my life.

Your son,

KEITH FRANKLIN.

HISTORY-WRITING IS THE ART CONSERVATOR OF ALL THE ARTS

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, about this time every year we hear and are given the opportunity to read about history, its meaning, and its importance.

It is my privilege to represent the same district that some years ago was represented by Mr. John Sharp Williams, who came to Congress from the Sharp Place sometimes called Cedar Grove Plantation in Yazoo County, Miss.

The sixth annual meeting of the Mississippi Historical Society was held in the Citizens' Opera House in Yazoo City on April 23 and 24, 1903. Gen. Stephen D. Lee, the president of the society, presided throughout the meeting. He introduced Hon. John Sharp Williams, who had been appointed to deliver the address of welcome to the society.

A constituent of mine, a retired naval officer, Comdr. Robert W. Collins, has provided me a copy of the long-out-of-print address of Mr. John Sharp Williams. The point is made that history-writing is the art conservator of all the arts. I take real pleasure in sharing this

masterpiece of an address with my colleagues and include it in my extension of remarks.

The welcoming address of Hon. John Sharp Williams, Member of Congress, to the Mississippi Historical Society on April 23, 1903, follows:

APPENDIX TO PROCEEDINGS

(Address of welcome, by Hon. John Sharp Williams)

Mr. President and Members of the Mississippi Historical Society: It is my pleasant task, if task indeed it, in any sense, can be called, to welcome you to the hospitalities and the freedom of our big little town. The occasion is twice blessed: blessed in the giving and in the receiving of your presence. The task is twice pleasant: because I know it will end by your falling in love with our people for the same reason that all others that have known them have fallen in love with them because they couldn't help it. It is pleasant also because of the general character and local significance of the study to further which your Society was organized and exists.

There is no study more interesting certainly and probably none more important than that of history. "I know of no light to guide my footsteps other than that of the past," said Patrick Henry in effect. The study of history furnishes us with that light and makes us acquainted with its use. There has long been and long will be a discussion—somewhat academic—of the question: "Which is of the greater utility, the man of action or the man of study"—the man who makes history or the man who writes it? A young lady once asked one of my little boys: "Which of us is the sweetest?" and he replied with singular frankness "Both of us." So both of them are the most useful. The man of action—whether on the field, in the cabinet, in legislative hall or on the bench—the man who makes history; we cannot do without; his initiative and his for the greater part the plaudits of mankind. But if it were not for him who records what has been done—the things accomplished and the things attempted, which were failures—the world would have to live its life, virtually, over again every generation or two; most of the conquests of man's brain and the lessons of his experience would be constantly in a state of being forgotten and relearned. Continuity in progress would be destroyed. We can not build a Pyramid of Cheops today because after the work of its erection there was no recorder of the manner of its doing. The world has lost Tyrian purple and for a long time had lost the art of making glass because no record of the processes came down to us. Progress in civilization is first the work of individuals in a given generation; then comes the work of conservation, without which there could be no great development, improvement or extension—one generation building on the foundation, or post-foundation structure of another. This is the "mounting on our dead selves to higher things" of which Tennyson speaks. It is thus only that "through the progress of the suns one increasing purpose runs." It would not run very far nor increase very much except for the labors of the Muse of History—the muse conservative of human progress. The whole discussion is best relegated to the debating societies, however, for the simple reason that there are no two such distinct classes as are here assumed—they intermingle always, and as enlightenment goes on, more and more. The men of action write history and write it most interestingly and instructively—witness: Sallust, Caesar, Thucydides, and Froissart, and Gen. Dick Taylor, and those known best as historians only were yet men engaged in large affairs of state or of industry—making history as members of parliament, colonial administrators, soldiers or diplomats, witness: Macauley, Motley, Bancroft, Guizot, etc.

Out of this comes this lesson—the historian must know much of many things, certainly much of the thing or science whose history he undertakes to write; because history-writing is the art conservator of all the arts. Hence too the truth which Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, wrote and which has been read without digestion and quoted without understanding by so many since. After telling us that reading makes a full man, speaking a ready man and writing an accurate man, he adds: Poetry makes a man witty, mathematics makes him subtle, philosophy makes him grave and *history makes him wise*. History is necessarily written, whether by pictures or hieroglyphics on the eternal rocks, or by printed words still more imperishably on perishable paper and because it is written cultivates accuracy in the writer and reader. Then "history makes a man wise." Why? Is it not because the historian *must* keep in his mind's eye many peoples, many times and many sciences? Breadth is almost wisdom; narrowness is almost its opposite. Old Homer attributed the wisdom of the wisest of his Grecian chieftains to the fact that he had seen "many cities and many men." The historian cannot be a mere specialist, who may have much knowledge, or many knowledges, with little wisdom. A specialist may emerge from among details about which his "knowledges" are wonderful, like one who walking in a great beautiful forest and examining there with a microscope, bark and leaf and acorn, comes out with no correlation of the whole, "no bird's eye view," and who, once in the open, says he did not see the forest for the leaves or the bark—like Yankee Doodle, who "couldn't see the town for the houses."

Thus in *space*, comprehension is necessary for the historian—he cannot be a mere "chronicler of small-beer"—a mere "classifier of chalks." And in *time* duration—long-sightedness—is necessary for him. His is not the work of a mere to-day; it is the work of recording the work of many yesterdays; and, if wisely, well or interestingly recorded, recording the work of many yesterdays with a view of hastening and well-ordering the work of to-day and of to-morrow.

"Knowledge comes but wisdom lingers." Waits or "lingers" on what? *On the generations and the lessons of the generations*. On the slow processes of material, intellectual, social, political and racial evolution; hence wisdom comes especially from history, which study alone presents *in one view* these slow processes. Out of the confusing maze of the many knowledges of to-day and yesterday—the many sciences—*scientia*—history gathers wisdom—the fruit—that which has fructified—that which has ripened—that which is digestible for man in the building up—culturing—his social system for further growth. This then is civilization. Is it not?

It is said that a pygmy on the shoulder of a giant can see further and in a wider horizon than the giant. Thus a historian of to-day, though a pygmy, can see further into the future than a giant of Napoleon's day—of which day he was—by the way—himself the giant—further than Solon who made laws, as he fondly imagined, for many generations, or Lycurgus, who still more fondly fancied that he had moulded institutions for all time.

There will always be two classes of historians and much discussion which class writes history best. One class consists of those who tell "a plain unvarnished tale," "as they themselves have heard it;" "naught extenuating, naught setting down in malice" and naught explaining either. Some of them mere wonder-eyed children, like Herodotus, as much astonishing themselves, as others, by the stories they repeat; some mere chroniclers, like the old monks, mere "Dry-as-dusts" as Carlyle called them, though, by the way, much of Carlyle's best work had been

left perforce undone but for the previous labors of these same "Dry-as-dusts"; others of them, like old Froissart, stirring your soul as with a trumpet blast out of the past. Then the second class consists of those who "point a moral," as well as "adorn a tale;" some of them beautifully keeping the thread of the story, like Von Sybel, Carlyle, Gibbon, Macaulay, Hume, and Tacitus; some, like Bunsen, for example, with so much pointing of morals and so much philosophizing about causes, that there is scarcely any tale told at all, becoming rather narrative metaphysicians, theologians, or politicians than history writers—producing a result like Wagner's music with so many variations of sound that there is no tune or melody left. It must ever be remembered that the word history means, etymologically, "a story"—a tale told—only it must be a true tale, that is all. The first class simply pictures the moving panorama of facts—*facts*—things done—collated, proportioned and, in a way, made dramatic—leaving the reader to read *into* the book between the lines by the application of his own intellect, with its peculiar coloring or light derived from his own peculiar place, time, individuality and heredity, his own lesson or philosophy; the other class furnishes the lesson, as seen in the writer's light or coloring, "ready-made," teaching "Geschichtliche-wissenscraft," as the Germans word it, the "philosophy of history," as we phrase it. Which class writes history best? The answer is again "both of us." Both are necessary. The chronicler, indispensable and first in order of time, is perhaps the most instructive and pleasing, if he tells his tale eloquently and well, to those few, who are able to do their own digesting and whose intellectual light is strong enough to enable them, without help from others, to illumine the page with its lesson. The second class is equally, but later indispensable, and more instructive, perhaps, for that "wider many" who must have their food cooked for them and who read only *out of* a book and never anything *into* it.

So much for the importance of the study of history generally.

A few words as to the local significance of its study—its bearing upon us as residents of a State and a section. The history of Mississippi—in fact, of the whole South—has yet to be written. Indeed, the history of no one Southern State can be written except as a part of the History of the South. In many fields even the local chronicler has not yet done his first work. Much of the material has been lost and will never be regained. Let us save what is left. Then let the broad chronicler, with his "plain unvarnished story" come next. And then in God's own time, will come the historical philosopher, he who can draw for all men the *lesson*—buttrussing it with the admitted or proven facts. I believe, that when the time and the man shall have come, the philosophy of our sectional history—the purpose, conscious or unconscious, of our sectional strivings—will be shown to have been always consistent, always at one with itself and with the eternally right—one "increasing purpose" running through it all—a purpose divinely unvarying. And that purpose—whatever shibboleth of the hour, whether States' rights, secession, sanctity of slavery, equal citizenship in the territories, anti-reconstruction, or what not, may more or less have obscured it to the eyes of others and for a time to our own—that unvarying purpose being this; the preservation of our racial purity and racial integrity—the supremacy in our midst of the white man's peculiar code of ethics and of the civilization growing out of it—equally peculiar to him. It will show that there has been no "lost cause" but a *preserved cause*, though many things thought at many times to be a necessary part of the cause have been lost. For example secession has been lost, but it was

never our *Cause*. It was the remedy resorted to in order to assert the *Cause*. Slavery has been lost, but it was not our *Cause*, though we thought so once and fought for it among other things. But why? Was it not because our people thought that with the enfranchisement of the negroes would necessarily come the downfall of the white man's civilization and the destruction of his family life, whence is evolved his code of ethics and upon which is based his civilization? The event has proven that the *apprehended* result was not a *necessary* result, but how well founded was the apprehension, judging by San Domingo, Mexico and South America whose experience alone history had then furnished us! Moreover how hardly did we escape it? Would we have escaped it at all, but for the fortitude, patience, constancy, self-discipline, self-command, and solidarity and *capacity for organization* learned during four years of hardship and war?

But we, the people of Yazoo, "came not here" to talk but to welcome you and to listen, and I can not therefore go into all that I have suggested. History will go into it. The world has yet a lesson to learn from us and from our struggles, has yet to learn our part in the "increasing purpose" of "the God in History." Never fear; the world will learn it. "Wisdom lingers" but it comes after a time. Only save the material—the "knowledges"—the quartz; the miner will come and then the smelter and then the purifier. Perhaps he is here already though we do not know it. Your Society and others like it throughout the South—all doing noble work—can furnish the opportunity, perhaps the man. Mr. President, we welcome you with hand and tongue and heart to our "City of Beautiful Roses," where you will be so much more sweetly welcomed, later on, by the scarcely less beautiful women, who grew the beautiful roses.

PHOSPHATES IN DETERGENTS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the outcry that has arisen in recent months against the pollution of our air, land, and water has not, in my opinion, focused sufficiently on the part that each of us can play in the battle to preserve our environment.

In addition to the obvious contributions we can make to this effort, such as picking up our trash, there are a number of things the concerned American can do. One of these is to use products, such as detergents, that are relatively low in polluting ingredients.

For the benefit, therefore, of those who may be interested I am inserting in the RECORD a list, provided by the League of Women Voters of Skokie, Ill., of common household detergents indicating the percentage of phosphates in each. Phosphates are an essential nutrient of algae, which clog our waterways and kill large numbers of fish by depriving them of oxygen. It is clear that those products that have a high phosphate content are the more serious polluters, and that those with little or no phosphates do far less damage. The following list is merely one indication that the battle against pollution need not be left entirely to Govern-

Phosphates in detergents
[In percent]

Axion	43.7
Biz	40.4
Bio-Aid	35.5
Salvo	35.3
Oxydol	30.7
Tide	30.6
Bold	30.2
Ajax Laundry	28.2
Punch	25.8
Drive	25.3
Dreft	24.5
Gain	24.4
Duz	23.1
Bonus	22.3
Breeze	22.2
Cheer	22.0
Fab	21.6
Cold Power	19.9
Cold Water All	9.8
Whisk	7.6
Diaper Pure	5.0
Trend	1.5
Blue Luster	None
Borateen	None
Ivory Snow	None
Lux	None
Lux Flakes	None
Vel	None

CONCERN EXPRESSED BY CONGRESSMAN WHALEN OVER THE SOVIET ROLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AS OUTLINED IN AVIATION WEEK MAGAZINE

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly clear that the Soviet Union has gone beyond the role of a mere supplier of military equipment in the Middle East to that of a participant.

Russian pilots now are standing alert to fly intercept missions as part of the Egyptian air defense system against deep Israeli air penetrations. Soviet crews also will have to operate the new SA-3 low-altitude missile emplacement being constructed in Egypt. There are other examples as well.

The question that logically follows then is: What is the Soviet intent in the Middle East?

One thesis that I find particularly persuasive and distressing was articulated in the May 18 issue of the highly regarded *Aviation Week & Space Technology* magazine. I have no reason to believe that the main thrust of the article, that the Soviet Union's goal is control of the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf States, is incorrect. I have detected no evidence that the State Department, or Mr. Kissinger in the White House basement, care to dispute this contention.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would be of benefit to my colleagues to insert herewith the *Aviation Week* article:

SOVIETS ACCELERATING MIDEAST DRIVE

(By Edward H. Kolcum)

GENEVA.—Soviet Union is accelerating its massive penetration into the Middle East and employing strategy designed to give it control of the Suez Canal, the Red Sea and ultimately the oil-rich, defenseless states that border the Persian Gulf.

At the same time, Russia has started to court Libya directly with the objective of torpedoing the French sale of 108 Dassault Mirages to that country. In this move, Russia has the strong support of Egypt, Libya's eastern neighbor.

The feverish burst of Soviet activity is being viewed in Europe as a clever exploitation of the internal dissension in the U.S. triggered by President Nixon's controversial Cambodian campaign. While America, and much of the remainder of the western world, is engrossed in the U.S. domestic turmoil and events in Southeast Asia, Russia has been able to accelerate its Middle East timetable by:

Taking over the complete operation of three Egyptian military airfields and controlling three others.

Selling Libya 25 Mig-21 Mongol trainers. Increasing the number of seasoned airmen and ground troops in Egypt to 15,000. Another 5,000 Soviet civilian technicians and advisers are in the UAR.

Delivering 80 low-level surface-to-air SA-3 Goa missile launchers and 160 Goa missiles to Egypt.

Constructing 15 T-shaped Goa concrete-shelter sites along the entire 109-mi. length of the Suez west bank. Sites are being built at standard 7.5-mi. intervals along the Suez narrows. This interval allows a range overlap for the SA-3s, providing a serious potential threat to low-level Israeli strike missions against massed Egyptian artillery emplacements along the west bank. The Goas probably will be manned by Russian military personnel.

Deploying four Tupolev Tu-16 strategic reconnaissance aircraft to Aswan, from which they will keep watch on the Red Sea.

Stationing a picket destroyer off the Sinal coast to furnish early warning data to Egypt of Israeli air activity.

Increasing air- and sea-lift between Russian and Egyptian ports to the point where deliveries now are at the heaviest pace since the end of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

A new intelligence assessment is that Russia will bring a total of 150 MiG-21J interceptors and 250-300 interceptor pilots into the UAR to defend the country's interior. Three airfields now completely under Soviet command and control are at Inchas, 30 mi. to the northeast of Cairo; Jiyanklis, 70 mi. to the northwest of Cairo, and Al Mansura, 70 mi. north of the UAR capital. Russian pilots also fly from Beni Suf, Cairo West and Aswan. They probably control these bases, but Egyptians also fly from them.

Soviet aircraft are protected by camouflaged shelters at all bases. There are about 450 hardened shelters in Egypt.

In addition to interior air defense of Egypt and reconnaissance of the Red Sea, Russia also conducts routine reconnaissance of the U.S. 6th Fleet and the Mediterranean, using seven Tu-16s, with Egyptian markings but flown by Russian crews (AW&ST Mar. 30, p. 16).

The 15,000 uniformed Russian airmen and troops in Egypt are responsible not only for operating and maintaining MiG-21J interceptors and Goa missiles, but also for manning and maintaining associated search radars and the artillery defending the missiles and radar. Russia has deployed two low-level radars to Egypt. They have the code names Low Blow and Flat Face. The 23-mm. antiaircraft artillery used for defense is radar controlled.

Russian flying elements in Egypt are organized into 12-aircraft units. Three such units, with 36 aircraft, form a fighter regiment. The entire Soviet interceptor fleet in Egypt goes on alert whenever Israeli aircraft penetrate UAR airspace.

New equipment delivered to Egypt in recent weeks also had included 16 additional Sukhoi Su-7 fighter bombers. This brings to 86 the number of these strike aircraft in

Egyptian hands, and the new deliveries indicate that Egypt intends to increase its air pressure on the occupied Sinai.

As of late last week, Egypt's tactical combat air fleet also consisted of 55 MiG-21Cs and 44 MiG-21Ds. The UAR also has 73 tactical helicopters—mainly the Mil Mi-1, -4, -6 and -8.

In Russia's Middle East and North African penetrations, Egypt has been the strategic pivot point. There is a new fear that Egypt is convincing Libya to back out of its deal with France to buy Mirages. The rationale for this is that 25 Mongol trainers have been delivered to Egypt, which does not need them. They are apparently awaiting further shipment to Wheelus Air Base when the U.S. completes its withdrawal from this base June 30. Egypt and Libya will establish a master Arab air training center and air academy at Wheelus when the U.S. leaves (AW&ST Mar. 23, p. 14).

French sources dispute the conclusion that Libya is about to default on the Mirage deal and say that first deliveries will be made on schedule next January and February. They point out that Libya already has lost \$80 million by cancelling the missile air defense package with Britain. It is estimated that Libya has paid at least \$30 million down on the \$400-million Mirage deal, which includes spares, training and maintenance as well as the 108 aircraft.

Oil looms ever larger as the major strategic and economic factor behind Russia's Middle East and North African push (AW&ST Mar. 30, p. 8). Although the Persian Gulf states have largely been overlooked by intelligence experts as a Soviet goal, the departure of Britain from the five states there makes the area highly attractive at minimum risk.

Britain will begin its East-of-Suez withdrawal this summer and complete it by the end of next year. This will leave the wealthy states of Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Muscat and Oman, and the Trucial states open to Soviet incursions.

These developments are evidence to some western observers that land-based military airpower is the real strategic key to the Soviet Middle East intervention. To Israeli planners, the speed at which Russia is moving means the price Egypt is paying to the Soviets for military and economic aid is the control of the Suez Canal.

With Soviet control of the Suez, a direct confrontation between Russia and Israel will be unavoidable if Israel continues its basic policy of holding the Sinai territory it captured in the 1967 war. A critical aspect of Israeli strategy is to pin the enemy down along a 15-mi. strip behind the Suez ceasefire line to prevent an Arab buildup for retaking the Sinai (AW&ST May 11, p. 18).

At this point, Israel appears willing to allow the Soviets to defend enclaves in Egypt's interior but believes its existence depends on maintaining the Sinai as a buffer zone. Doubtless, both sides will probe the other to determine how far they can go short of exploding the area into a general war.

CHEAP LABOR

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, in the current hue and cry over foreign imports and their disastrous effects on American industries and American workingmen, we often hear the charge the United States cannot compete on fair grounds because foreign producers take advantage of cheap labor costs.

The following article, the second in a series of five written by Sylvia Porter for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, refutes that charge. Nor does Miss Porter agree with the contention Japan dumps her goods on the American market at cut-rate prices.

Instead, she pinpoints the reason for Japan's almost unbelievable production growth to other reasons: the close-knit relationship between government and industry; her ability to copy technology from other nations and improve on the product; the dedication of the Japanese worker; and the strong protectionist policies erected by the Japanese Government.

The article is most informative and I invite the attention of my colleagues to it: "CHEAP LABOR" DOES NOT EXPLAIN JAPAN'S Go-Go

(By Sylvia Porter)

TOKYO.—It's a portable pop-up, TV, the first of its kind in the world. I touched the lid and up popped a 5-inch screen for a black and white picture. I touched the lid and back folded the screen into a case which also included an FM/AM radio and which altogether weighed a mere 13 pounds. It works on any house current or a built-in rechargeable battery with a life span of 500 hours. Matsushita Electric of Japan will introduce it to the U.S. market this June to sell for under \$180.

It's a 5½ by 9½-inch electronic calculator weighing 3 pounds. On the simplest of keyboards, I added, subtracted, multiplied, divided (and erased my mistakes) in an instant. Sharp Corp. of Japan has this one for the U.S. at \$390, cheapest on the market.

It's a tiny tape recorder with a tiny microphone which works with an easy standard cassette and can be carried in a man's coat pocket. All the big Japanese electronics companies have models which are available in the \$80-\$90 range.

I could go on and on, detailing the exciting consumer electronics products I saw on the assembly lines at Matsushita Electric in Osaka, at the opening of the 1970 Electronics Show in Tokyo, at Expo '70.

For while the pioneering U.S. electronics industry has been concentrating on extremely complicated military and commercial equipment, a gap has opened in the home and small office field. Into this gap, Japan has happily moved and now she's challenging us on all sides.

The phenomenal electronics boom in Japan is almost unbelievable. Her production has been climbing at a rate of 35 to 38 per cent a year! The U.S. Ambassador to Japan, Armin H. Meyer, estimated for me that her output would reach \$7.4 billion this year.

While our output is at \$26 billion, thoughtful projections show the U.S. and Japan reaching the same level—\$45 billion—within 15 years.

How come? The answer, I cannot overemphasize, is not, as you may think, cheap labor!

While her wage scale is nowhere near ours—what nation's is?—she's up to Italy's level and moving toward England's. What's more, Japanese companies take on costs and responsibilities for their employes beyond anything the U.S. even dreams of.

Nor is the reason Japan's unfair dumping at cut-rate prices. She does not export cheaper brands and sell higher-priced items in the home market but so do we. No. The reasons, I am convinced after this trip to Japan's industrial centers, are much more subtle.

Her uniquely close government-trade-industry-financial relationships and the way all segments plan together for growth in specified, selected areas. This sort of relationship is absolutely alien to us; our anti-trust laws abhor it.

But in each of 22 major industries, just three Japanese Zaibatsu—Mitsubishi, Fuyo and Sumitomo—account for one-third to 100 per cent of all production.

The bigness of these family trusts alone helps control Japan's production, markets, prices, profits, competition and promote national goals.

Her astounding capacity for copying the technology of other nations, building superior "Japan-ized" products on this know-how, and then creating on her own.

Her highly skilled, educated, dedicated and fantastically industrious labor force. I never saw anything like the concentration and cheerfulness of the young men and women on Japan's assembly lines.

Her protectionist policies which safeguard her industries from foreign competition while her companies freely penetrate other markets. Japan is now lowering her barriers, but they are still far too high for a nation at her advanced stage of economic development.

What does it all mean?

To you and me, the buyers of electronics products, the competition is great. We benefit from new, improved and cheaper products.

To the electronics industries of both Japan and the U.S. the competition is a challenge: Japan must give us fair access to her markets and permit us to invest, develop joint ventures and licensing agreements and we must continue to permit her to compete freely for you and me, the consumers.

To both our governments, it's a warning: they must help promote a new era of cooperation and competition between us as equals.

Chujiro Fujino, president of the powerful Mitsubishi Kaisha, Ltd., put it perfectly, I think, when at the end of a long interview he said:

"We must not repeat the mistakes of World War II. We will either collide or cooperate. But since we both must keep growing, there is only one way to go: cooperation.

"D-DAY—1970"

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in June 1944, it was my privilege to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on D-Day by Mr. Pete Wehmeier. At that time, Mr. Wehmeier was editor of the Gosport, a publication of the U.S. Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. At this time, Mr. Wehmeier is an employee of the State of Florida on the Governor's Safety Committee. He has written another timely D-Day editorial, and it is my pleasure to submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

"D-DAY—1970"

(By Pete Wehmeier)

On June 6, 1970, we will observe the 26th anniversary of "D-Day", the Allied invasion of the beaches of Normandy, World War II.

Today, 1970, we face another "D-Day"—the battle for survival on our streets and highway. "D-Day—1970", printed below, dramatizes the needless slaughter and the constant current battle against instant death on our streets and highways; also the urgent need for all responsible and concerned motorists and pedestrians to join in the 1970 war against traffic deaths.

To date, 1970, U.S. traffic fatalities exceed those for the same period a year ago. During the past decade (1960's) there were 475,024 traffic fatalities in the United States—more than our World War II bat-

tle deaths. Currently, there are more U.S. traffic fatalities each year (56,400 in 1969) than our battle dead (42,118 as of May 16, 1970) during nearly 9½ years of fighting in Vietnam. We get concerned about our war dead and air pollution, and rightly so, but remain complacent and show little concern over our increasing traffic fatalities.

During the past decade U.S. traffic deaths, if concentrated in one small area, would total enough to wipe out completely the entire population of a city the size of Buffalo, Portland, Louisville, Newark, Oakland, Minneapolis, Toledo, Long Beach, Fort Worth, or Nashville.

The new decade (1970's) could and should show a decrease in traffic fatalities, but will it? The answer will be determined largely by the degree public apathy can be decreased, and safety involvement participation by millions of drivers and pedestrians can be increased.

The novel traffic safety editorial follows:

DEADLINE: "D-DAY—1970"

"Dedication.—Defenseless, defensive drivers.

"Denouncing.—Disobedient, discourteous, disrespectful, dispicable, drunk, drugged, despotic, decapitating death-dealing, dangerous driving daredevil demons . . . desecrating democracy . . .

"Death drives daily.—Describable dramatic driving deaths definitely disables, destroys, deprives dozens daily, doubles doctors debts. Dependents destitute—due drink, dope, drugs, disregard, domineering, dizzy, dazed, damn dangerous, deceitful, delusive "donkey" drivers duplicating devastation, disorder, dastardly deeds.

"Detention.—Dandy Dads drink/drive, dodge death, do disturbance, District deputy dispatched . . . drunkometer . . . docket . . . driver donates dollars . . . defendant detained. Dad's driving denied, disallowed . . . dungeon . . . desiccate.

"Doomsday.—Dreamy, discrete "delectable dish" dolls, dainty, delicate, diminutive, divine dancing, dating, darling debutante daughters—distressed, depressed, discomforted, disfigured, dislocated, dismembered, disintegrate—dead! Doleful drum dirge . . .

"Drink, drugs.—Dipsomaniac, debonair, dashing, daring, daggered, dungaree dressed dropouts . . . defiant, despiteful, delinquent, double-dealing, disgustingly debased, depraved, drivelling, drunk-drugged dumb deleterious devilish demagogues . . . "dragging" dreadful defective "dreadnaughts"—deny, disclaim Deity, dethrone decency, defy desired dutiful defense driving—deal, distribute destructive damage, demolished dashboards, debris, disaster . . . depravation . . . dismal death . . . damnation.

"Damage, destruction.—Discouraged, dishearted, disingenious, disconsolate, despondent, disenchanting, disillusioned, disbelieving, disoriented, disorganized, distressed, dejected, depressed, distrusting, deprived, dissipated, deaf, discredited, demented debilitated, dotting, dillydallying drivers—die drowning. Decompose. Ditto distasteful, disgusting, disgraceful.

"Disagreement.—Drowsy, dozing, dopey, daffy, dazzling damsels (dames, dowager drivers), deem disfavor disemboweling domain, disbelieve, deny discovered damage. . . duress . . . disagreement . . . disown . . . divorce . . .

"Dissatisfaction.—Disappointed, discontented, diligent, dexterous, decent drivers . . . deplore deceitful, deucedly dispicable dirty driving—desire disarming disobeying, defrauding, devastating, destructive, depreciative, dishonorable, detestable, demoralized disappearing demon-driving devilish dragon "diseased" dupes.

"Desire.—Distinguished, degree'd, dutiful, deferential, dictatorial, dedicated defensive driving disciples, do disapprove death, disaster, destructive damage, depredation, desolation—display definite desirous devotion—declaim, denunciate, delve, dig, detect,

deduce, detour, design, discount, disallow, discard, deviate, draw, draft, decipher, diagnose, discover, discuss discourse . . . debate, digress, define, document, demur, deem, devise, divulge, declare data . . . disseminate, disburse, decree, dictate direct deliberate drive . . . dogmatic determination demanding drastic disarming, defeating, debarring, disbanding, demobilizing, dethroning disin-terested decapitating drivers, 'Deacons' dearly defend defensible democratic driving doctrine.

"Decision.—Dynamic denizens drive defensively definitely diluting disastrous demise. Don't delay donating, dollars, dimes, doubloons, ducats, drachma, dough . . . displaying desired denunciation demanding decisive death decrease! Desegregate defensive/dangerous drivers!

"Drive defensively.—Drizzle. Driveway-damp, devious . . . design-displeasing . . . darkness displeasurable driving, discouraging, dusty, desolate, disillusioning, dismal, difficult, doubtful. Detour-deranged, dreary, distracting, dull, deserted, depleted, denounced, deluged, delaying, deformed, defunct, defaced. Deadly . . . discontinuing, discordant, discredited, discrepancies, disdainful, disorderly, dubious damaging . . . denoting danger! Drive Defensively!

"Democracy—destiny.—Dedicated drivers Dusk . . . darkness . . . dawn . . . daybreak . . . daylight. Desired dignity . . . devotion . . . dwells during democracy! Divine deliverance day—death's diminish!"

PRESIDENT NIXON'S DECISION TO SEND TROOPS INTO CAMBODIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WASHINGTON REPORT

This past week, President Nixon called an unusual meeting of Congressional leaders to defend his decision to send American troops into Cambodia. I was among those called to the White House for the two-hour briefing. I have grave reservations about the Cambodian venture. I came away reassured, at least in part, that the President wants very much to reduce American involvement in Vietnam and to limit the Cambodian thrust. Because of its importance, I want to summarize the President's report.

The President's theme was that the U.S. action was designed to buy time—time to allow the Vietnamization program to work, to bring the South Vietnamese Army up to strength, and to continue the withdrawal of American troops.

The action was taken at this time, he said, because of recent, rapid developments in Cambodia and in South Vietnam. Cambodia, under the rule of neutralist Prince Sihanouk, permitted the North Vietnamese to maintain supply and staging areas on the South Vietnam border, and to receive supplies through Cambodian harbors on the Gulf of Thailand.

When an anti-Communist military group recently overthrew Sihanouk the North Vietnamese moved to attack the new government and protect their supply lines in Cambodia.

The President said he refused a request from the new government for massive military assistance because of the obvious danger of being drawn into an Asian war and because of the inability of the Cambodian military to use effectively the arms.

The Cambodian operations are being limited in extent, purpose and duration, he said. American troops are to penetrate not more than 30 kilometers, their primary mission is to destroy stockpiles of arms and food, and their operation is to be completed by July 1.

The move against the Cambodian sanctuaries, he insisted, was legal. He emphasized that the operation was not an invasion of Cambodia since the sanctuaries have not been under the control of Cambodia for some time. There are no limitations of international law in the right of self-defense, he said. International law permits the use of reasonable force to attack an enemy which occupies a neutral country.

Repercussions, both international and domestic, have been quick. The North Vietnamese delegates appear to be boycotting the Paris Peace Talks. Reaction from other nations, however, has been restrained. The Communist countries have objected strenuously, but, so far, they have taken no overt action. The President said he is making it very clear to the Soviet Union and Red China that the U.S. is not attempting to defeat the North Vietnamese or invade Cambodia—only cleaning out sanctuaries on Cambodian soil.

Reaction at home has been swift, and in many cases, violent. The President acknowledged rising student unrest, but said his action was designed to help end the war, assist the complete American withdrawal, and make an all-volunteer army feasible—matters which have been fermenting student discontent.

I have supported the President in his efforts to disengage our forces from Vietnam. He has made a sincere effort to de-escalate the conflict and withdraw our troops. Recent experience in Vietnam, however, raises doubts whether the Cambodian exercise will lead to negotiation or heightened confrontation and whether the political price will be too high for a relatively minor military gain.

The action was taken without advising or consulting with the Congress, and right after Secretary Rogers had assured the Congress that no troops would be committed to Cambodia without consulting with Congress. While the President has talked of reducing our profile in Asia, this exercise extends our presence in that area.

Recent events show, too, that the internal stability and tranquility of the Nation have been disrupted, and the country is not drawing together on the issue of Vietnam, but polarizing, separating even more.

SIXTH FLEET STATUS DECLINES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the decline of our naval superiority in the past decade, particularly in view of the Russian Navy's massive expansion and modernization. I know my House colleagues will find the following San Diego Union article by T. T. Cross on the plight of our 6th Fleet of special interest and concern:

SIXTH FLEET STATUS DECLINES

(By T. T. Cross)

BEIRUT.—As recently as five years ago the American 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean Sea was a spear aimed at the industrial and demographic Achilles' heel of Soviet Russia.

Its carrier task forces, forever on the prowl, could launch toward targets the breadth of

European Russia as many as 200 supersonic jets, each carrying in its belly enough atomic thunder to obliterate 100 Hiroshimas.

This awesome fleet was virtually invulnerable to sneak attack—and only such an attack could prevent its launching planes in the event of war. Its high-flying round-the-clock radar pickets guaranteed a warning of approaching aircraft and missiles in time for the fleet to mount a counterstrike and disperse.

Its 24-hour steaming radius of 700 miles forced the enemy to guess where in 1.5 million square miles of sea it would be found on a given day. As for submerged enemy submarines, they simply couldn't keep up with the flying task forces.

The 6th Fleet was—and still is—supplied directly from the United States by a sea-train of cargo vessels, conserving American gold by limiting dollar purchases abroad. Fueling and provisioning at sea also eliminated a need for expensive land bases which, like Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya, were regarded by local populations as bastions of American imperialism and—again like Wheelus—had to be abandoned at enormous cost in the end.

The ships' crews were welcome wherever they went ashore, for the sailors and Marines were well-policed by their own tough shore patrol, and customarily spent upwards of \$3 million during an average 10-day port visit. As a combination of strategic power and political invisibility, the 6th Fleet was perhaps unrivaled by any naval unit in recent history.

No more.

The status of the 6th Fleet has so radically degenerated in the last three years, in fact, that there is reason to suspect that it can no longer perform its primary mission of providing retaliatory strike capability against Russia should war come.

The 6th Fleet's decline began through no fault of its own, years ago when a penny-wise Congress and computer-led Pentagon slowed new ship development and procurement to a funeral pace, precisely at the moment Russia was building a new navy from the keel up.

Except for its nuclear submarine fleet, the U.S. Navy must now face its enemies with slightly modernized vessels basically of World War II design. Russia, meanwhile has concentrated its naval budget on the construction of fast guided missile cruisers and destroyers, helicopter carriers, and other new-generation ships tailor-made for today's wars, and for which the American Navy can offer no equivalents in the numbers it needs.

The erosion of the 6th Fleet's effectiveness rapidly accelerated after the brief Arab-Israeli war of 1967. America's mild reaction to Israel's killing over 30 sailors aboard the 6th Fleet intelligence ship, USS Liberty, followed by its jubilation over the Israeli victory, convinced the Arabs that America's commitment to Israel was coldly considered, complete and irreversible.

Accordingly, the welcome mat to Arab ports, with the exception of those in non-strategic Morocco and Tunisia, was abruptly pulled out from under the 6th Fleet and laid ceremonially before the Russians.

Today, American vessels are forbidden entry to Syria's Latakia, Egypt's Alexandria and Algeria's Mers-el-Kebir, where Russian men-of-war crowd the docks.

These Russian ships are now deployed in the Mediterranean in ever-increasing numbers. By American count, there some 63 of all types, as compared with approximately 100 (other, non-American observers say 40-odd) U.S. ships, including three carriers with 240 aircraft.

The Russians are not known to have any carriers in the Black or Mediterranean seas, and a consensus of informed naval sources therefore gives the Americans a healthy edge in firepower especially if, as is believed, the Russian Mediterranean fleet does not carry atomic weapons.

Probably overriding these diplomatic functions is the strictly military consideration of keeping a sharp eye on the Americans. Fast Russian fleet units shadow every 6th Fleet task force, sending back to Moscow regular position reports. They are aided by long-range Russian reconnaissance planes carrying Egyptian markings (and perhaps Russian crews) which insure that no major American fleet movement passes unobserved.

It is almost axiomatic that, should Russia decide to launch a preemptive missile attack against mainland United States, it would simultaneously launch an attack with nuclear weapons against the 6th Fleet, now pinpointed by that unblinking Peeping Tom, the Russian Mediterranean fleet.

Five years ago, had the crunch come, the 6th Fleet would have inflicted appalling devastation on Russia. Today, should Russia shoot first, there may not be time for the 6th Fleet to heave its anchors.

TOWARD A FAIR FARM POLICY

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer in rural America, and the sad fact is that our own agricultural program has contributed greatly to widening the gap.

Through the farm-subsidy program of the Department of Agriculture, which paid \$3.5 billion last year, much of it to wealthy farmers, we are helping to create what amounts to a Government-subsidized landed aristocracy and an impoverished rural peasantry of poor black and white farmers. Michael Harrington has described this sort of thing as "socialism for the rich and capitalism for the poor."

That I am from an urbanized part of the country does not decrease my eagerness to see an equitable farm program developed, a program that would be fair to farm people and to all the rest of us alike. This ought not to be a matter that sets some Americans against others on vocational or geographical lines. What happens in rural areas in our tightly woven, interdependent society affects urban areas, and vice versa; for one thing, when people cannot make a living on the farm, they move to town, with all the consequences for the Nation implied by this continuing urbanization.

So I, and many other Members who represent urban and suburban constituencies, would like to be able to vote for a fair farm support program, and will do so if we are given the opportunity.

In this spirit, I want to call to the attention of the House an article by Mr. William Robbins of the New York Times, which I am inserting in the RECORD for those who may have missed it. Mr. Robbins raises some basic questions about the Nation's farm policy, both as legislated and administered, and I have written the Secretary of Agriculture in hopes of obtaining his thoughts about these matters.

The article mentions the case of a Texas farmer who receives both subsidy payments from the Department of Agriculture and grants for irrigation projects from the Department of the Interior. If this is so, we need to know how widespread this practice is, and so I have asked the Secretary for a list of those receiving payments under both programs, together with the amount of money involved in each instance. Furthermore, if this kind of situation exists at all, I assume we will all agree that legislation is needed to prevent crop-limiting and crop-increasing programs from operating simultaneously on the same property.

Examples of the work of extension service agents cited in the article include teaching hamster care and lawn care, and working with hobby farmers and suburban pony clubs. Although I agree that the extension service should not be limited to serving and educating solely those who are farmers by profession, I wonder if Federal funds are wisely expended on peripheral projects when there are so many poor farmers, often inadequately educated about agricultural skills and technology and desperately in need of whatever help ESA might be able to give.

I have therefore asked the Secretary for his thoughts on the appropriate range of extension-service projects, together with a statement of Department policy regarding the extent to which agents are encouraged to involve themselves in efforts to solve the problems of poor farmers.

I am particularly concerned about the plight of small farmers who find themselves unable to make ends meet. I have asked Mr. Hardin to describe what programs the Department is pursuing to assist in the relocation of such farmers, and how extensively these programs are being utilized. I have also asked for details of the Department's approach to the serious problem of developing water resources and insuring that water tables in crucial areas do not fall to precariously low levels. I am especially interested in what precautions, if any, are being taken to conserve the Ogallala pool in the Midwest, which Mr. Robbins mentions in his article.

I have been impressed during my short term on the Agriculture Committee with the diligent and conscientious efforts of many members of the committee to work out an equitable bill. I am still hoping that we will, in fact, finally produce a bill that will end some of the unfairness that inflicts farmers and the general public alike under present legislation.

If we are unable to produce such a bill—if we are unable to do something as basic, as necessary, and as just as placing a reasonable limit on individual subsidy payments—it will be very difficult to persuade millions of Americans that they should approve the passage of any legislation continuing support programs for farms. We may not be able to correct in 1 year all the inequities that have arisen in our farm program, but we will have to move more clearly and decisively

in that direction or the laudable goals that underlie the concept of farm price supports will be forgotten in the reality of the peculiar perversions of these goals have grown up through the years.

I am grateful to Mr. Robbins for this difficult work he has done in so conscientious a way, and I am looking forward to Secretary Hardin's reply to my inquiry. It is not too late to produce a farm bill that would be fair to all involved, and I cannot believe that we will not have the help of farsighted and dedicated leaders of agriculture in working urgently toward that goal.

The article by Mr. Robbins follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1970]
FARM POLICY HELPS MAKE THE RURAL RICH RICHER

(By William Robbins)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—Young Fred Salyer swung his little red and white monoplane through a bright California sky, looking down on the flat expanse of the San Jacinto Valley. His father had faced bankruptcy there in the early thirties. Now the land supports a thriving farm, with operations so extensive that only in an airplane can they all be checked in one day.

Three thousand miles away, on a muddy road leading to a sagging house in South Carolina, Thomas Washington looked out over his 67 sandy acres summed up the result of a year's work. "Mister," he said, "there wasn't nothing left."

Both men are wards of the Department of Agriculture, but both get widely different benefits. The department pays the Salyer family nearly \$1.7 million a year in subsidies; it pays Mr. Washington slightly more than \$300.

Trips to the major agricultural regions of the United States, interviews with economists and Government officials and examination of official Government budgets and documents over several months show that the stories of Mr. Salyer and Mr. Washington are not unusual.

After three and a half decades and costs of billions of dollars the Department of Agriculture's farm programs continue to widen the gap between the rich and the poor.

"They have helped create a class of wealthy landowners while bypassing the rural poor—and that means 40 per cent of the poor people in this country," Dr. C. E. Bishop, agricultural economist and vice president of the University of South Carolina, said recently.

Meanwhile the problems of the rural poor have spilled over into the cities, which are trying to cope with millions of displaced farmers and farm workers. But the records show that the Government continues to spend more on middle-class and wealthy farmers than it does on a variety of national problems such as hunger, housing, urban transportation or air and water pollution.

Congress has a new opportunity this year to alter the focus and change direction as legislation that authorizes the farm programs expires. But the bill now in the House Agriculture Committee follows the same course as the vehicles that have brought the programs from the 1930's to 1970.

Critics are sure to mount a determined attack when the bill reaches the House floor. But the farm-oriented Congressmen who control the committee shaping the legislation have been able to beat down revolts against rising farm outlays in the past and are expected to do so again, with only a few compromises. And no compromise is likely to be sweeping enough to change the pattern of the Department of Agriculture, which keeps growing bigger while the farm population is dwindling.

Twenty years ago, when families living on farms totaled 20 million people, the department had appropriations of \$1.5-billion (\$2.3 billion in today's dollars) and a staff of 84,000. Today the farm population has dropped to about 10 million but the department's rolls have grown to 125,000, operating under appropriations of \$7.4-billion. The actual payroll, as under appropriations of \$7.4-billion. The actual payroll, as of last June 30, is substantially larger than estimate reported earlier in testimony before the House Appropriations subcommittee.

The department points to increasing responsibilities for food programs, which have been greatly expanded in reaction to a wave of national concern over hunger, and for rural housing and consumer affairs, but the biggest part of its funds is still budgeted for the old farm agencies.

Supporters of present farm policy contend that over the years the Government programs have created a highly efficient agricultural industry, the greatest in the world, with substantial benefits for consumers in the form of relatively low food prices. Critics acknowledged that the nation's farm industry in general is a monumental success, but they narrow the focus to the costs. They ask where the dollars go.

Some pay the Federal share of salaries for state and county agricultural and home extension services. The county agents' numbers, not officially included in the department's rolls, have grown from 6,796 in 1940 when there were six million farms to 10,282 today, when the number of farms has dropped to three million.

The service, which was started in 1911 but won its greatest acclaim for helping poor farmers in the Depression, now has agents who occupy themselves with teaching the care of hamsters to suburban children, lawn care to urban homeowners and investing to suburban wives.

In suburban Montgomery County, Maryland, the county agent's staff has nearly quadrupled while a third of the county's cropland was being cut up into housing and industrial lots. It was a 4-H agent who counsels clubs of suburban children on puppet-training and pony-care projects, a horticulturist who coaches weekend gardeners, an agriculture agent who says he spends a quarter of his time on hobby farmers and a home-extension woman who devotes most of her time to middle-class wives in exclusive communities.

The suburban pony club is operating without a pony.

However, two agents, working with low-income families come closer to the old image of the county and home extension agents than most of those in rural communities do.

In Abilene, Kans., where blowing dust in the nineteen-thirties turned noonday to night, agriculture extension agents have long finished teaching farmers to hold the earth in place with cover crops, and women extension agents no longer need to teach the nutritional value of green vegetables. They have moved on to other things.

Recently, the home extension agent met at a dinner with one of the 32 clubs that are her major responsibility. The women, well-dressed and obviously middle-class, were headed by the wife of the local gas distributor and was gathered to see a service film on weight-watching called "The Oopslies." Other clubs were scheduled for programs on investing, air-conditioning, folk music, politics and famous women of Kansas.

In the same week, the agricultural agent's farm visits focused on some of Dickinson County's most successful farmers.

But while some of the Agriculture Department's money goes into that sort of thing, the biggest part of it is allotted to farm subsidies, paid to those who agree to limit their crop acreage and help relieve pressure on prices by controlling surplus.

There is little coordination between Government programs. The Agriculture Department spent \$3.5-billion on subsidies last year, while the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation was spending \$85-million a year for irrigation projects to bring arid lands of the West into production.

On Arlin Hartzog's farm in Parmer County, Tex., as on others across the country, both the crop-liming and crop-increasing programs were in action at the same time. Mr. Hartzog received more than \$30,000 in Federal subsidies last year for liming his acreage while the Government was helping him pay for an irrigation system that enables him to make up for the production of the land he had diverted.

The Government puts out millions in such farm counties in subsidy payments to control surplus commodities. But it does not require the counties to help surplus people pushed off the land by the agricultural revolution produced in part by its research and farm programs.

Parmer County, whose farmers received \$12-million in Federal payments last year, has no food program although many of its hungry are farm workers like Reuben Gallardo, who lives with his family in a boxcar at Bovina.

Mr. Gallardo is unemployed part of every year, but for farm workers there is no unemployment pay, no compensation for accidents, no maximum to the hours they can be made to work without overtime pay, no minimum wage on most farms and no right to have a union bargain to improve their lot.

Contradictions also exist within the subsidy system. Payments encourage farmers in places like the High Plains of the Texas Panhandle to plant cotton, a crop unsuited to the climate. Payments to farmers like Clarence Martin, who receives about \$14,000, brought Parmer County's total in cotton subsidies to about \$2.5-million last year, while in the favorable California climate the Salyer farm could have equaled all of the Texas county's production, with or without a subsidy. Yet the Government paid the Salyer family \$942,000 to limit its cotton acreage.

The Agriculture Department's agency that helps pay for irrigation systems and other practices that increase production is also linked, under what is called the Agricultural Conservation Program, to depletion of vast water resources. In the Salyer family's area it helps pay for piping and land-leveling in deep-well irrigation systems that are lowering the water table.

The big farmers in the area are not worried, however, because projects of the Bureau of Reclamation will provide a new supply although, by law, its benefits are confined to 160 acres per farmer.

Some say that in a generation many sections will be left dotted with ghost towns, but there is no Federal control to curb further tapping of the resource. In Yuma County, Colo., the Gates Rubber Company has more than 60 wells and is still drilling, while all around its 10,000-acre Big Creek farm the water is being used so lavishly that pastures are now being irrigated.

The new irrigation systems are bringing a boom to parts of Yuma County and land values are multiplying, as Ruth Warrick, the home agent in Wraye noted.

There is no prospect, however, of replenishing a vast water resource that is being depleted in the Midwest—the Ogallala pool, which has been accumulating for centuries under parts of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas and Nebraska. In Parmer County, Bruce Parr's wells have already grown weak and experts say his water will be gone before his son is ready to take over the farm.

The Department of Agriculture now describes itself as a department of rural affairs. Besides meat-inspection and other activities for the general consumer, its agencies handle

food programs, protect forests, lend money for rural homes and farms, help develop water and sewer systems and soil-conserving watersheds, perform economic research, report on crops and markets and direct extension service through state land-grant colleges and universities.

In its rural affairs role, its mission is the well-being of 55 million rural people. But most of its budget is spent on three million farmers, a big part of it on the million its officials call "serious commercial producers"—the big farmers who produce most of the \$50 billion a year in crops and earn most of the \$16 billion a year in net farm income.

But 14 million poor people remain in rural areas after the flight of 20 million migrants to the cities.

The farm programs began in the early 'thirties when the Roosevelt Administration was floundering about in efforts to aid distressed farmers. There were nearly seven million of them then, most losing their shirts and a million losing their land. Surpluses were mounting as prices fell.

The farmer became stereotyped through the rich literature of the period as a man in patched overalls, bowed by debt and overwork, plodding behind a mule through eroded fields. He and his inevitably large family were undernourished though eating plentifully of heavy, overcooked meals.

Acreage controls and price supports were instituted to begin his economic rescue. Researchers at land-grant colleges stepped up their studies, county agriculture agents spread the word of their findings and women trained as home demonstration agents taught the farmers' wives about balanced diets that would end the wide-spread plague of pellagra.

The years since have brought a technological revolution on the farm. Instead of the man behind the mule, today's commercial farmer is more likely to be like Mr. Hartzog, a university trained planter who lives in a solid brick house set at the edge of the 1,300 acres he farms in Parmer County.

Mr. Hartzog, resting a muscular arm on the door of his pickup truck the other day, discussed at length the problems of the cities as well as the farms. The topic that stirred him most was farm subsidies.

"The payments are really a subsidy to consumers," he said. "They mean that the graduated income tax helps the average man pay for his food, and in this country that's the world's best bargain. But the farmer still earns less than other groups in the economy."

In general, what he said was supported by statistics. But these show that the income disadvantage fades among larger farmers.

As he suggested, the consumer has benefited, too. With the advances in technology spurred by the Department of Agriculture and brought to the farm by the extension agent, the American farmer has become highly efficient. As a result the average consumer pays 17 cents out of a dollar for his food and is left with more for other necessities and for luxuries than anyone else in the world.

But while technology and the farm programs have produced men like Mr. Hartzog, others like Mr. Gallardo, the Texas laborer, and Mr. Washington, the low-income farmer in South Carolina, have been left behind.

Mr. Gallardo is among the one-third of farm workers who are under-employed—a statistical way of saying that they are often unemployed—and at such times often hungry.

"The judge says we can't afford a food-distribution program," said Lorenzo Granada, a young poverty worker operating out of a dim little office off a side street in the village of Bovina, not far from the Gallardos' boxcar home. Mr. Granada, who haunts the local welfare office seeking funds to aid families like the Gallardos, said that the county costs would total about \$380 a month.

STILL AWAITING COUPONS

County Judge Archie L. Tarter, head of the local government, a smiling affable man, told a visitor at the courthouse nearby in Farwell:

"I could see a lot of benefits in a food program. But you see our welfare system handles the problem for a lot less money. We could put up maybe \$100 a month, though, if somebody else would set up a program."

The Department of Agriculture has promised to bypass the Farmer officials with food stamps, but the hungry are still waiting for the coupons.

Judge Tarter's farm, run by his two sons, received about \$11,000 of the \$12-million in Federal payments distributed last year to Farmer County's fewer than 1,300 farmers.

Mr. Gallardo and millions like him work at wages below poverty levels.

In South Carolina, the average farm laborer gets about \$1 an hour when he works. But Thomas Washington would be hard-pressed to pay that for help on his 67 acres near Kingstree in Williamsburg County. Last year he tried to scratch a living from about two acres of tobacco, 20 acres of cotton, some corn and pigs.

Low wages paid to laborers on bigger farms are reflected in the prices men like Mr. Washington receive for their crops and thus in their income for their own labor.

"Mister, all I had left were debts," Mr. Washington said after detailing the \$1,400 he had grossed from tobacco and about \$800 for cotton, including a little over \$300 in Federal payments.

He is one of more than a million low-income farmers who average less than \$400 in Federal subsidies while the top 100,000, or less than 4 per cent of all three million farmers, receive more than a third of the subsidies. Payments for the latter group range from \$5,000 to more than \$4-million for the J. G. Boswell Land Company, which has farms in California and Arizona as well as land interests abroad.

Aside from the differences in subsidies, men like Mr. Washington get fewer benefits from other farm programs than the big farmers do. The Farmer County farm agent is a well-known visitor at Mr. Hartzog's farm. Mr. Washington does not know his county agent's name, and Mrs. Washington, like Mrs. Gallardo, has never been visited by a home economist.

Among the ammunition of those expected to attack the disparity between farm subsidies and aid for the poor when the new farm bill comes up for debate will be a study made by John A. Schnittker when he was Under Secretary of Agriculture.

CALLED FOR REDUCTION

Mr. Schnittker found that the biggest farm subsidies could be reduced, producing substantial savings for the budget. He says a total of \$500-million could be diverted to rural development and projects for the poor without hurting the effectiveness of surplus controls.

But Mr. Schnittker, now a professor of economics at Kansas State University, also found, as he said recently: "The Boswells have powerful friends in Washington."

Orville L. Freeman, then Secretary of Agriculture, quietly buried Mr. Schnittker's report.

In an interview the present Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Hardin, said he saw no early prospect of substantial reductions in the subsidy costs. He said:

"The payments have been capitalized in land prices and mortgage structures. With a sudden change you could force some farms out of business and bring on a general struggle for survival."

He expressed the hope that future programs would give farmers greater latitude in

making their planting decisions and permit a transition from the payments system "under their own volition."

He did not explain how the transition would take place, although he has proposed a move away from strict application of crop allotments.

The Secretary said that among his greatest concerns were the problems of rural poverty and rural development. "We have to find ways to create jobs in the rural areas," he said. "We have to find ways and means of redirecting rural population, as it expands, into rural America and away from the cities."

The recent report by the Presidential committee, calling for unspecified amounts of Government spending on rural development, drew a cool reception, however, when it was presented to the Nixon Administration.

The bill now in Congress, described by Secretary Hardin as a "consensus" program, would reduce some of the largest payments but, if passed in its present form, would be expected to produce an over-all saving of no more than \$10-million a year out of future farm subsidies, which will climb next year to about \$3.7-billion.

Critics in Congress have gained strength and now stand a good chance of some further savings as well as some additional increases in food programs.

But when the speeches are over and the votes have been counted, the department of rural affairs is expected still to be a growing Department of Agriculture devoting the biggest part of its money and energy to a dwindling farm clientele.

REFORM OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, ours is a government of laws and not men. Congress should be governed by rules and not men.

The Constitution and the laws of the land contemplate each Congress as a new and separate entity. Legislation does not carry over from one Congress to the other—neither should one Congress commit another on either seniority or rule-making authority.

The rules which we adopt should be directed toward providing a sense of equality to those who serve only for a short time—whose contribution must be quickly made within time framework of their term.

Under the Constitution and the laws of the land, the most junior Congressman is presumed to be equal to the most senior. The rights of seniority are arbitrary. The rights of seniority are usurped at the expense of other Members.

Our purpose should be to give every Member of the 92d Congress the full measure of his rightful share of responsibility and authority. As a Member of a new Congress, he should have a right to select leaders and be considered for leadership and the making of rules.

The great majority of the Members of Congress are men who have served or who will serve less than four terms. Some of our great leaders have been de-

veloped through service and seniority, but we can never calculate how many we have lost or how many we have suppressed.

Many Members who serve for only a short time are brief in service not because they are not qualified, enterprising or of good judgment. It may be that they lacked only the ability to compromise for survival—a process in aging and seniority which gradually tends to erode the idealism with which most Members start and which only a few can safeguard through seniority.

A new Member gets elected to this Congress with high hopes, with great expectations, with idealism, with dedication, and high purposes.

Very suddenly after his arrival, he is appalled for he receives the prerequisites of his office and gradually begins to learn that he is not an equal Member of Congress. He is subordinate, he is less than others, he is junior.

He sees the power of leadership, the awesome power of committee chairmen, those—who decide in their own usurpation of authority—what bills shall be considered and when they shall be considered, and how. He sees klieg lights when his chairman and important witnesses appear, but he is never in them. He is in their shadow. When the time arrives for his important questions, the press is gone, the room is empty. His part comes after the curtain has been dropped.

He sees the fiefdoms of committee chairmen, subcommittee chairmen, men whose profundity stems from power rather than from wisdom. He sees the power of ranking committee members who are consulted while he is not. He sees the fiefdom of the powerful committees which he can never see in action because they are exclusive and secret to him.

He learns soon that some Members of his same Congress—equal Members to the body to which he has been elected—are cleared for secrets he does not share. That almost all of the business of some committees are total secrets to which he is not entitled. He learns that five or six men in a subcommittee can transfer the spending of billions of dollars under circumstances in which he is not informed.

After all of this, he is shocked by the sudden discovery of his insignificance. He awakens to learn that he is a nobody in the citadel, and he never comes to realize that he and the other nobodies in the Congress are, indeed, the great majority who have let the power drift and accrue in the hands of a few who have usurped it. The Congress itself, the world's greatest showcase of representative government, if shown inside out, would reveal itself as a process of questionable democracy where few have usurped the power which, indeed, belongs to the many.

It is not seniority alone that dwarfs the new Member. It is the custom which is not part of the law. It is these customs and traditions which are outside of the law and the Constitution, which have developed the Congress into an institution at least one and one-half generations behind the times it is intended to serve.

JOHN J. RHODES REPORTS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith in the RECORD the June 1 issue of my Newsletter—John J. Rhodes Reports—which I send periodically to my constituents in the First District of Arizona:

SOUTHEAST ASIA REPORT

With the far-ranging debate in recent weeks over our military operations in Southeast Asia, some of the more basic issues in that conflict have become clouded. Let us look at the situation as we find it today: Whether we like it or not, we are in Vietnam. Most Americans want us out of Vietnam, including President Nixon. The question is how best to accomplish that goal, protect American troops in the process, and insure that millions of South Vietnamese will not be killed immediately following our departure.

President Nixon has concluded that lasting peace in Vietnam depends upon the ability of the South Vietnamese to determine their own form of government and to defend it against aggression from the North. While the President did not abandon the negotiating table, he directed that top priority be given to the training of the South Vietnamese so that they would be able to assume the burden of their own defense. This is the program of "Vietnamization." The result of this policy has been the withdrawal of 115,000 Americans from South Vietnam to date, and the announced withdrawal of another 150,000 Americans by next spring.

I was in Vietnam a short time ago and am pleased to report on this situation first hand. I have never seen finer or more dedicated men than I saw among those wearing the uniform of the United States in Southeast Asia. Thanks to them, Vietnamization is working. The 1st South Vietnam Infantry Division, for example, is an outfit that can stay on anybody's battlefield. This is in striking contrast to the situation I found there in 1964 when every South Vietnamese I met gave me the impression that the North Vietnamese were invincible on the battlefield. Today it is different. They have confidence. They know they can get the job done.

The true test of Vietnamization, however, will come when the second 150,000 U.S. troop withdrawal has been completed. Remaining in Vietnam will be American troops—mainly communications, maintenance, and supply personnel. This is when the North Vietnamese may decide that they can strike quickly at our diminished force, humiliate the United States of America, and earn a cheap victory. The real mettle of the South Vietnamese will be tested when they try to defeat this attack.

However, we want to do everything we possibly can now to insure that this attack, if and when it comes, will be unsuccessful. The neighboring nation of Cambodia had for many months been an unwilling sanctuary for the troops of North Vietnam. At the end of the Ho Chi Minh Trail and the Sihanouk Trail supplies were cached in sanctuaries which our troops and allies did not hit. They did not hit them because Cambodia was a neutral nation.

As a result, the supplies in these areas were built up and the areas of South Vietnam nearest to Cambodia, particularly in the IV Corps Mekong Delta, became strongholds of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. A

few months ago the situation began to change. Prince Sihanouk, then the ruler of Cambodia, recognized that his people did not appreciate large numbers of North Vietnamese within their country. Moreover, he could see that large numbers of well-equipped North Vietnamese represented a danger to his own regime. Consequently, he began to cut off the supplies which came through the port of Sihanoukville and asked the Soviet Union and Red China to order the Vietnamese to leave.

When Sihanouk left the country, he was overthrown and another government took control. Not only did this government continue to cut off the supplies at Sihanoukville, but it also cut off the Sihanouk Trail. In addition, the Government let it be known that it expected the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to quit using Cambodia as a sanctuary.

This put the North Vietnamese to the test because they had some extremely difficult decisions to make. One alternative, of course, was to withdraw troops before they used up their supplies. A second alternative was to keep their troops in place and try to supply them, using the Ho Chi Minh Trail. A third alternative was to attack, widen their area of domination, and increase their supply system's capability. Soon, movements of North Vietnamese into the interior of Cambodia and toward Sihanoukville made it apparent that Hanoi had chosen the third alternative, and was trying to turn all of Cambodia into a real supply-and-operations bastion of Communist aggression in the South.

Such a bastion would outflank the Mekong Delta and the Saigon area. The delta situation had so improved that American troops had been pulled out. The improvement accelerated after the closing of Sihanoukville.

Sihanoukville supplied the IV Corps which is the Mekong Delta of Vietnam and the III Corps, which is the area in which Saigon is located, with great quantities of goods and supplies. In fact, it is my understanding that the IV Corps got 75 percent and the III Corps got 50 percent of their supplies and equipment from Sihanoukville. Thus, this was a very important port which the North Vietnamese were most anxious to reopen.

It was at this time that the President of the United States and the President of South Vietnam went through a rather agonizing reappraisal. As long as the troops who occupied these sanctuaries were in relatively small pockets, there was not an overwhelming danger that could not be contained even by our diminished American forces and the South Vietnamese.

However, when the North Vietnamese began to connect those pockets and build them into a continuous chain of supply depots, thereby increasing the supply capability of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, it became apparent that Cambodia was about to become a real arsenal for attack against the South Vietnamese and the remaining Americans. The President of the United States and the President of South Vietnam came to the conclusion that this constituted a risk to the lives of our men which they could not and would not take. As a result, the Cambodian operation was begun.

As a consequence of this operation, a major threat to the continued withdrawal of American military personnel from South Vietnam has been met. The elimination of these sanctuaries, I believe, will prove to have saved American lives, allowed Vietnamization to proceed on schedule, and made possible the continued withdrawal of American troops.

As the first American troop withdrawals from Cambodia got underway, President Nixon characterized the operation to clean out these Communist sanctuaries as "an enormous success—far exceeding expecta-

tions." American, and South Vietnamese units have already captured or destroyed tons of enemy arms and supplies which would have been used against allied forces. I received one report that more enemy materiel had been either captured or destroyed in the first two weeks of the Cambodian operation than in the previous 19 months of the war.

By destroying the enemy's logistics systems, facilities, supplies, and equipment, the operation in Cambodia makes it impossible for the enemy to use these areas effectively for many months. Meanwhile, the United States and South Vietnamese forces have been given vital additional time to handle their own defense. All of this has taken place in one of the swiftest military operations of this magnitude.

Nevertheless, various proposals have been offered in the Congress recently to deny to the President the use of funds to conduct various types of military operations or to curtail his authority in other respects. In effect, Congress, through its power of the purse, rather than the President, as Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces, would shape future military operations in a war in which we are already deeply involved.

I oppose this position. I believe that it would undercut the real hope we have for peace in Southeast Asia today. First, Congress cannot manage a war, as this action would imply. Second, the President is trying to get us out of Vietnam, not accelerate our activities. We should support him.

It should be noted that there were no such proposals offered at the time American forces in Vietnam were increased from the 653 there were when President Eisenhower left office, to over 16,000 by the late President Kennedy. There were no amendments offered to limit the authority of President Johnson as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States when he ordered the bombing of North Vietnam. There were no such limitations offered when that same President raised our troop level in Vietnam from time to time until it reached 546,000 as it was when President Nixon was inaugurated.

The mistakes of the past cannot be remedied by cutting the ground out from under the President today in the midst of an on-going inherited war. On the contrary, one of the worst mistakes we could now make would be to issue an open invitation to the North Vietnamese to return to their privileged sanctuaries and, henceforth, use them freely as bases from which they could attack our diminished forces. This is no way to protect American lives. It would actually give encouragement to the enemy at a highly critical juncture. In short, such an action, in my opinion, would prolong the war rather than hasten the day when American troops can return home.

I know of no one who wants to end this war and withdraw American troops more quickly or more urgently than I do. But I want to see American troops withdrawn after we have fulfilled our objective of seeing the process of Vietnamization through to its culmination; of seeing a courageous people choose their own national destiny in freedom. This will occur when the South Vietnamese can defend themselves against North Vietnamese aggression.

I am confident that the actions which President Nixon has taken will bring us a step closer toward that end and, in turn, toward a just and lasting peace in Vietnam. I support the President in his efforts to achieve that long awaited peace.

VISITORS

Phoenix.—Barney Burns, Charles W. Miller, Melinda D. Stevens, Frank G. Benites, Glynn Ross, Sid Magness, Jack Klenstra, Tom Parrish, Russ Hulse, Jack Pfister, Charles F.

Woods, Dr. John S. Young, Lt. Col. John Norviel, Leroy Michael, Honorable Walter E. Craig, David Barnes, Mr. and Mrs. Matt Hanhila, Richard D. Burke, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Evans, Mr. and Mrs. K. H. Vincent, Mr. and Mrs. David Roberts, Wiley Roberts, N. A. Winters, Jr., Mabel, Barbara, and John Reeder, J. A. Riggins, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. T. E. Clark and Georgia, Dr. Louis C. Kossuth, Elmer C. Coker, Don Payne, Sam Mardian, Margaret Fisher, Mr. W. S. Fisher, Mrs. Randolph Young, W. F. Mahan, Marian E. Mortano, Michlos Sakis, Honorable Jack Williams, Nolan Terrill, Edgar F. Scheibel, James E. Barry, Tom McSpadden, Dr. and Mrs. R. C. Behrens, Mrs. Paul Fannin, Frank Scussell, Wes Steiner, Rich Johnson, Roger Ernst, William P. Reilly, Reverend Clifford F. Peterson.

Paradise Valley.—John D. Roeder.

Tucson.—Richard H. Tower, David H. Nix.

Tempe.—Mr. and Mrs. W. S. Gookin, Jr., Joseph C. Bernier, Victor E. Rothe, Daniel K. Phippen.

Kearny.—Audrey D. Stevens.

San Carlos.—Barbara Hiebert.

Guadalupe.—E. L. Pastor.

Litchfield Park.—Pete Espl.

Gilbert.—Thomas E. Cady.

Window Rock.—Leo F. Haven, Peterson

Zah, Tom Galbraith.

Chandler.—Orval A. Knox, Mr. and Mrs.

Norma L. Knox.

Scottsdale.—Duncan H. Newell, Jr.

Mesa.—Dr. Richard M. Lott, Jerald Green, Mrs. Harold Frederickson, Jim Foran, Rev. and Mrs. James Dingman.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

If there are any changes that should be made in your name or mailing address, I would appreciate it if you would tear off the address on the brown envelope and return it to me with the applicable changes indicated thereon. (Congressman John J. Rhodes, 2312 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515)

THE BIG BONIFAY SING

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, from a lively little Pensacola publication, the *Singing News*, comes the following interesting story of the big Bonifay All-Night Sing to be held in my First District in Bonifay, Fla., on the night of July 4. This is an annual affair, frequently referred to as "the world's largest sing," and a tremendously popular event which attracts thousands for the rousing gospel singing and fireworks display. I would like to reprint this article about this great event in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information and pleasure of my colleagues:

BONIFAY SING—JULY 4

To the people who live there, Bonifay is home—a thriving rural typical small town, U.S.A., with most of its businesses centralized on U.S. 90 and its one main street. These people take pride in the town where they live, work, worship, and bring up their children. They channel their community efforts through two principal civic clubs and thus have made the name "Bonifay" synonymous with the most spectacular gospel singing on earth.

The Bonifay Kiwanis Club, which sponsors

the biggest all-night singing on earth, joins hands with the Lions' Club, whose members direct 10 acres of parking lots, and with promoter J. G. Whitfield in producing this "granddaddy" of the sundown-to-sunup singings.

This year the program will feature The Statesmen Qt., The Rebels, The Segos Bros., and Naomi, The LeFevre, The Happy Goodman Family, The Florida Boys, The Thrasher Bros., Steve Sanders, The Lewis Family, The Blue Ridge Quartet, The Klautd Indians, The Stroup Family, The Messengers, The Blackwood Singers and The Singing Evangelists. This year's sing will be on July the 4th. Tickets are \$2.00 for adults and \$1 for children.

Even in the early days of this annual event, the crowds were large but mostly from Florida, Alabama, and Georgia. Today they come from Maine to California, from Canada to Mexico. And they come by the thousands—on campers; pickup trucks; large air-conditioned buses; Cadillacs; sleek, new sports cars; the family station wagon; and some of them walk; but they come as faithfully as the Fourth of July comes around.

A stranger to Memorial Field in Bonifay this Fourth of July evening might think at first glimpse of the huge crowd that he was at a rock festival. But he would spend only a few minutes on the field before he would be caught up in this old-fashioned camp-meeting atmosphere and would soon be humming along with the gospel quartets. He'd see children asleep on homemade quilt pallets; he'd smell the fried chicken from the picnic baskets all over the field; he'd drool at the chocolate cake given to a singer by a fan; and he'd probably be offered a slice of red, juicy watermelon.

He would experience a surge of patriotism at the fireworks display, and he'd find himself praying a prayer of thanksgiving for freedom and liberty. The word "America" would take on a new meaning for him; and, for the first time in a long time, he'd acknowledge his Christian heritage and would find self-expression for the compassion and concern stirring inside what he thought had become a cold, indifferent heart.

He might shed a few tears of homesickness as he sees happy reunions among friends and relatives; but he would have to laugh too because the joy and happiness of the multitudes are contagious.

Soon he would be listening attentively to such familiar songs as "The Old Rugged Cross" and he might be surprised to find himself clapping his hands in time with the music of a modern, rousing spiritual.

He might drop off to sleep in the wee hours only to wake up refreshed and ready to enjoy some more singing and eat another drumstick. Long before the sun comes up, he'd realize that he was no longer a stranger, that he was one of them.

As he followed the crowd off the field Sunday morning, he'd know that this night had been an experience he'd never forget; and chances are, the following year, he'd be back and would bring someone with him. That's how it is at Bonifay.

AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORTS PRESIDENT

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted that my own American Legion

Post No. 20 in Greenwood, S.C., of which I am flattered to be a member, adopted the following resolution at their May meeting. I commend this excellent and timely resolution to the attention of my colleagues and to the American people:

RESOLUTION BY THE AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 20, GREENWOOD, S.C.

Whereas, the war in Vietnam has lingered too, too long for reasons which prevented the combined arms strength of the South Vietnamese and the United States of America from achieving a just and honorable military victory over a vastly inferior enemy;

Whereas, because of international commitments, involvements and fear of world-wide criticism, the combined forces of the United States and South Vietnam were not allowed to pursue the enemy across the narrow stretch of South Vietnam over the border into Cambodia where vast military buildups by the enemy and operating headquarters were allowed to exist;

Whereas, the military buildups by North Vietnam and the Viet Cong had imperilled the very existence of the Cambodian government which desperately sought the military assistance of the United States;

Whereas, President Nixon responded to the call from the Cambodian government and the dictates of his own office as Commander-in-Chief of the Military Forces of the United States by sending American troops into this enemy's sanctuaries along the borders of Cambodia and South Vietnam.

Whereas, reaction from President Nixon's decision to engage in winning warfare rather than continuing a course of limited surrender to the enemy became unexpectedly hostile among the students on the American college campuses, many of which were engulfed in acts of insubordination all the way to insurrection and open warfare with our own military troops at home;

Whereas, we believe that President Nixon acted in good faith and wisdom in pursuing a course of knocking out well-entrenched enemy positions and whereas, we believe that some of our college students over-reacted to the President's decision in shamefully anti-American led demonstrations which are anathema and repugnant to our traditional American way of life;

Therefore, be it resolved that American Legion Post Number 20 in Greenwood, South Carolina, on this day, May 12, 1970, do hereby go on record as commending President Nixon for his efforts to end the Vietnam war and further commend him for standing by his decision to pursue the enemy into his sanctuaries across the borders from South Vietnam and assure him of our support in the future to bring this long-fought war to an honorable end.

Be it further resolved that our young people who want to be heard should exercise restraint, politeness and be more circumspect in having their voices heard on this and other issues of vital national and international concern. We share the view of the nation's youth in wanting to end all wars but we believe that the end of any war must come from mutual desires of the opposing forces to do so, and we fall to see where the Viet Cong-North Vietnamese "Communists" have met our negotiators half way or even close to half way in trying to resolve the issues that have permitted the Vietnam war to continue.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent directly to President Nixon and that copies be sent to Senators Strom Thurmond and Ernest Hollings and Representative Dorn by the Post Commander hereof.