EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WARRIORS' WIDOWS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I introduced legislation—H.R. 6226—which would provide the same benefits for the surviving spouse of an active duty or retired military man as are now received and enjoyed by the widows of civil service workers.

It is my opinion that this is the next great military fringe benefit which will be enacted into law and will also do a great deal toward promoting an all-volunteer service.

The San Francisco Examiner published a column on April 29, 1970, by Guy Wright entitled "Warriors' Widows" which expresses approval of my bill. I invite my colleagues to read this article and, hopefully, support my bill. The article follows:

WARRIORS' WIDOWS

(By Guy Wright)

A man spends his career in the military, retires and receives a pension. Eventually he dies, leaving a widow. The widow continues to receive a portion of his pension for the rest of her life. Right?

Wrong. She doesn't get another dime.

When her husband dies the money stops.

The widow of the career serviceman is peculiarly alone in this plight. The widow of a man drawing Social Security continues to receive a share of his pension. The widow of a civilian government employee continues to receive a share of his. But the widow of the retired serviceman does not.

Under certain conditions the Veterans Administration will pay her a widow's pension ranging from $17 to $74 a month. But this is the same deal offered the widow of any veteran, even one who served only 90 days.

There is no special provision for the widow of the career serviceman.

If the retired military man wants to provide for his wife after he is gone he can join the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan (RSFPP)—if he can afford it.

No government money goes into this plan. The retired servicemen must pay for it themselves and the tab is stiff.

A retired chief petty officer with 20 years active service pays $13.77 a month out of his pension. When he dies, his wife gets a whopping $83.75 a month.

The civilian federal employee gets a much better deal. The civilian employee in a comparable grade to that chief petty officer pays only $5.92 a month. And his widow will receive $130.50. The government pays almost 80 percent of it.

For the career serviceman's survivor insurance it pays not a penny.

With this glaring difference in treatment, it should be no surprise that less than 15 percent of military retirees join RSFPP, while more than 90 percent of their civilian counterparts enroll in their survivors benefit program.

The Fleet Reserve Association wants this situation corrected. Representing 75,000 career sailors and marines, it made an 18-month study of the problem.

The study shouldn't have been necessary. Anyone with two eyes and half a brain should be able to see the injustice of this arrangement.

When a man devotes his career to the defense of his country, his country shouldn't leave his widow to starve or go begging. The issue is as simple as that.

Congressman Charles S. Gubser of Gilroy has introduced a bill (H.R. 6226) to set the matter right. This bill is no giveaway. It would simply accord widows of career servicemen the same pension treatment that the widows of civilian federal employees receive.

The bill is before the House Armed Services Committee, with the approval of its chairman, L. Mendel Rivers.

But it is still a long way from passage. Still to be learned is the position the Defense Department will take. In similar situations in the past it has preferred to shortchange those who served it so that it can spend more money on arms.

As long as this injustice continues I would advise any young man being offered a military career to turn it down.

Thoughts of retirement, pensions and widowhood are far from the minds of the young. But older men know the importance of these things. And older men who hoodwink the young aren't worth fighting for.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE STANS AT ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF WORLD TRADE WEEK, FOREIGN TRADERS ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, U.S. Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans recently delivered a most incisive speech at the annual observance of World Trade Week Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia. He acknowledged the new and urgent situation in the 1970's that is compounded by many complex factors. Then he proceeded to analyze the Nixon administration's response to the problems. He said:

We can do no less. Government must—and this administration will be—far more aggressive in its policies and actions dealing with international economy.

Business and Government must share the responsibility for assuring that no nation was ever ruined by trade.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Stans' speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MAURICE H. STANS, U.S. SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, AT THE ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF WORLD TRADE WEEK, FOREIGN TRADERS ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA, THE DOWNTOWN CLUB, PHILADELPHIA, PA., MAY 21, 1970

It is indeed a pleasure to join in this observance of World Trade Week in Philadelphia.

No city in America has deeper roots in trade than yours.

No city has known longer the benefits of trade to its people and its commercial life.

No city today has a business community more dedicated to the expansion of world trade as the road to abundance for cities and nations everywhere.

In Washington, I can assure you that President Nixon's Administration is determined, at the national level, to match your leadership in trade expansion at the local level.

Today, I want to tell you about some of the things we are doing to respond to the call of you exporters for action on vital trade matters.

But first, I want to say that one of the most pleasant things about speaking on world trade in Philadelphia is that a ready-made text for his remarks is waiting for every speaker. Your great patron saint Benjamin Franklin provided it in just seven words that embody the wisdom of the ages on this subject. And in recent months, at meetings where I've been listening to sharply divergent views on protectionism, free trade, quotas, nontariff barriers and the like, I have often wished that the ghost of Dr. Franklin would appear and repeat for our benefit that single, simple sentence:

"No nation was ever ruined by trade."

That was true in his time, it is true today, and it will hold true as long as men and nations exchange their goods to better their lives.

But every era has its own special problems that must be solved to keep the flow of trade expanding. We had them in the decades of the 1950s and 60s. And now we face a new and urgent situation in the 1970s that is compounded of many complex factors:

The Sharp decline in our traditional trade surplus;

Vastly heightened competition from a completely recovered and economically strong Europe and Japan;

An accelerating trend toward regional market groupings;

A rising wall of nontariff barriers and the increasingly protectionist agricultural policies of the Common market;

A proliferation of preferential trading agreements between the Common Market and other nations that discriminate against U.S. exports;

The increase in agricultural self-sufficiency overseas;

The change in trading patterns caused by the rise of multi-national corporations.

And the need of the less developed countries for access to the markets of industrialized countries.

To each of these developments, we shall respond within the framework of our traditional commitment to freer trade. We want to widen the markets for the products of working people everywhere, as one of the roads to prosperity for all. We ask of our trading partners only the reciprocal treatment that is due by right to the nation that is the most open market in the whole world!

Now these new conditions did not just suddenly develop overnight with the opening of the new decade on January 1, 1970. I know that you exporters have seen them coming for some time—and have been seeking a vigorous response by government to the problems involved.

OUR RESPONSE

You have an Administration in Washington that is answering your call for action! Over the past year, and including some new developments that are underway, I believe President Nixon's Administration has taken more meaningful and effective steps to expand exports than in any other comparable period.

Let me review some of these actions.

First, you wanted our export financing to meet the competition anywhere in the world. Through liberalized policies of the Export-Import Bank and its private affiliate, the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, we have made notable progress toward that goal.

Eximbank has launched at least 20 new programs or financing initiatives. Under aggressive new management, the bank now provides advance commitments, has improved its insurance programs, has pioneered the financing of lease equipment, has accelerated the processing of loan applications, and within the framework of its financial limitations, it is developing many other new and expanded export loan procedures, including those covering special situations that don't quite meet the usual criteria required for other transactions.

Together, these new steps have made our export financing more flexible, more useful, and more competitive than ever before. And we are determined to make further progress in the future until we are fully competitive on financing terms.

TAX TREATMENT

Second, you wanted more favorable tax treatment for earnings on exports. Our present tax laws tend to favor sales by foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations over exports from the United States.

We have responded with a highly promising legislative proposal under which exporters would be permitted to form "Domestic International Sales Corporations" to be known as DISCs. Essentially, the proposal would permit a company, within prescribed rules, to defer income taxation on exports sold through a domestic export subsidiary. This will serve to increase the profitability of exporting, and should induce more effective promotional efforts or other measures to compete more effectively. I have the greatest expectations for this plan and hope that Congress will enact it promptly.

Third, you wanted liberalized criteria for findings of injury under the escape clause provisions in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. We have responded with suggested amendments to provide the necessary relief from imports that are causing or threaten to cause serious injury to a domestic industry. Until President Nixon's decisions in the case of upright pianos and sheet glass in February, not a single U.S. firm has been able to qualify for assistance during the eight years this Act has been on the books. The new proposals, when enacted, will help domestic producers to adjust to the competition from imports.

Fourth, you wanted government to step up its export promotion programs to make them comparable with those provided by the governments of other industrialized countries. We have taken significant steps toward this goal through our established overseas trade centers, through trade fairs overseas, and through increased emphasis on export marketing opportunities through our Commerce field offices. This fiscal year, our Department will stage 22 trade fair shows abroad and 51 shows in our trade centers. Some 2,500 American manufacturers are expected to participate. Additional funds requested in the 1971 budget will enable us to mount 23 trade fair exhibitions and 63 trade center shows during the next fiscal year.

In addition, we are helping firms in resolving major export problems through our new International Business Assistance Service. This new effort is designed to coordinate and expedite government action on behalf of businessmen who need help on specific export problems involving U.S. or foreign government agencies.

NTB'S

Fifth, you asked for an attack on nontariff barriers, many of which discriminate against the products of American industry. Through our persistence, GATT has started a thoroughgoing examination of some 800 items affecting trade in industrial products. Although we know that progress in reducing or eliminating these will be slow and difficult, the GATT's Committee on Trade in Industrial Products has begun to search for fruitful areas of negotiation.

As you know, the principle of reciprocity applies here as in tariff reduction. We will have to give something to get something. We cannot hope to gain a net advantage for the United States but we certainly believe that we can insist on clear rules of the game and equality of treatment for our goods in world markets.

Finally, there are two other proposals in the trade bill submitted to Congress that would strengthen the President's hand in seeking an end to certain foreign practices that discriminate against U.S. exports. Under one proposal the President's authority to take action against countries which maintain unjustifiable import restrictions on U.S. agricultural products would be extended to include nonagricultural products as well. Another proposal would permit the President to take appropriate measures in cases where subsidized exports to third country markets unfairly affect competitive U.S. exports in those markets.

TURNING POINT

Taken together, I believe these measures represent a turning point in our government's effort to assure the competitive position of American industry in the developing one-world market. Other governments of the major industrialized countries give foreign trade the very highest consideration in developing all their economic policies. And they work hand-in-glove with industry in stimulating export sales.

We can do no less. Government must—and this Administration will be—far more aggressive in its policies and actions dealing with the international economy.

Nor will we be hesitant about speaking our mind when we believe that the policies and actions of other governments discriminate unfairly against our products.

RETURN TO PRINCIPLES

A quarter of a century ago, during the formation of GATT, we agreed to conduct our trade and economic relations with a view—

To raising standards of living,

Ensuring full employment . . .

Developing the full use of the resources of the world,

And expanding the production and exchange of goods.

The time must never come when men and nations turn their backs on these basic objectives—or on the realities of implementing them. The significant questions in implementation are:

Have we reached the limits of our capacity for cooperation?

Must the Kennedy Round Agreements stand as the high water mark of our ability to open wider the channels of world trade?

Do we think that retreating back into a fortress of protectionism is the way for each of us to preserve and protect the unprecedented prosperity that has flowed from increased trade?

I cannot accept any of these notions. I cannot accept the idea that we are blind to every lesson that the history of international trade teaches.

AGE OF COOPERATION

But I do believe that the time has come for us to make new resolves, to join together in common bonds of trust and friendship to usher in a new Age of Cooperation in the Free World economy.

Let us subscribe to a new Declaration of Responsibilities in World Trade, starting with commitments that we will erect no new nontariff barriers nor intensify existing ones and will work diligently to reduce their number; and that we will adhere to orderly marketing procedures in world trade so that all may share in the growth of markets, without unfairly jeopardizing existing jobs and industries.

We in the United States invite other nations who are also concerned about the trend of recent events to join us in our adherence to the historic principles of reciprocity and mutual advantage that have served us so well in the past.

CONCLUSION

We recognize today that international trade and investment are not simply things that are "good for business" or "good for national economies." They aren't just abstract transactions in the world of high finance, of interest only to the readers of financial pages in our great metropolitan centers.

On the contrary, with travel and technology, they form the great vehicle for the progress of mankind. They are the worldwide mechanism for helping people everywhere fulfill their aspirations for a better life. Business and government the world over share the responsibility for keeping this vehicle rolling, picking up speed, and moving on up the heights to abundance for all.

It is a challenge worthy of the best that's in all of us. With confidence and determination, let us go forward to meet it. We can do so in the full assurance that "no nation was ever ruined by trade."

TRIBUTE TO DONALD H. DAVIDSON

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1970, the officials and citizens of Gardena, Calif., are honoring Mr. Donald H. Davidson, who is retiring as city councilman after many years of service to the city. I wish to take this opportunity to commend him for his public service and to share with my colleagues the outstanding merits of Don Davidson.

Don was born in Oregon and raised in Missouri, graduating from the University of Missouri at Columbia. He received his LL.B. from Loyola Law School and also attended UCLA. He is a practicing attorney, and in 1955 became assistant to the city attorney. In February of 1956 he became city attorney and is past president of the Compton Bar Association.

It was in 1943 at Mt. Lassen that he met his wife, Anne, the lovely president of the Gardena High School PTA. They have four children who join him in his likes for tennis and camping.

His dedication to young people is evidenced by his 20-year activity in the Boy Scouts of America. He is, in his own right, an Eagle Scout and past Scoutmaster. He was institutional representative for a local PTA, as well as men's participation chairman for the Gardena Council PTA. He is a past chairman of the Harbor District Executive Committee for Boy Scouts. He is a member of the Los Angeles Boy Scouts and the Gardena Valley Youth Counseling Committee.

For his outstanding contribution to the great organization, the Boy Scouts of America, Don Davidson received the Order of Merit. His dedication to youth is again noted by his service for several

years as youth counselor for the Wesley Group of the Alondra Park Methodist Church. As a member of that congregation, he also served as president of the Men's Club, and is a former member of the board of trustees.

Don is a man of action, a man that likes to get things done. He is a leader and worker, not for himself but for others. He has been active in various civic organizations. He is a member of the Masonic Lodge, and is past president of the Lions Club; and of both the Junior and Senior Chambers of Commerce of Gardena. He is a past commander of the Gardena Valley American Legion Post 187, as well as a member of the Gardena Valley Branch of the American Red Cross, and a past member of the board of directors.

Other notable activities in behalf of the community include committee chairman for the 1966 school bond drive for the Gardena area. The YMCA appreciates his efforts in a number of YMCA fundraising committees in which he was active. He is the 1968 chairman for the initial gift section of the sustaining membership drive, and is a member of the board of directors.

Don is a Navy reservist with the rank of lieutenant commander and is classified as a legal specialist. He is a veteran of World War II and Korea. During the Second World War, he was a Navy lieutenant and sailed on a tanker. During the Korean conflict he was stationed at Pearl Harbor as a legal department specialist for the Navy.

Following the Korean conflict, Don returned to Gardena when his strong sense of civic duty became most evident. In 1955, he became commissioner for the planning committee of Gardena. In that same year he was appointed assistant city attorney and was soon appointed city attorney, a position he held until late 1959.

In 1962, Don was elected city councilman, a position to which he was again elected in 1966. He began his second term as mayor of Gardena and has served as mayor pro tempore for the past 3 years.

Recently, the Gateway Council PTA paid homage to Don for his service to the community and youth by awarding him honorary life membership.

This year, after 8 years as a city councilman and many years of dedicated and active service to his community, Donald Davidson chose not to run for reelection. I join the people of Gardena in honoring Donald H. Davidson upon his retirement from public office. I invite my fellow Congressmen to join with us in paying tribute to him and in saying, "Thank you, Don, for a job well done."

THREE TRIBUTES TO WALTER REUTHER FROM TEXAS NEWSPAPERS

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, after the death of Walter Reuther, Americans from all walks of life paid tribute to this great labor leader and humanitarian.

The tributes were well deserved, for Walter Reuther will rank with the giants of the labor movement in this country. He will also be remembered and honored for the great work he did to improve life in this country, for not just the members of his union, but for all Americans.

Mr. President, to the many tributes which have been given here to Walter Reuther, I would like to add three editorials from newspapers in Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the Houston Chronicle of May 12, entitled "Reuther Always Controversial," from the Houston Post of May 12, entitled "Labor Loses a Paladin," and from the Dallas Times Herald of May 13, entitled "Walter Philip Reuther," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, May 12, 1970]

REUTHER ALWAYS CONTROVERSIAL

The death of Walter Philip Reuther, controversial president of the United Auto Workers for the last 24 years of his life, could very well mark the end of several Reutherisms in the American labor movement.

He was one of organized labor's giants and champions, yet one of its severest critics. It remains to be seen if anyone in labor will take up the critic's mantle.

He was an authentic American radical in an area which has become establishment. He often worked outside the traditional union-management-government structure and was chastized by persons in and out of labor.

He possessed great power which he used to strive for social justice and for revitalization of the labor movement in this country. Neither of these goals had been accomplished to his satisfaction.

The UAW probably can find a man who can approach his expertise in negotiation. But is there someone within the movement to advance his ideas?

Reuther was unique in that while his first priority as a union leader was to secure increased wages and benefits for the rank-and-file auto worker, he always was more than a bread-and-butter unionist.

During his tenure as head of what has become the nation's largest industrial union, Reuther and his ideas had an unprecedented effect on this nation's economy. He strove to make bargaining more rational, more dependent on economic factors than on power. Virtually no salaried worker or industry in this country has not been affected economically by Reuther's bargaining with automobile company management on behalf of his union.

His philosophy of the role of labor unionism in our society and his social conscience were formed in childhood by a Socialist father who was a brewery workers union official in Wheeling, W. Va.

Reuther felt the labor movement should always be "on the march"—in the vanguard of those groups seeking social change. This thinking kept him active and in the forefront of numerous once-liberal causes such as racial equality, aid to the poor, nuclear disarmament, improved and expanded medical care, better housing and a cleaner environment.

[From the Houston Post, May 12, 1970]

LABOR LOSES A PALADIN

In the death of Walter Philip Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, the labor movement lost one of its most powerful advocates and the nation one of its truly great citizens.

The 62-year-old Reuther, with a fire and spirit to match his red hair, ranks with such titans as Samuel Gompers, Dave Dubinsky and John L. Lewis in the long and tempestuous fight of the American working man for a just share of the country's blessings and industry's rewards.

When Reuther, his wife and the other four occupants of a small chartered plane died in a crash at Pellston, Mich., he had rounded out 24 years as head of the 1.6 million automobile workers who comprised the UAW and been elected to a new two-year term. His loss will be even more sharply felt by his union when the UAW begins contract negotiations with the auto industry in July.

He always conducted final negotiations with all of the automobile companies personally, and his was the most powerful personality on either side of the bargaining tables.

In his long and vigorous leadership of the United Auto Workers, Reuther took his workers from the $5-a-day pay scale of the original Henry Ford to more than $5 an hour in pay and fringe benefits. Yet his own annual salary as head of one of America's largest single unions was a relatively modest $33,000 a year. He wanted it that way.

He combined dynamic labor leadership with a strong sense of social justice. He so firmly believed the labor movement should be virile and aggressive that in 1968 he took the UAW out of the AFL–CIO he helped to weld, because he felt the national leadership was too smug and satisfied. He piloted his union to many breakthroughs in labor benefits, including a guaranteed annual income and cost of living wage increases.

Even though his break with the AFL–CIO climaxed a long feud with President George Meany, the AFL–CIO president was among the first to pay tribute to Reuther's contribution to the labor movement, and to the nation.

Few can disagree with that appraisal, even the leaders of the industry whom he often battled so tenaciously and so successfully. Walter Reuther will be long remembered as a man who fought for the right, as he saw it to be the right, and who did much to advance the welfare of his fellow man.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, May 13, 1970]

WALTER PHILIP REUTHER

By any standards, the late Walter P. Reuther was one of the most remarkable men in all the history of American labor. During his 14-year tenure as president of the United Auto Workers, he won unprecedented economic gains for his workers. So intense was the personal loyalty he inspired that upon hearing the news of his death, at least one UAW member in Dallas became physically ill.

Reuther was a tough and personally courageous labor spokesman who bargained skillfully and persistently in behalf of auto workers—not just to win them fatter paychecks but to give them more leisure for personal development.

Unfortunately, he could also be unbending in the pursuit of ideals that often bordered on the fantastically utopian. He, for example, was all set to meet the auto industry this fall with a set of strenuous demands such as big wage increases, year-end bonuses, and unlimited cost-of-living allowances—this, to help usher in a day when, in Reuther's rather visionary words, "Working for a living will be sort of a hobby."

And yet auto profits are off 10 per cent, and inflation, which is to a large extent fueled by wage increases, is on the rise. Is this a good time for such demands? Reuther refused to admit that it is not.

Reuther had this fault, too: He was a man of the dogmatic (though non-Communist)

Left. He gave generally uncritical support even to the kookier civil rights causes, bitterly attacked the Vietnam war, and hatched a multitude of costly welfare schemes—among them, most recently, a national health insurance plan that would cost $40 or $50 billion a year.

The other side of the coin is that Reuther had a deep and abiding concern for the interests and welfare of all working men. He ran a clean union, tossing out the Communists and the lottery operators when he became president in 1946. No one had cause to question his patriotism and loyalty to his country.

Whatever his failings, he was a giant among labor leaders. He accomplished things perhaps no other union man could have accomplished. But then few other union men have possessed the intellectual gifts and missionary zeal of Walter Reuther.

AFL–CIO ASKS CURBS ON MULTINATIONAL FIRMS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, certainly the sharp decline of U.S. international trade must be reversed. It seems to me obvious that no single action will restore the U.S. trade balance. Organized labor's chief economist, Nathaniel Goldfinger, speaking recently to the session on "U.S. International Trade and Investment in the '70's" at the 58th annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, urged regulation of U.S.-based multinational firms as an immediate first step. The points he makes deserves the close consideration of every Member of the House. Therefore, I insert an article about Mr. Goldfinger's proposal, from the May 2, 1970, issue of the AFL–CIO News, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AFL–CIO ASKS CURBS ON MULTI-NATIONAL FIRMS

Regulation of U.S.-based multi-national firms "is urgently needed" if America is to recover from a sharp deterioration in trade, AFL–CIO Research Dir. Nat Goldfinger told the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Washington.

Until such regulation is established, he said, there must be "at least a stop-gap" limitation on imports in areas where they are destroying U.S. jobs.

Goldfinger was one of several speakers to address a session on "U.S. International Trade and Investment in the "70s" at the 58th meeting of the Chamber.

Any attempt to blame the sharp decline of the U.S. position in world trade "on such temporary factors as the current inflation, the capital goods boom and the Viet Nam war is nothing but a dodge," Goldfinger declared.

What is a "major factor" in the rapid destruction of the U.S. trade balance, he said, is the uncontrolled, mushrooming spread of multi-national firms to areas of the world where they can boost profits by hiring cheap labor.

He cited figures to show these firms now control more than 50 percent of what is called "U.S. trade." But, he added, their operations are not really "trade" at all—merely transactions within their structures entirely to their own benefit.

These firms, which also are exporting technology developed with the help of U.S. taxpayers, have "substantially reduced or eliminated" the nation's productivity leadership in a number of industries, Goldfinger stated.

One immediate step that should be taken, he said, is for the government "to stop helping and subsidizing U.S. companies in setting up and operating foreign subsidiaries" by giving them special privileges in tax and tariff laws.

"Regulation of the multi-nationals is inevitable," Goldfinger declared. It is urgently needed. And it is needed now."

EDDIE CHUPEK NIGHT

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on June 11, 1970, the Shade-Central City Area Jaycees, at Central City, Pa., are sponsoring a surprise birthday party for one of Central City's truly outstanding residents, Eddie Chupek.

On September 11, 1948, during a high school football game, his brilliant career came to an abrupt end. Eddie was injured, and as a result more than 90 percent of his body was paralyzed. Now, 22 years later, he remains happy and continues to converse with "anyone who drops by" and provides confidence for those who are more fortunate than he. Until recently he served as assistant to his tax collector brother, George.

Eddie Chupek is a man of great achievement and humility. I join with the citizens of Somerset County in wishing him a very happy birthday.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about Eddie Chupek Night, published in the Winber Era, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Richland News, Oct. 19, 1969]

EDDIE CHUPEK NIGHT FRIDAY

(By Frances Andrew)

Eddie Chupek Night will be observed Friday at the football game between Shade and Ligonier, to be played on Panther Field at 8 p.m.

The game will be dedicated to Edward Chupek, whose football (and college) career were cut short 21 years ago when he was injured in a game between Shade and Windber. He sustained fractures of the fourth, fifth and sixth cervical vertebrae and damage to the spinal cord, causing extensive paralysis.

Eddie was a junior in 1948 when he was sidelined. His graduation was delayed a year, but he was happy to have made it to commencement with his "adopted" class of 1951. He has kept in touch with many of his classmates, and has kept a special interest in sports at Shade. For years, he was a familiar sight in his wheel chair at football games.

About three years ago, he was hospitalized with what appeared to be a "bug". Testing showed he was suffering from diabetes. He has surmounted this difficulty, and although it has curtailed his outside activity, he is hoping to be able to attend the Friday game, weather permitting.

Eddie is always happy to have company. He is affable and loves conversation. He especially enjoyed the visit last Sunday of the photographer, and Coach Arthur Palumbo and four of his players. The coach and players stayed long after the photographer had departed. It was "football talk" and the boys learned much just listening to the coach and Eddie comparing football in their "times".

When he was leaving, Coach Palumbo promised Eddie he would bring a projector and films of the season's games for Eddie to view.

"Chup," as he was known to his fellow students, is a son of Mr. and Mrs. John Chupek of 768 Cedar St., Central City For the past 12 years, he has served as assistant to his tax collector brother, George. Eddie collects the money and keeps the books.

A visit to Eddie includes a meeting with his friend, a myna bird named Charlie Brown. He has spent much effort trying to teach the bird to talk—quite unsuccessfully—but Charlie Brown keeps putting his two cents worth in trying to prove he isn't as stupid as Eddie makes him out to be.

Dedication of the game to Eddie Chupek came about as the result of a suggestion by the Rev. Robert Rebeck, pastor of SS. Peter & Paul's Greek Catholic Church, when he attended a recent meeting of the Shade-Central City School Board. The board approved. The Shade-Central City Jaycees will participate.

ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which would prohibit further Federal financial assistance for State and local educational agencies which permit or encourage students at the primary and secondary levels to conduct experiments with live animals.

There apparently is a growing fad, Mr. Speaker, among junior and senior high school science classes for experimentation with birds and other small animals. These experiments, performed by unskilled and untrained students, often result in death and suffering to the animals.

The scope of this problem was first brought to my attention by a constituent, Mrs. Keith Thompson of Orinda, Calif. Mrs. Thompson informed me of her concern and justifiable "outrage" for the encouragement of such inept experimentation by private firms and individuals.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, I have been in contact with Friends of Animals, Inc., and have received very helpful assistance from this organization in drafting the legislation I am introducing today.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this measure will be acted upon by the Congress and that the experimentation of small animals in primary and secondary schools will be halted.

The legislation introduced follows:

H.R. —

A bill to prohibit Federal financial assistance for State or local educational agencies which permit primary or secondary students within their jurisdiction to conduct experiments with live animals.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that no Federal assistance may be provided after the date of the enactment of this Act to any State or

local educational agency which the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare determines permits students enrolled in primary and secondary schools under its jurisdiction to experiment with live animals or encourages students to perform such experiments. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare shall by regulation prescribe procedures for review of his determinations under the preceding sentence and such other procedures as he considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

DEATH OF LT. JAMES F. BROWN, JR., ASSOCIATION OF THE 82D DIVISION OF WORLD WAR I

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Association of the 82d Division of World War I recently adopted a resolution in honor of one of its most outstanding members, Lt. James F. Brown, Jr., who died February 19, 1970.

Jim Brown served as secretary and treasurer of this association for 52 years, and I know that his presence will be sorely missed by his comrades, many friends, and loved ones.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorial resolution, a splendid tribute to a fine man, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE 82D DIVISION ASSOCIATION MEMORIAL

The Creator and Architect of the Universe has called from worldly labor one of our dearest and most beloved members, James F. Brown, Jr., affectionately known to all his friends as "Jim." We know he only is physically separated from us. His spirit still abides in our hearts, now and evermore.

We believe it is fitting and proper, therefore, to commemorate so worthy a friend and comrade by publicly proclaiming this testimony, because:

Whereas, Jim Brown was our efficient, courteous, and completely dedicated Secretary-Treasurer for fifty-two years. And,

Whereas, Jim's whole life exemplified unstinted loyalty to his Community, State, and Nation. And,

Whereas, from us has gone a husband, a father, a kindly soul, a true citizen, a patriot, and one who kept the torch of duty and responsibility burning bright throughout his life. And,

Whereas, we shall miss Jim and his ever sincere smile and handshake, we still are privileged to have remain with us a noble and devoted wife, Emily, who in her gracious and lovable way, generously and untiringly helped our Association as the staunch better-half of our greatly appreciated and admired one and only Secretary-Treasurer.

Now, be it resolved that a copy of this testimonial be incorporated as part of the 82d Division Association records, a copy furnished to Mrs. James F. Brown, Jr. and a copy mailed to local news media for publication.

Submitted to the Association's Reunion, this 17th day of May, 1970.

JOSEPH F. MULDROW,
President.

ADDRESS OF DR. HARRY PHILPOTT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 31, Auburn University President Dr. Harry Philpott delivered the commencement address at the University of Alabama. I found his remarks on that occasion to be most appropriate in this time of crisis and tension on our Nation's campuses. Many of our colleagues would enjoy reading Dr. Philpott's address, and I would ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The University of Alabama also conferred on Dr. Philpott an honorary doctor of laws degree for his contribution to higher education in Alabama. Also receiving honorary degrees were two other outstanding Alabamians, John E. Horne, former chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and Thomas D. Russell, chairman of the board of Russell Mills, Inc.

The address follows:

SOME BITS OF BACON

(By President Harry M. Philpott)

On Tuesday, June 9, persons interested in things literary will be taking note of the Centennial of the death of Charles Dickens, the great novelist of the Victorian Era. It was the reading of some articles appearing recently in connection with this anniversary that recalled to mind some of his words that so aptly describe the present scene and the present time. Let his words from the opening passages of A Tale of Two Cities serve as a background for Commencement, University of Alabama, May 31, 1970.

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair."

The obviously paradoxical character of the contemporary scene must not be blurred with optimistic pretense or clouded with the dire pessimism of inevitable doom. Reason and honesty compel us to recognize both the goodness and the evil of our day, the wisdom and the foolishness, the belief and the incredulity, the Light and the Darkness, the hope and the despair. We are a deeply troubled people, but we are an exceedingly fortunate people also. All is not right with our world, by any means, but neither is all wrong with our world. Cognizant of the paradoxical character of the present, permit me to share with you a few midnight musings of a University President searching desperately for a sense of direction while awaiting the next crisis of confrontation.

The task is undertaken with timidity, so conscious are we of communication gaps and generation gaps today. However, I find some consolation in a washroom graffiti reported from the Auburn Library recently. It read: "Have you considered that in fifteen years the President of the University will be on Social Security and the President of the Student Body will be the Establishment?" While your own fine President cannot qualify for retirement in that span of time—unless it be under the disability provisions—it does illustrate the fact that gaps are transient and sometimes overemphasized. Francis Bacon in his Apothegms says: "Age appears to be best in four things,—old wood best to burn, old wine to drink, old friends to trust, and old authors to read." I have been re-reading Francis Bacon recently in an endeavor to discover what insights a wise and influential author might have for our present time.

You may recall on a November day last fall, during the annual renewal of the hard but splendid rivalry between your institution and my own, some of you sang a refrain that proclaimed: "You can take Auburn out of the country, but you can't take the country out of Auburn." Perhaps today I am only proving anew the veracity of that sentiment when I pass out to you some bits of Bacon for your Commencement fare.

Francis Bacon, who was born in 1561 and died in 1626, stands in the forefront of those who produced the Natural Science Period of the Renaissance in the seventeenth century. While best known as the philosopher who pioneered the empirical method on which modern science is based, he also eloquently expressed the spirit of his method in proclaiming the possibilities of infinite human progress through scientific discoveries. While not noted as a scientist himself, he predicted with amazing accuracy many of the discoveries so familiar to us. In his imaginary New Atlantis he foresaw such inventions as the airplane, submarine, telephone, synthetic foods, man-made metals, and even products yet unrealized such as man-made plants and animals. He would not find our material world strange should he walk among us today but I suspect that he would be bitterly disappointed that comparable progress has not been made in social matters which he saw as the inevitable concomitant of scientific advance.

For centuries prior to Bacon, rationalistic inquiry was largely deductive in methodology, based on the logical principles set forth by Aristotle in his Organum. One started with fundamental premises, absolutes, or revealed truths and from these deduced new insights and understanding. Bacon believed that "If a man will begin with certainties he shall end with doubts but if he will be content to begin with doubts he shall end in certainties." Human knowledge, for him, begins with sense experience and is enlarged by experimentation and testing. He deplored what is unfortunately an ever-growing phenomenon of our times.—the tendency to take a few facts and leap quickly from these into sweeping generalizations. "Knowledge is power," he said, but only that which takes into account all known facts can be considered as knowledge.

In his Novum Organum, Bacon sets forth four types of fallacies or errors of reason into which the human mind is prone to fall. I call your attention to them today, not as interesting historical ideas or because of their influence on natural science methods, but because of their relevance to the rational consideration of our contemporary social and spiritual problems. He termed these Idols—fantasies that beset our minds and detract us in the pursuit of truth. The first of these he called the Idol of the Tribe, fallacies which seem to inhere in us by the nature of our humanity. The practice of supporting preconceived opinions by accepting only affirmative data and rejecting negative viewpoints, and hasty conclusions from limited observations are cited as examples of the Idol of the Tribe. Contemporary illustrations might be seen in "non-negotiable demands" or the assertion: "My mind is made up. Nothing can change it."

Albert Einstein, when asked once how he came to discover his theory of relativity, replied simply: "I challenged an axiom." So it was in scientific progress and so it must be in social progress. Consider the assertion

with axiomatic force for many people today: "There have always been wars and there will always be wars." Granted the validity of the first part, there is no justification for taking the deduction as axiomatic. In your zeal to prove it false, be understanding of a generation that recalls so vividly a Neville Chamberlain returning from Munich in 1939 proclaiming the achievement of peace in our times or for whom the high hopes of the United Nations as a fully effective instrumentality for peace were so short-lived. And, above all, do not fall into the hasty generalization that the mere cessation of hostilities anywhere will bring the peace we all desire. Peace is positive and not the simple absence of war.

The second group of errors in reasoning Bacon termed the Idols of the Cave. These are rooted in our individual differences and the fact that we must view all matters from our own point of view. We cannot escape from our cave of individual reference but we can recognize its existence and make allowances for it. Bacon advised: "In general, let every student of nature take this as a rule, that whatever his mind seizes and dwells upon with particular satisfaction is to be held in suspicion." In our very human desire for final and absolute answers, it sounds discouraging to advocate that these are the very things we must keep questioning. On the other hand, social orders do not exist for long when conflicting absolutes will not be submitted to reason and examination.

From an author now forgotten I recall a reference to "the sacred duty of every individual to figuratively crawl under the skin of other people." He meant by this our obligation to understand them, to appreciate their point of view, and to weigh this in the formulation of our own ideas. The late William Lyon Phelps of Yale wrote that "The greatest of all arts is the art of living together." To do so, we must utilize all means of transcending the cave of selfhood. The recognition of this obligation was stated by Jesus when he taught that "he that would find his life must lose it."

Additional fallacies are classified by Bacon as Idols of the Marketplace. These arise when men come together and share their ideas through language. The fact that words have different meaning for different persons and that all of us use words that we do not define and even cannot define is perhaps the most troublesome kind of error. For example, the cry of "War Eagle" would be greeted with loud acclaim at an Auburn Commencement but rightfully could be expected to have quite different repercussions in this setting. Had Bacon been writing today, with the heated discussions of media problems and communication difficulties, he would have felt fully justified in terming this the most important hindrance to reason.

He had some advice for us in his essay Of Studies: "Reading maketh a full man, conference a ready man, and writing an exact." Perhaps all of us today are guilty of engaging in too much conference with an overabundance of readiness to discuss, while neglecting the fullness of knowledge that gives content to our debates and the exactness of statement which gives clarity to our thought. Let us also recognize that mere writing itself is not necessarily productive of exactness since total obscurity of meaning seems to be the aim of some authors writing at the present time. I long for writers in agreement with John Ruskin who wrote: "The greatest thing a human soul ever does in this world is to see something and tell what it saw in a plain way."

A final class of errors Bacon termed Idols of the Theatre. He spoke here of philosophical systems which have been accepted much as one accepts the production of a stage play, and which remain unquestioned and unexamined by the individual. Though a rather conventional Anglican churchman himself, he recognized that certain religious ideas of his time were not consistent with his scientific viewpoint. For most of us today, a reconciliation of the conflicts between science and religion has been achieved. However, in other realms of belief and thought, we may be at fault in accepting systems of thought without questioning and examining. If it were not so dangerous, one might view with great pity those young people whose dissatisfaction with our society leads them to embrace with unquestioning naivete the Thoughts of Mao Tse-Tung, the Revolutionary Road of Che Guevara, or the crushing dogmatism of Lenin. Abandoning reason, they exemplify most clearly the Idol of the Theatre.

It would be a gross over-simplification to say that the difficulties of our time find their roots only in fallacious reasoning and can be corrected by overcoming our errors in thought. In addition to his rational character, man is also a social, moral and spiritual being. While reason gives clarity and meaning to the other aspects of our being, it does not encompass them totally. However, in an institution dedicated to the promotion, practice and propagation of reason, one must proclaim its importance with greater power than ever today. Beset with the cries for power, the demands for action, and the alien presence of violence, this university and others like it must have now and in the future your understanding and support of its primary rationalistic function.

Finally, the spirit in which you face the paradoxes of our day will be of major importance in determining what you achieve. In the Book of Esther in the Old Testament, we are told that Haman erected gallows on which to execute the Jewish kindred of Queen Esther. Mordecai, her uncle, asked her to intercede with the king to save her people. She pointed out that one who went into the presence of the king without a summons lost her life unless the scepter was extended, so that she was being asked to place her life in jeopardy. His answer expresses a spirit appropriate for our time: "Who knows but that you were born into the Kingdom for such a time as this?"

"It was the best of times; it was the worst of times."

"Who knows but that you were born into the Kingdom for such a time as this."

SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADER HUGH SCOTT LAUDED

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, recently, the outstanding leadership qualities of Senate Republican Leader HUGH SCOTT were recognized in an excellent profile which appeared in the Advocate, published by the Retail Clerks International.

As one who has worked closely with my senior colleague on many important matters affecting Pennsylvania, and as one who has greatly admired the skillful manner in which he has been carrying out the difficult duties of senatorial leadership, I was pleased to see this perceptive analysis of Senator SCOTT.

I share the conclusion of the article that "the senior Senator from Pennsylvania is one of the outstanding men in the Senate," and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

HUGH SCOTT, SENATE MINORITY LEADER

Senator Hugh Scott, elected leader of the Republican Party in the U.S. Senate in September, 1969, is a man of independent judgment, courage, and conscience.

A friend of labor, Senator Scott steers a moderate course down what he calls "the great middle way." As one of the best-known senators nationally, he is also well known by his party, having been intimately involved in national Republican politics for more than two decades. His moderate political philosophy has earned support from the entire spectrum of senators, and helped him climb the ladder of leadership in the GOP.

Before being chosen Senate minority leader, Scott served as minority whip and acting minority leader. He has been the national chairman of the Republican Party, an eight-term member of the U.S. House of Representatives, and as a United States Senator since 1958. He was re-elected in 1964, and sits high on the Senate Judiciary, Commerce, and Rules Committees. He is the first Pennsylvania Senator, of either party, to be elevated to the position of leader.

Senator Scott occupies a key role in Senate affairs, participating at least bi-weekly in leadership meetings at the White House, rounding up the all-important votes of his colleagues, and obtaining acceptable compromises with the majority leader and his party to expedite the passage of legislation.

For his role—as a consensus-maker with his colleagues, a confidant of the President, and a solid man of his own convictions—he is ideally suited. An attorney, he has become particularly well-known for his skillful advocacy for causes to which he is committed.

The sincerity and determination to let his personal conscience be his guide was recently illustrated by his important vote against the confirmation of Judge Clement Haynsworth as associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. The Senator had this to say about his valiant stand: "In voting against this nomination I have kept my own counsel. I have voted my conviction. No statement was made prior to the vote, because to have done so would have added to the burdens of the Administration. Under the constitutional power of the Senate to advise and consent to nominees to the Supreme Court, important factors emerge: the prestige of the Court itself and the structure of this country's judicial determinations for years to come. This nomination required each Senator to reach his individual conclusion and to search his own conscience as to how to do equity in a most difficult matter."

Senator Scott became determined at the age of 13 to enter politics. He scoured the papers for political news, and attended sessions of the Virginia House of Delegates. Even today, with a schedule that often exceeds 18 hours a day, he reads newspapers avidly. Senator Scott is a stamp and coin collector, a fisherman, and a pipesmoker (he has collected 500 pipes). He is a student of American History, as well as Oriental History and Art, a subject on which he has written a book (*The Golden Age of Chinese Art*). He is also the author of *How to Run for Public Office and Win* (1968), a subject he is well qualified to discuss; *Come to the Party—An Incisive Argument for Moderate Republicanism* (1968); *How to Go Into Politics* (1949), as well as numerous articles. He co-authored *Politics U.S.A.* (1960).

He is a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., and serves as Secretary of the Interparliamentary Union (U.S. Delegation).

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania is one of the outstanding men in the Senate. He is a man of integrity. His leadership and his ability to count heads before a vote is taken are great assets. Senator Scott has been a friend of the working people of his state and the nation.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER JOHN McCORMACK

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that commitments in my district kept me from being present at the time the House paid tribute last week to the long, superlative career of Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK. But I cannot let that occasion pass without joining, though belatedly, in paying my tribute to this remarkable man and very dear friend.

The Speaker's recent announcement that he will not seek reelection to the 92d Congress is, of course, a sad one for me as it is for all who have known him, loved him, and worked with him, regardless of their partisan affiliations.

I have known JOHN MCCORMACK since 1941, a period of almost 30 years. I have a lot of relatives who live in his congressional district in Massachusetts, and, when I first came to Washington and met him, I commented on that fact. His response was as warm and gracious as if he, himself, had been one of my relatives, and I have enjoyed and cherished a close friendship with him every since.

Throughout the course of all the tributes that have been paid the Speaker since his momentous announcement, there has run one notably common thread. This is the repeated reference to his fairness. I note that, particularly, because I believe, if I had to describe JOHN MCCORMACK with only one word, fair is the one I would choose. He is many other things as well—warm, kindly, capable, hearty, ever the gentleman, a skilled debater and parliamentarian, a dedicated patriot and statesman—but the hallmark of his long and notable career in public service has been, I believe, his fairness.

His concern for freshman Members of Congress and his eagerness to help them, in a body where tenure is often deemed all important, bespeaks his fairness. His ability to accommodate widely diverse views on various issues and to seek workable compromise bespeaks his tolerance and objectivity. And, of course, the profound skill he has always demonstrated in striking an even balance between his role as partisan leader and impartial presiding officer leaves no room for doubt regarding his fairness.

The Congress and the people of the United States will sorely miss the qualities of leadership, dedication, patriotism, and judiciousness which he has brought to his role as Speaker of this House. I will miss him as a friend. Mrs. Belcher joins me in wishing for him and his lovely wife a long and joyous retirement, and especially for Mrs. McCormack we pray God's blessing for a speedy recovery to full health.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE KENNETH L. NASH

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1970, Judge Kenneth L. Nash will retire from his position as Chief Justice of the Massachusetts District Courts. Judge Nash's presence on the court and his entire life gave true meaning and expression to the ideals of dignity and integrity. The just decisions of Chief Justice Nash exemplify his humane qualities. He has earned the respect, not only of the Members of the court, but also of the community and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I would like to insert in the RECORD, recent news items detailing the distinguished career of Judge Kenneth L. Nash:

[From the Patriot Ledger, June 5, 1970]

LEAVING ON TOP

Seven years ago, when legislation had been passed creating the new post of chief justice of the district court system, there was rare widespread agreement in the state that one man was uniquely qualified for the position: Judge Kenneth L. Nash of the Quincy District Court.

The support came from the judiciary, lawyers and legislators, and editorially from a number of newspapers out of this area. It was an unusual event, serving to demonstrate the scope of respect in the state for Judge Nash. At that time, it is pertinent to observe, Judge Nash was 75 years old, an age when most men have long since called it quits on the job. He had been a district judge for 45 years, justice of the Quincy District Court for 31 years, and for eight years the chairman of the Administrative Committee of the District Courts.

This week, Judge Nash, 81, regretfully announced his retirement, effective Sept. 1. A measure of the regret with which the news was received was the effort of the District Court. Administrative Committee to change his mind, an appeal more than a courtesy gesture.

Judge Nash has had a rich and varied career—as a major league baseball player, high school and university baseball coach, state legislator, lawyer, jurist. In the district court system, the judge has been innovator, reformer and source of current judicial information as well as administrator of the far-flung 72 district courts.

When the judge retires to his 100-acre farm and woodlot in Epsom, N.H., he will be leaving an imposing record of distinguished service for his successor as chief justice and district court judge. He is, as one district judge put it, "leaving on top."

JUDGE NASH TO RETIRE ON SEPTEMBER 1

Kenneth L. Nash, 81, who gave up a promising professional baseball career in 1914 for a life of public service, announced his retirement yesterday as chief justice of the Massachusetts District Courts, ending 52 years in the judiciary.

ON SEPTEMBER 1

The justice informed Gov. Francis W. Sargent yesterday noon that on Sept. 1 he would leave the post he has held for six years.

The judge offered no suggestions for a successor, but advised the governor to appoint a man who would keep the courts in good order.

Later Governor Sargent said Judge Nash "has exemplified the highest ideals and traditions of the judiciary. We of the Commonwealth are deeply indebted to him for his past service and wish him success for the future."

Judge Nash said he had been considering the move for the past two or three months. "It's time . . . I wasn't getting any younger," he said.

Veterans of the state's judicial system say they cannot remember any other judge serving so many years on the bench.

Yesterday Miss Joan Weinz, the judge's secretary and confidante for many years phoned the justices of the 72 district courts to inform them of his decision.

About 11 a.m., Judge Nash who became the first justice of the district courts Dec. 23, 1963 made his formal announcement to judges gathered for a regular District Court Administrative Committee meeting.

Against their pleas, he said his decision was final. One justice remarked he certainly was "leaving on top."

When Judge Raymond Wilkins, Chief Justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court was told his old friend was calling, he stepped from the superme court bench to receive the message.

Born in South Weymouth, July 14, 1888, Judge Nash attended Weymouth schools where he enjoyed basketball in addition to baseball.

STILL SPRY

Judge Nash a bachelor said his health did not enter into the decision. With his 82nd birthday a month away he is nearly as spry as when he played all the infield positions for the Cleveland Indians in 1912.

Ken Nash joined Cleveland following his graduation from Brown University in Providence. He was traded to the St. Louis Cardinals in 1914 but would not report until completing Boston University Law School.

At the end of the 1914 season, the young lawyer decided to devote more time to the native Weymouth and play Minor League ball in Montreal and later St. Paul, Minn.

At the age of 28 in 1916 he played his last season of the game about which he still loves to reminisce.

At age 29, he was appointed a special justice of the Quincy Court by Gov. Samuel W. McCall in 1918. The same year he filled in for his brother as wartime baseball coach at Milton Academy. Later that year he began a 21-year career as baseball coach at Tufts University.

In 1933, Gov. Joseph B. Ely made Judge Nash justice of the then part-time East Norfolk Court, one year after he had become Weymouth Town Counsel.

When the court was reorganized in 1952 into a full time court, Judge Nash resigned as town counsel and became presiding justice of the court.

STATE REPRESENTATIVE

Before his legal career began, Judge Nash had already established himself as a political figure. The year he graduated from law school—1914—he was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives. He later served in the state senate as well.

From 1956 to 1963 he was chairman of the administrative committee of the district courts, a committee he had joined in 1941.

The judge was appointed to the Southern District Appellate Division in 1942 and was selected as the division's presiding justice in 1952.

He was one of the principal architects of the pay-by-mail traffic fines system which went into effect in 1965. He also set up the six-man jury system and helped revise the district court rules.

However, the crowning moment of his career came in 1963 when Governor Endicott Peabody appointed Judge Nash to the newly created position of chief justice of the state's district courts. He was sworn in on Dec. 23, 1963 for a term of one year, but a year later the governor made the appointment permanent.

His duties included supervision of 72 courts, their justices, and their clerks.

When asked what he might do Sept. 2, the Chief Justice said he would head for his 100-acre farm, New Rye, in Epsom, N.H. Over the years he has remodeled the old white home, perhaps in anticipation of a crisp September day to chop some wood or till the soil in his gardens.

OUR NATION'S SPORTSMEN—OUR FIRST ENVIRONMENTALISTS

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been concerned over the defiling of our environment for many years view with enthusiasm the sudden awareness on the part of most Americans.

The problem is big enough, and complex enough, that it is going to require the help of all our people, and our governmental agencies at all levels. But in this sudden bloom of popularity of this worthy cause, let us pause a moment to reflect and pay tribute to the sportsmen of our land, for they, indeed, were the first environmentalists. They not only warned us long ago about the desecration of our land and water resources, but took positive action to preserve our wildlife and its habitat. It was gratifying to me to read that a friend of mine, Charles Dickey, Director of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, penned a guest editorial in the Pennsylvania Game News calling attention to the great part our sportsmen have played in environmental protection.

I commend this article to my colleagues, and to those Americans who are truly concerned over our natural resources, for as Mr. Dickey says:

All Americans are needed in the fight to use our natural resources wisely.

The article follows:

CHARLEY'S SERMON

The 1970s will be the decade of conservation. City people are finding out that the wise use of natural resources is imperative for survival.

General magazines, the television networks and civic organizations have suddenly discovered conservation. Most of all, politicians are scrambling to get on the conservation bandwagon, and there is no doubt that 1970 will be the year of conservation acceptance by the public, in theory if not in action.

Hunters and fishermen should welcome the newcomers to the fold. The news media, public and politicians are picking up a crusade outdoorsmen started 70 years ago.

Hunters and fishermen were the first to decry the destruction of America's forests, soils, streams, prairies and wetlands. They were the first because their love of the outdoors had made them aware of the beauty of nature and the necessity for protecting wildlife habitat and scenic grandeurs. Outdoorsmen were the first to plead for conservation because they were the ones who were hiking the mountains and fishing the streams. They saw what was happening, but the city folk did not. For over 50 years, the outdoorsman was the only one who really cared.

Hunters and fishermen were the ones behind major conservation legislation in state capitols and Washington. When they could not get space in the news media, they started their own publications to warn Americans of what was happening to the environment.

Hunters and fishermen started state fish and game agencies. They asked that they themselves be required to buy licenses and that the money support the state agencies. Even today, with two minor exceptions, hunters and fishermen are the sole support of state fish and wildlife agencies; no money comes from the public despite the fact that the sportsmen funds provide protection and habitat for hundreds of species of non-game wildlife.

Hunters and fishermen, unique in all America, asked that their fishing reels, guns and ammunition be taxed so that funds could be increased for habitat development and the purchase of lands to be held in perpetuity for all Americans.

Hunters and fishermen imposed seasons and bag limits on themselves in order to give all a fair chance to crop game and fish without hurting the basic breeding stock of each species. The outdoorsmen formed national organizations to push for the wise use of our natural resources, such as the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League of America, Ducks Unlimited and many others.

Now, after 70 years, who is going to be passed over and not given credit in this "Year of Conservation" by most of the mass media and politicians? You guessed it—the hunter and fisherman!

In fact, with the sudden rash of amateur preservationists, there is a good chance that the hunter will be the first attacked. These sudden discoverers will think that game can be stockpiled; they don't understand that hunters crop only the annual surplus and that no game species in America is in danger of being overharvested by sportsmen.

It's up to every outdoorsman and the outdoor writers to see that hunters and fishermen are recognized for their leadership and magnificent crusades of the past seven decades. As for the host of newcomers to conservation, sportsmen should say, "Welcome aboard." All Americans are needed in the fight to use our natural resources wisely.—*Charley Dickey, Director, National Shooting Sports Foundation.*

GREECE AND MILITARY SALES

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, why, after the NATO Foreign Ministers' meeting in Rome during the last week of May, the United States is still reluctant to resume military sales to one of its great and most dependable allies, Greece, is a puzzling irony of political injustice. The importance of Greece as a pro-Western bastion in the Eastern Mediterranean is a well-known fact. To support my stand, I want to associate myself with my distinguished colleagues, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, the Honorable ROBERT F. L. SIKES, and the Honorable BOB WILSON, whose remarks of May 28 and June 3, 1970, most clearly and candidly point out Greece's strategic location, her very strong anti-Communist government, the growing threat of the Soviet presence in the Mediterranean, and our own self-interest, all as sound reasons why we should resume military sales to Greece.

I would like to cite an editorial rebuttal to the Washington Evening Star on June 4, 1970, from a concerned citizen who provides the current administration with ample rationale for timely action to correct an obvious incongruity in our foreign policy.

The editorial follows:

GREECE AND MILITARY SALES

SIR: I consider it extremely important that the American hoi polloi be exposed to facts which indeed negate the sullying editorial of Mr. Bartlett entitled "Greek Arms Plan a Bad Bargain" of June 2, 1970. I wish to quote three most distinguished and knowledgeable Congressmen, the Honorables Sikes, Rivers and Wilson, whose Congressional remarks on May 28 and June 3, 1970 invite serious reflection and responsible review regarding the importance of Greece not only to NATO but to our own self-interest as well.

Congressman Sikes states: ". . . we in this country should exercise restraint in criticizing the Greeks for the way they are running their country. We do not have Communist neighbors, we are not a target for Communist penetration, at least from across our borders . . . When we consider the importance of the strategic position that Greece occupies on the southern front of the Allied Command Europe this selective suspension in the shipment of essential equipment simply makes no sense. . . . If we do not regularize our relationship to Greece in the matter of furnishing military aid and assistance we may well find ourselves in very serious trouble in the Middle East. . . . I think we should view the Greeks for what they really are: a stalwart ally and a very necessary friend in one of the most dangerous and explosive parts of the world today. And we should implement this feeling and attitude in a tangible way by providing the Greeks the means to perform the mission that we—and NATO—have assigned to them."

And from Congressman Rivers: ". . . we should recognize these people as our friends. American tourists returning from Greece have nothing but laudatory comments regarding the order and safety that reigns in the cities throughout the country. It behooves us to take note of this when it is not even safe in these United States to walk the streets of our large metropolitan cities at night. Turning to the military-politico aspects for a moment, Greece occupies a very important strategic position on the southern front of Allied Command Europe. Since joining NATO, Greece has been a stalwart NATO member and has devoted great effort and has contributed her armed forces in the fulfillment of NATO's objective of maintaining a credible military posture against further Communist aggression thus insuring the preservation of peace and security in the area of NATO's Allied Forces, Southern Europe." And referring to the Greek armed forces: ". . . their reliability, their strong anti-Communist attitude and their proven support of their commitment to NATO's objectives make it highly desirable that the United States continue to provide modern arms and equipment to Greece . . ."

Finally, Congressman Wilson comments: ". . . The national self interest of the United States clearly dictates that we should accept our friends and allies where we find them. And when we take a hard pragmatic look at our country in relationship to today's world

we find Greece among our staunchest and most important friends. . . ."

In light of the above facts, I feel that the President should not only take a hard look but decisive and timely action to renew military sales to Greece. Otherwise this vigorously anti-Communist ally of ours, one of the very few whose position we really know, will be forced to turn elsewhere to buy the necessary equipment to protect themselves against the very threat which so seriously threatens us and upon which our whole foreign policy is based. Let us not be dodderingly indecisive and too late with Greece as we have so blunderingly displayed to our South American friends by providing the French with a fertile field for the sale of Mirage aircraft. On the contrary, let's be sensibly practical. Greece is eager to stimulate international business and renewal of military sales will be a refreshing breath of vitality to our economy.

DONALD C. MORENCY,
A Responsible and Concerned Citizen.

If we really believe in NATO and the purpose for which it exists, we ought to recognize our time allies, such as Greece, and to resume military sales to this country whose value to us strategically, economically, and politically is without question.

WASHINGTON ORDERED NOT TO CROSS THE DELAWARE

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the Indianapolis News. It is a tongue-in-cheek piece on what would have happened if the Continental Congress would have tried to put controls on Gen. George Washington during the Revolutionary War.

This is an excellent article and I recommend that all Members of Congress read it:

ESCALATION FEARED: WASHINGTON ORDERED NOT TO CROSS THE DELAWARE

(NOTE.—The following letter from the Continental Congress to Gen. Washington was recently discovered by the research staff of the Stephen Decatur Society.)

DECEMBER 12, 1776.

DEAR GENERAL WASHINGTON: Word has been received by the Continental Congress which has caused grave concern. We are informed that you are planning an expansion of the conflict into New Jersey. Rumor has it that you intend to cross the Delaware River and attack the enemy at Trenton.

You are advised that Congress has passed a resolution forbidding you from such a reckless adventure. You must be aware that a large percentage of our citizens do not favor your military approach to this war. Furthermore, you have already announced a major withdrawal of combat troops since the enlistment of about three-fourths of your 6,000 troops expires on Dec. 31. It seems highly unreasonable to expect these troops to reenter New Jersey less than 10 days prior to expiration of their enlistments.

It is the sentiment of the Congress that your pitiable supplies should be preserved and not expended on a maneuver of such debatable value. What can you possibly hope to accomplish? The British command the seas and will have no difficulty resupplying what little military equipment you may be able to destroy or capture.

We must also advise that should you disobey this command and attack Trenton, that all further monies and supplies will be stopped immediately. While we regret the inconvenience this may cause to your army, we feel that control of the purse strings is the only effective tool which we have to force you to limit your ambitious programs.

We are further shocked that you should anticipate launching a surprise attack on Christmas Eve. This is traditionally a festive occasion on which it may be reasonably anticipated the British Army is not expecting to engage in combat. Perhaps, this situation might be slightly altered if you had received a formal invitation from the duly constituted government of the colony of New Jersey to engage in such conduct. But we find nothing in the files of the Continental Congress's Committee on Foreign Affairs to indicate such an invitation.

We understand you have promised to leave New Jersey immediately following the Trenton operation. But how can we believe you. You have 4,500 militiamen who expect to be discharged on Dec. 31. What assurance do we have that you will not keep them in Trenton under some pretext of military necessity? How can we trust you. We relied on your leadership at Long Island, Throg's Neck, Pelham and White Plains and each time you lost. Now you say that this sneak attack on Trenton is not only militarily sound but might be the turning point in the war.

Finally, your proposed attack will only harden the attitude of King George III. Although we admit that for 10 years negotiations with King George have had no success beyond agreement on the shape of the conference table, still we must persist in seeking a political settlement. He may become even more intransigent when word of your affront reaches London.

After all, we really have no vital interest to protect in New Jersey. The Revolution can be won without New Jersey. Maybe you can win this war by catching Gen. Cornwallis at Yorktown in Virginia. Although this is admittedly speculation, under such a circumstance we could get along without re-taking New Jersey.

In summary, Gen. Washington, you are hereby ordered to keep your troops on the Pennsylvania side of the Delaware until the Continental Congress's Foreign Affairs Committee decides to let you cross and, oh yes, be sure to have the Revolution terminated no later than Dec. 31, 1777.

I KNOW THIS WAR

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, of all the letters I have received on the subject of the war in Indochina, perhaps the most moving and persuasive letter was sent to me by a veteran of that war who served two tours of combat duty there.

He describes the war as it is being fought there and as it is being fought in our own Nation.

I would urge all my colleagues to read this letter from a man who knows that war:

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

DEAR MR. WALDIE: Five weeks ago, I returned from Vietnam where I served two combat tours—the first tour as a paratrooper with the 101st Airborne Division; the second as a sergeant with the 5th Special Forces. I was hospitalized for three months as a result of wounds inflicted by Viet Cong machine gunfire when my company was overrun and decimated. I know this war. I know the mud, the heat and the rain; I know the jungle nights, the dreariness and the terror. I have seen the mountains and the valleys, the cities and the villages—on foot, from trucks and jeeps; and from helicopters and airplanes. I have talked with the people, and have shared meals with them in their homes. I have seen bodies stacked like lumber, and bomb craters big enough to hold a house. I have heard my buddies shriek with pain, and have heard the loud silence when the shrieks stopped. Forgive me if I seem melodramatic, but I do not take any of this lightly.

Although I am of college age and plan to return to the academic world this Fall, I am not a shouter. I have never carried a placard, and probably never will. I believe that a representative democracy can and will work if enough concerned and honest citizens make it do so. Consider this letter to be my placard, then, and read it thusly: Please, please, please make every possible effort to end this war immediately!

I will not belabor you with the history of the Indochinese conflict—I know that you are well versed in it. I would, however, like to advance one argument: Let us put aside the fact that North and South Vietnam have for centuries been one ethnic and geographic entity. Let us put aside the fact that the majority of Vietnamese peasants (the bulk of the population) either do not care who governs them, or actually support the Viet Cong in either an active or a passive role. Let us put aside the fact that the V.C. guerrilla and the NVA soldier consider themselves supreme patriots, being Vietnamese first, and Communists second; and that they see *us* as an occupying force in *their* country. Let us put aside the fact that the Thieu regime is a venal, self-aggrandizing charade which at every turn violates the principles for which it purports to stand; and let us also put aside the fact that we cannot possibly win a military victory without recourse to full mobilization, the use of tactical nuclear weaponry and an unacceptable level of saturation bombing. Let us instead consider what we have done in S.E. Asia from a narrowly chauvinistic viewpoint. Have we hurt our own country more by waging this war than if we had not waged it? Even a peripheral knowledge of what is at this very moment occurring on our nation's campuses, to our economy, our world prestige and our national morale leaves one with no other answer but "Yes!". Will we damage our country's interests still further if we widen the war or continue with our current plan of gradual disengagement? The answer again is "Yes!".

Everywhere I look in my country I see angry faces. Everywhere I listen I hear angry voices. Our government *must* demonstrate that it is responsible to the will of the people, for I see violence looming that all of the police and National Guard units in the nation will be hard put to contain.

Please consider what I have said. If you feel as I do, you can count on the continued support of myself and millions like me. If you do not, won't you reflect on why you maintain the position that you do?

Thank you for your kind attention. In spite of everything, I have unending hopes for the future.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN F. MCPHERSON.

TRIBUTE TO HARVEY L. CHAPMAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1970, the officials

and citizens of Gardena, Calif., are honoring Mr. Harvey L. Chapman who is retiring as city councilman after many years of service to the city. I wish to take this opportunity to commend him for his public service and to share with my colleagues the outstanding merits of Harvey Chapman.

Harvey was born in Louisville, Ky., and came to Gardena with his wife, Mary Ann, in December of 1944 while he was still in the Army. He served as a bombadier-navigator in the Army Air Corps during World War II. Upon his discharge, he began a real estate business, located at 14595 South Western Avenue. Because of the success and growth of the business, quarters were moved in 1957 to its present location at 15420 South Crenshaw Boulevard.

For his outstanding accomplishments in business, he was presented with an honorary membership in the Gardena Board of Realtors at an annual Realtor's Week luncheon.

The city of Gardena in May of 1965, honored Mr. Chapman with a testimonial dinner as "the outstanding citizen of Gardena." The scroll of commendation read, in part: "the Honorable Harvey Lorn Chapman is known and recognized as a prominent and popular official, realtor, and citizen of this community." The presentation noted "his invaluable donation of time, self, and effort toward the overall betterment of the city of Gardena."

In 1954, Harvey Chapman was elected to a 4-year term as city councilman, a position in which he has served until this year when he chose not to run. These 16 years of continuous service as an elected city official made him the senior member of the Gardena City Council in length of service. He served as mayor of the city from April of 1961 to April of 1962. Among the accomplishments in which Mr. Chapman played a major part was the acquisition of county land for Freeman and Rowley Parks.

He maintains an active concern in many organizations such as the Knights of Columbus, the Young Man's Institute, and the Professional Golfers' Association. As an active member of the Gardena Valley Kiwanis Club, Councilman Chapman was one of the founders of the annual Gardena Valley Kiwanis Open Golf Tournament. He is an outstanding and well-known golfer, having played professional golf in his State of birth, Kentucky. Since the tournament's inauguration in 1954, the event has brought nationwide recognition to Gardena and has raised several thousands of dollars for use by the Kiwanis Club in support of various civic projects.

In working diligently for the welfare and betterment of the city of Gardena, and because of his interest in sports and the youth of the area, Harvey Chapman has constantly recognized and assisted various local sports leagues and teams.

When the city of Gardena was honored by the International Nisei Businessmen's Convention in 1957, Councilman Chapman was one of the two officials selected by the city council to represent the city at the convention, which was held in Tokyo, Japan.

In addition to his duties as councilman, Mr. Chapman was active in representing the city council and the city of Gardena as delegate to the Inter-City Councilmen's Committee. Furthermore, he was chairman of the annexation committee, and alternate delegate to the West Basin Water Association; County Sanitation District No. 5; the Greater Los Angeles Intergovernmental Cooperation Committee; and the Administrative Committee.

Mr. Speaker, very few men display the unselfish devotion and personal, purposeful interest in the development and welfare of a community such as Harvey Chapman has exhibited during his affiliation with the city of Gardena. I ask my colleagues to join with me and with the citizens of that great city in honoring Harvey L. Chapman for his exceptional contributions.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, it was with much sorrow yesterday that I learned of your decision to leave this body at the close of this session of Congress. I know that this must have been a difficult decision for you because, in the brief time I have been privileged to serve, I know of the deep love and admiration that you hold for this House of Congress and for those Members who have served under your able leadership. At the same time I can well understand your wishes to be with Mrs. McCormack in this time of poor health, and I shall accept your decision, knowing that you have made this choice after extensive deliberation and through your daily petitions for divine guidance.

Mr. Speaker, others more eloquent than I shall present in the body of this RECORD, in a more eloquent manner, the respect which all of us hold for our beloved Speaker. You have indeed served our great country in a very fine way and history will bear out your brilliant record, spanning across these four decades in service to your country. There are so many highlights in your career that it would be difficult to point to any one of them, but I shall always remember your admonition to those of us who have the awesome responsibility of providing an adequate defense for America, and these words are indelibly stamped on my mind, "If I should err, I prefer to err on the side of strength" and in these troubled times your counsel should be heeded by all future Congresses.

I am sure that I express the wishes of every Member of this body when I extend the wishes expressed in those lines of that great Irish poet who wrote:

May the road rise to meet you,
May the wind be always at your back,
May the sun shine warm upon your face,
the rains fall soft upon your fields,
and until we meet again—
May God hold you in the palm of His hand.

LORTON INMATES' ANGUISH DEPICTED

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Star, there was a news account illustrating the continued poor administration of the Lorton Correctional Institution.

The item discussed a visit by entertainers to Lorton arranged by one of the prisoners. These people performing before the inmates sang songs containing such phrases as "I wish I knew how it feels to be free" and "Knock down these walls and set me free." In one scene, they improvised a theme of sadism as they depicted an inmate tortured by a prison guard. In another, they acted out the flight of a revolutionary to Algeria and sang songs of struggle, or trying times and hope for release.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that at a penal institution, an effort should be made to rehabilitate prisoners and to keep them as content as possible under their circumstances. A drama group such as this, depicting a scene of sadism on behalf of correctional officers, can only bring about discontent and could trigger another series of riots as occurred recently at Lorton. This is poor administration and still another reason why these correctional institutions should be removed from the present management and transferred to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons as provided in the House version of the District of Columbia crime bill.

The entire article is set forth below:

ARENA STAGE VISIT: LORTON INMATES' ANGUISH DEPICTED

(By Gus Constantine)

"I wish I knew how it feels to be free."

As she sang these words, Louise Robinson of Arena's Stage's improvisation touring company moved through a tangle of some 20 Lorton Reformatory inmates locked into frozen poses to express their feelings about life in prison.

The tension of the "statue" they had formed to portray this feeling showed in the flexed muscles, protruding veins and rigid arms pointing upward, forward or in defiance. Louise caressed their faces, then hugged them.

". . . To be young, gifted and black," she sang on. Even the Lorton guards turned away affected by the combination of anguish mixed with tenderness which they were witnessing. It was theater but no one was acting.

Arena's Living Stage 70, which works in the inner city to stimulate creativity through theatrical participation by the audience, visited Lorton for two hours yesterday.

"The idea is to come in contact with a person's creativity, to understand how he feels, Bob Alexander, director of the Living Stage program said.

CONVICT ARRANGED VISIT

The visit was arranged by Lorton inmate Rhozier (Roach) Brown, who has set up his own drama group, which he calls "Inner Voices," at the reformatory.

Even before the performance began, the three actors and three actresses began to identify with the frustrations of prison life. Someone had forgotten to notify the watchtowers that they were coming. They were

shuffled to three different gates before being admitted.

So they sat down on the grass outside, beat on guitars, sticks and cowbells and sang, "Knock down these walls and set me free."

Inside, the theater group's identification with the men it was trying to involve was virtually total. In another context, the material improvised might have evolved into humor, a lighter mood at least.

At Lorton, the dominant feeling of the troupe was compassion for the fate of the inmates.

TORTURE BY GUARD DEPICTED

In one scene, they improvised a theme of sadism as they depicted an inmate tortured by a prison guard. In another they acted out the flight of a revolutionary to Algeria. They sang songs of struggle, of trying times, of hoped-for release.

Living Stage puts a premium on total participation by the audience and several times one guard on duty seemed unwittingly to be lending a hand to tell prison life like it is.

For example, one inmate who had not submitted his name for permission to watch the show strolled in and was immediately ushered out. At another time, when some inmates slipped behind a screen, the guard walked across the "stage," actually the floor of a Lorton school conference room, to see what they were doing.

ANOTHER STEP IN THE PROMOTION OF PATRIOTISM AND RESPECT FOR THE AMERICAN FLAG

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Rapid City, S. Dak., Shrine Club has taken another step in the promotion of patriotism and respect for the American flag. The Shrine Club has passed a resolution urging every member to fly the American flag every day between Memorial Day and Labor Day, and have asked all Americans to join in this activity.

Mr. Speaker, I include the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

ANOTHER STEP IN THE PROMOTION OF PATRIOTISM AND RESPECT FOR THE AMERICAN FLAG

Whereas: We are a nation governed by a democratic Constitution; and

Whereas: Under said Constitution we have the right of free choice in the election of our government, and

Whereas: Under said Constitution we are granted many freedoms; such as, freedom of speech, assemblage, press, regardless of race or creed, etc., and

Whereas: Because of these freedoms, we can freely express our opinions, whether disagreement or agreement.

Therefore: Be It Resolved That, to demonstrate, that regardless of our differences, we remain one nation of Americans dedicated to the principles of freedom and the actions of a free people, we will take the following action:

1. To fly our American Flag everyday from Decoration Day through Labor Day.

2. That we call on all Americans to join us in this expression.

On May 25, 1970, at the regular meeting of the Rapid City Shrine Club and Executive Committee, at the suggestion of Nobel John L. DiSanto, a motion was made by Noble Glenn Best and seconded by many Nobles, to pass a resolution to fly our American Flag each day from Decoration Day until Labor Day as a demonstration of our patriotism to our country by all Shriners of the Rapid City Shrine Club of Rapid City, South Dakota.

A second motion was made by Nobel John L. DiSanto and seconded by Nobel James C. Quinn to urge all Service Clubs, other organizations, and all citizens to participate in the resolution adopted by the Rapid City Shrine Club.

GEORGE E. O'HALLORAN,
President, Rapid City Shrine Club.
FLOYD L. HAUSER,
Secretary.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT J. MYERS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened to learn of the resignation of Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration. His letter of resignation, which I am including in the RECORD at the end of my remarks along with a brief biographical sketch, was accepted by Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Robert Finch on May 25.

Bob Myers has served with unparalleled distinction throughout the 35-year history of our social security program. His dedication, integrity, and quiet competence during this long period are greater testimony to the character and professional ability of this distinguished civil servant than I can provide. His assistance to the Ways and Means Committee during the years in connection with social security legislation was highly regarded by Members of both sides of the aisle.

Bob began his service with the social security program as a staff assistant on the original Committee of Economic Security which recommended the social security program during the mid-1930's. Since 1947, he has been Chief Actuary for the Social Security Administration.

Along with these responsibilities, he has provided technical assistance to many foreign countries over a long period of time, and provided assistance to pension programs of various church organizations. Recently, he expressed his sympathy for the sacrifice that other Americans are making in South Vietnam by serving in that country for a period of time to assist them in developing a social insurance system.

Bob's professional distinctions are numerous. He is a fellow and past vice president of the American Society of Actuaries, and a member and past vice president of the American Academy of Actuaries. He is vice chairman of the Committee on Social Security Actuaries of the International Social Security Association.

On the basis of his broad experience and careful study of social security programs, Bob has authored two books that are widely used by students and scholars of our social insurance system: "Social Insurance and Allied Government Programs," published by Richard D. Irwin, Inc., in 1965, and "Medicare," published by Richard D. Irwin, Inc., in 1970.

Bob's knowledge, sound judgment, and long experience will be sorely missed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He is one of the most outstanding civil servants that Department has ever had. In recognition of this, he has been awarded the Distinguished Service Award of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League. It is extremely unfortunate that the leadership in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been unable to retain the services of this outstanding individual.

The letter and biography follow:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1970.

Hon. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is with the utmost regret that I am constrained to submit my resignation as Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration.

I am deeply concerned about the welfare of the Nation, and I wish to serve the Nixon Administration and the Congress to the best of my ability. I believe that I can best serve these causes by remaining in my present position until the President signs the Social Security bill which will result from the pending Congressional deliberations. Therefore, I have not set a definite date for my resignation. If you believe that my continued presence is not in the best interests of the Department, I will be glad to make my resignation effective at any earlier date. I would appreciate your informing me as to your views on this matter.

I wish to make it clear that my resignation is by no means related to my views on the pending Social Security legislation. In fact, the situation is quite the opposite. I strongly believe that the President's proposal is an excellent one, including its sound financing. It is certainly the most progressive, forward step taken in the Social Security field in many years.

I believe that the President's proposal very well conforms with, and implements, the moderate philosophy of Social Security. It is a progressive, forward step that would prevent future over-expansion of the program, which would destroy private efforts in the economic security field and thus lead to serious consequences insofar as our national economy is concerned.

I should also add that now—as at all previous times during my 35 years of actuarial service with the Social Security program—no one has made any attempt whatsoever to influence or sway the technical actuarial cost estimates for the existing program or any proposed changes therein.

The question might well be raised as to why I believe, in all conscience and integrity, that I must resign. I have previously talked with you about my strong personal beliefs and have given you much supporting factual evidence to substantiate my views—namely, that certain of the top policy-making officials of the Social Security Administration (who are holdovers from the Johnson Administration) have strong beliefs in the desirability—even the necessity—of the public sector taking over virtually all economic security provisions for the entire population and thus eliminating private efforts in this area. It seems to me that this viewpoint is completely alien to that of the Nixon Administration.

Further, and equally important, it is my deeply-held conviction, as I have expressed to you a number of times in the past, that these officials of the Social Security Administration have not—and will not—faithfully and vigorously serve the Nixon Administration. Rather, they will exert their efforts to expand the Social Security program as much as possible by aiding and supporting any individuals and organizations that are of this expansionist conviction. Such anachronistic actions took place extensively during the Eisenhower Administration—against its political views. Such working at cross purposes with the Nixon Administration has occurred in the past year, and is still occurring, although to a somewhat limited extent so far. I have brought to your attention, on several occasions, the fact that the Social Security Administration is excessively wasteful by spending far too much time and money in performing research, conducting program planning, and collecting statistics in a manner that is not only nonproductive of sufficient worthwhile results, but also inimical to what I understand to be the philosophy and goals of the Nixon Administration.

Undoubtedly, there will be those who will say that I am taking this action solely or largely because I seek enhanced personal recognition. This is not the case. There is no position of any type that I would rather serve in than my present one, and I am not happy to have to leave it.

Evidently, no credence is placed in what I have related to you personally or in other evidence that I have furnished you on this matter, which has such an important effect on the future of the Social Security program. Therefore, I must, in good conscience and personal integrity, resign. It is especially dismaying to me to have to take this action, because I had hoped to serve the Nixon Administration not only with competence and integrity—as I had tried to serve all previous Administrations—but also with great enthusiasm, since I strongly believe in its philosophy and goals.

ROBERT J. MYERS, F.S.A.,
Chief Actuary.

BRIEF PROFESSIONAL BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON ROBERT J. MYERS

Degrees: B.S. in Engineering Physics, Lehigh University, 1933. M.S. in Actuarial Mathematics, University of Iowa, 1934, LL.D., Muhlenberg College, 1964.

Professional experience: Various actuarial positions with U.S. Social Security Administration since 1934; Chief Actuary since 1947. Actuarial consultant to various Congressional Committees and to Federal Judiciary.

Missions of technical assistance in connection with Social Security or pension programs in Bermuda, Bolivia, Colombia, Cyprus, Greece, Honduras, Iran, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, New Caledonia, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Puerto Rico, Saudi Arabia, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Venezuela, Viet-Nam (South), and West Germany.

Missions to study Social Security systems of Ceylon, England, Greece, Lebanon, New Zealand, Philippines, Soviet Union, Sweden, Turkey, and United Arab Republic.

Professional relations with international organizations: Committee of Social Security Experts, International Labor Office.

Vice-Chairman, Committee of Social Security Actuaries, International Social Security Association (Chairman, American Regional Committee of Social Security Actuaries).

Pension Review Group, United Nations (1958–60).

Committee of Actuaries, UN Joint Staff Pension Fund.

President, Int. Fisheries Commissions Pension Society.

Actuarial Consultant, Organization of American States.

Professional relations with other organizations: Board of Pensions, Lutheran Church of America (1956–68).

Pensions Committee, National Council of Churches.

Board of Trustees, Group Health Association (1962–65).

Professional societies: Fellow, Society of Actuaries (Vice President, 1968–70).

Fellow, Casualty Actuarial Society.

Fellow, Conference of Actuaries in Public Practice.

Member, American Academy of Actuaries (Vice President, 1969–71).

Fellow, American Statistical Association.

Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Fellow, Royal Statistical Society (England).

Corresponding Member, Spanish Institute of Actuaries.

Corresponding Member, French Institute of Actuaries.

Associate, Institute of Actuaries (England).

Member, International Union for Scientific Study of Population.

Member, International Actuarial Association (member of Council).

President, Inter-American Association of Social Security Actuaries.

Population Association of America (1st Vice President, 1962).

Professional awards: Distinguished Service Award, Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Career Service Award, National Civil Service League.

Publication of books: "Social Insurance and Allied Government Programs", Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1965.

"Medicare", Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1970.

Military service: Captain, Army of the United States, 1943–45 (Medical Statistics Division, Office of Surgeon General.

BALTIMORE ARMY SERGEANT KILLED IN VIETNAM FIGHTING

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. William H. Shaller, a courageous young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I should like to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

BALTIMORE ARMY SERGEANT KILLED IN VIETNAM FIGHTING

Sgt. William H. Shaller, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence E. Carroll, Jr., 9924 Harford road, was killed recently in Vietnam.

After non-commissioned officer and armor training schools, Sergeant Shaller was assigned to Vietnam last August.

"He was very proud to be in the Army and proud to be a soldier," said Mrs. Carroll of her son.

Sergeant Shaller was killed May 5 near the Demilitarized Zone while serving as a vehicle commander with C Company, 17th Armour Brigade, 5th Infantry Division (Mechanized).

He is survived by his mother and stepfather; a brother, Lawrence E. Carroll 3d, and four sisters, Mrs. Pamela Landon, Mrs. Barbara Wiedfield, Cheryl Lee Carroll and Karen Kaye Carroll, all of Baltimore.

CONSUMERISM AND THE UCCC

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, the January 30, 1969, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carried the text of the Honorable George Brunn's remarks before the Consumer Assembly 69 held in Washington, D.C., on that same date. Judge Brunn, of the municipal court for Berkeley, Calif., had written a strong attack on specific provisions of the proposed model State law drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners of Uniform State Laws. As Judge Brunn's views were worth reading and as I feel that all sides should be heard, I am placing in the RECORD an article appearing in the April 1970 issue of the Business Lawyer, by Paul R. Moo, a member of the Indiana bar.

Text of article by Paul R. Moo of South Bend, Ind., as it appeared in the April 1970 issue of the Business Lawyer, volume 25, No. 3, follows:

CONSUMERISM AND THE UCCC

(By Paul R. Moo*)

The Uniform Consumer Credit Code is of vital interest to all consumers who purchase goods and services on credit or who borrow money to pay hospital and medical expenses or other bills, to repair or modernize their homes, to educate their children or for other consumer purposes. Particularly since World War II we have experienced a phenomenal expansion and growth in the use of credit by consumers. The most recent statistics which I have seen indicate that we have over 120 billion dollars in consumer credit outstanding in the United States at the present time. Concurrently with this expansion and growth in the amount of consumer credit, and certainly contributing to its growth, has been a multiplication of the types of credit available to the consumer and the organizations by which it is made available.

The Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act, parts of which became effective July 1, 1969, is limited in its consumer protection features to requiring credit disclosure information and restricting the amount of a consumer's earnings which can be subjected to payment of the consumer's debts after July 1, 1970 by court proceedings. The Code not only contains all the Federal consumer protection features but undertakes to control, regulate and prescribe the rules of law applicable to all phases of all consumer credit transactions. The draftsmen of the Code have endeavored to take a balanced point of view recognizing that for the benefit of both consumers and businessmen the basic structure of the Code and its regulatory provisions must continue to encourage sellers and lenders to make available adequate amounts of credit while protecting both consumers and legitimate businesses from the predatory practices of a few cheats and gougers.

Notwithstanding the time and effort devoted by the distinguished group of unpaid, State appointed Commissioners who have drafted the proposed Code and notwithstanding its endorsement by recognized authorities with an admitted bias in favor of the consumer, a small but vocal minority of self-appointed consumer activists is jeopardizing the chances for adoption of the Code in a

---

*Member of the Indiana Bar.

number of States. This vocal minority, which contributed nothing by way of funds or effort to the drafting of the Code, and most of whom did not even bother to appear at any of the public hearings or make their points of view known during the drafting process, are now screeching that the Code (which goes far beyond the Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968) is not fair to consumers. Most, if not all, of their objections to the language and policies of the Code, were, in fact, considered during the drafting process and were either knowingly rejected or are covered by the Code as it presently exists.

One of the most unfair and intemperate condemnations of the Code and its sponsors has been made by a Berkeley, California, City Judge in a speech early in 1969 before a consumer group, which speech was reprinted in the Congressional Record, inserted in the record of a Congressional hearing and the substance of which he has recently repeated to the California Legislative Study Commission. While experience and service as a City Court Judge would not seem to provide the officeholder with impressive credentials as a consumer credit expert, the mere fact that the individual holds a judicial office, albeit that of City Judge, gives the attack a certain aura of independence and respectability.

The Code is called unintelligible, unfair, a means of permitting pernicious practices, a very bad Code, worse in many respects than many existing laws and better than very few. Such castigation and language does not have a very judicial ring.

The drafters of the Code are caustically referred to as a finance industry dominated Special Committee of the National Commissioners on Uniform Laws. Nothing could be further from the truth. Of the dozen members and ex-officio members of the Special Committee of the Conference responsible for presenting the Code for approval to the entire body of National Commissioners, only two members had any significant finance industry background or contacts. A numerical majority of the members of the Special Committee were Deans or Professors of Law. One of the nation's largest consumer finance companies, for reasons of its own, actively opposed the approval of the Code by the Conference, its acceptance and endorsement by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, the passage of the Code in Utah and is lobbying against the Code in all States. Evidence of the objectivity and fair balance of the Code is best supplied by the fact that while the Code was under consideration for endorsement and approval by the House of Delegates or the American Bar Association, those lobbying against its approval were certain national representatives of the American Bankers Association, spokesmen for the consumer finance company referred to above, and a group of OEO–Legal Aid attorneys in the Philadelphia area.

The attack by the Berkeley, California, City Judge not only impugns and castigates the non-partisan, highly qualified State Commissioners who devoted many hours and weekends to the study and drafting project as a public service, without compensation of any kind, but also reflects discredit upon those who have endorsed the Code and those recognized consumer spokesmen who, as members of the Advisory Committee, donated their expertise, time and effort in helping to shape and form the Code.

The Code is called one of the most technical and most difficult to understand pieces of legislation that this municipal judge has ever seen. Apparently, he has never had occasion to read or try to understand the Internal Revenue Code or other really technical statutes. To substantiate the charge of unintelligibility, reference is made to one of the subsections of the section of the Code dealing with prepayment rebates to the customer when the credit obligation is paid prior to maturity. This particular subsection is undoubtedly the most technical provision of the Code. What is not said, or perhaps not understood, is that the purpose of this subsection is to permit and encourage creditors to continue to accommodate consumers who buy goods or borrow money on any day of the week or month but want to schedule their payments on the days of the month most convenient to the consumer for paying his bills. Anyone who thinks about it for a moment would realize that consumers want to have their payments fall due on the most convenient day of the month to them regardless of the date on which they enter into the consumer credit transaction. Certainly the prepayment subsection is "technical" in nature but probably no more so than § 1808.5 of the California Unruh Act fixing the maximum service charge on a consolidated time balance contract or many other provisions of existing statutes.

Furthermore, this critic fails to point out that when the Code is adopted in California and in other States at least the lawyer and his client will know what law determines the client's rights and duties. The lawyer will search the Code for the answer rather than being faced with the question of whether the consumer's rights, in California, for example, are governed by the Small Loan Law, the Personal Property Broker's Act, the Industrial Loan Statute, the Unruh Act, the Rees-Levering Act, or by some provision in the Corporations Code, the Insurance Code, the Financial Code, the Civil Code, or the Penal Code. In describing "present law," Judge Brunn does not himself seem to recognize that California has several separate laws with substantially different provisions. Legislators, lawyers and most judges certainly recognize, as do laymen, that statutes in any area of the law are not and cannot be written in such a manner as to be completely intelligible and understood by the average layman.

The Code is also attacked as being unfair and is criticized for not achieving a fair balance between the rights of the public and the rights of the credit industry. This charge is substantiated by reference to three provisions. First, says the California City Judge, the Code lets the seller collect attorney's fees up to 15% when he sues and wins but gives no such rights to the consumer if he wins. This is not only somewhat less than fair, he says, but runs counter to many existing consumer credit laws.

At each point in the Code in which the subject of permitted attorney's fees is considered, the sponsors of the Code deliberately provided alternative provisions for the States to select. The tradition and history of many States is to permit the recovery of attorney's fees if included in the note or contract but a few States have just as strong a tradition against permitting the creditor to collect any attorney's fees. The sponsors of the Code, therefore, leave that choice to the States. For those States which wish to continue their policy of permitting the recovery of attorney's fees, the Code provides that the contract with the consumer may require payment of such fees only after referral for collection to an attorney not a salaried employee of the creditor and then only up to an amount not exceeding 15% of the unpaid balance of the debt. Attorney's fees can be collected by the creditor only when included in the contract with the consumer. Under at least two of the several present California laws, the creditor is entitled to attorney's fees without statutory limit in amount even though he did not contract for them! The provisions of the Code on attorney's fees for the debtor on the other hand do not depend upon any contract basis. To encourage private litigation to enforce the Code, it provides for the award of reasonable attorney's fees to the debtor in any case in which it is determined that the creditor has violated the Act. Only the Unruh Act and the Rees-Levering Act in California have any comparable provisions. Even those acts permit a creditor who has violated the law to avoid paying an attorney's fee to the consumer's counsel who brings the action by promptly depositing with the Court the amount which the consumer claims is due to him.

The second charge of unfairness is alleged to exist in the escalator clauses and the ceiling charges established by the Code. The theory of the Code is not to fix rates of charge but to depend upon free competition among creditors to establish the price for credit just as such competition establishes the price for a pair of shoes or a can of beans. The escalator clauses are designed to avoid the necessity of repeated legislative consideration of the maximum ceiling and other dollar amounts in the Code in a period of continuous inflation such as we have experienced almost without interruption since the end of World War II.

The ceiling rates and the escalation provisions are criticized on the assumption that all creditors will charge the maximum ceiling rates in all credit transactions. The argument runs that since in the recent past all small loan lenders have charged the maximum rate that they will continue to do so under the Code. This argument ignores completely the change in policy and philosophy represented by the Code's approach to the whole rate problem. Where competition exists today among sellers and lenders the rates charged consumers for credit are not at the maximum permitted by law. This is strikingly true in the financing of sales of automobiles which represent something in excess of 60% of all installment consumer credit outstandings.

That small loan companies or personal property broker lenders in California have virtually all charged the maximum rate is not a result of "tradition" or a result of such lenders "charging the maximum the law allows" but is the necessary result of the legislative approach to fixing rates in that area of consumer credit. The traditional approach to fixing small loan rates has been, and still is, a quasi-public utility theory of licensing people to engage as a public privilege in extending small amounts of cash credit to the consumer and in turn exacting a maximum rate structure to cover the creditor's costs and a reasonable profit, but no more. The rate fixing theory has been for the legislature to establish a rate and to require lenders periodically to return to the legislature when their costs and profits require a rate adjustment. The approach and theory of the Code is completely contrary to that concept.

The philosophy of the Code provisions is to permit and encourage competition among all kinds of credit granting institutions and to permit credit to be extended at any rate selected by the creditor up to a maximum level. The available evidence in the only area of consumer credit in which the law today permits at least limited competition, that is, the financing of automobile sales, tends to prove the validity of the Code approach. That lenders have "traditionally" charged the highest rate permitted by law proves nothing as to the future, if as suggested by the Code we change the whole basis and philosophy of rate regulation and freedom of entry of creditors into the cash loan business.

I certainly agree with the Judge that the last thing in the world the consumer finance industry (meaning the small loan lenders) want is increased rate competition but that is exactly what the Code is designed to provide. I can understand and appreciate why a consumer finance company, and some of the American Bankers Association representatives, would want to oppose the Code because of its free entry concept and the increased rate competition it will provide, but I cannot understand why a person who

claims a bias in favor of consumers should join that chorus.

The final and third charge of unfairness is the allegation that many existing laws provide that if the seller or finance institution violates the law the agreement is void but the Code gives the seller loopholes if his violation is "unintentional" or "the result of a bona fide error." The Code's language for excusing violations as "the result of an accidental or bona fide error in computation" is almost verbatim the same as the California Rees-Levering Act and the Unruh Act and other existing consumer laws. As for violations, the Code follows very closely the penalties of existing statutes. The California Rees-Levering Act goes as far or further than most retail installment sales act in providing that a sales contract is void because of a violation of the law, but under that Act the contract is only unenforceable until the violation is corrected.

As a matter of fact, the Code provisions for enforcement of the law are much stronger than any existing statutes. The Administrator is authorized to issue cease and desist orders against any creditor who is engaged in violations of the Act, whether willful or not, and the Administrator may enjoin anyone from violating the Act and if a creditor has made excess charges in deliberate violation or in reckless disregard of the Code, even though not willful, the Administrator may bring a civil action to order the creditor to pay to the consumers with whom he has done business a civil penalty in an amount of all finance charges or ten times the amount of the excess charges, whichever is the greater. Under the Code, the Administrator is expected to truly enforce the law rather than sit in his office shuffling papers, reviewing small loan examination reports, keeping records and annually renewing licenses and compiling statistics.

Not only are the Code remedies for violations of specific provisions equal and in most respects superior to existing remedies, but no discussion of the remedial approaches of the Code is complete without referring to the broad powers vested in the Administrator under the unconscionability sections. He may restrain creditors, or persons acting in behalf of creditors, from engaging in a course of making or enforcing unconscionable agreements, engaging in fraudulent or unconscionable conduct in inducing consumers to enter into credit transactions or engaging in fraudulent or unconscionable conduct in the collection of consumer obligations. These powers and rights for the benefit and protection of all consumers are over and beyond any violations of any of the expressed provisions contained within the Code. The Code remedies apply to all creditors, not just a few, and to all consumer credit transactions, not just small loans.

After making general charges of unfairness and unintelligibility, the Judge proceeds to a point by point comparison of some provisions of the Small Loan and the Personal Property Broker's Acts (indiscriminately mixing two separate laws) in California with the Code, and a point by point indictment of the Code provisions in the area of installment sales. This discussion, of course, ignores completely the breadth of the Code and the extension of regulatory laws to the many forms and types of consumer credit transactions which are now compeltely unregulated and adopts an argumentative position of enumerating present so-called consumer credit protection features which are not repeated verbatim in the Code.

The comparison of the Code provisions on loans, which will apply to all kinds of loan credit, most of which is not now regulated, to the provisions of the Small Loan Law or the Personal Property Broker's Act is, in itself, a basically unfair comparison. Nationally, less than 8 percent of consumer credit outstanding is held by consumer finance companies. The challenge of comparison can, however, be accepted without qualification and the charges answered simply and succinctly, seriatim:

CHARGE: Under present law, licenses of small loan companies in California can be suspended or revoked for any violation of the Act while under the Code licenses can be withdrawn only for repeated and willful violations.

ANSWER: Licensing under the Code is not a significant regulatory device. The administrator's authority to issue cease and desist orders, maintain injunctive proceedings, or obtain refund orders on behalf of all consumers are much more effective and powerful weapons than a license suspension or revocation. How many small loan or personal property broker licenses has the California Commissioner of Corporations ever revoked?

CHARGE: Present California law prevents the taking of real estate as security, the Code allows it for loans over $1,000.

ANSWER: To be valid under the Personal Property Broker's Act, a loan must be secured by personal property. Why should not a consumer who has an equity in real estate be allowed to use that equity as collateral for a loan? The Code, like the Federal Act, requires special protective notices on a real estate loan and gives the consumer an absolute right of rescission. With that protection the consumer should have the right to use any real estate he may own as security for a loan; particularly so when the pledge of that interest in land may well result in getting a lower rate of loan finance charge.

CHARGE: Present law forbids charges in addition to interest other than official fees and insurance. The Code permits delinquency charges, deferral charges and a vaguely worded loophole allows additional charges for other benefits conferred upon the debtor.

ANSWER: The California Personal Property Broker's Act (as do all other precomputation laws) permits both default and deferment charges and the Code provides, as does the present law, for interest, official fees, and limited charges for insurance. The charges for other benefits described as the "loophole" can be made only pursuant to an authorizing ruling by the Administrator. The purpose and intent of this provision is to provide for flexibility for future developments in consumer credit marketing and it is not nor was it designed to be a "loophole." The definition of charges in the Code closes several existing loopholes including the use of points in real estate loans.

CHARGE: Present law forbids the small loan company from conducting other businesses on the premises on which loans are made; the Code allows it.

ANSWER: Consistent with the attempt to increase competition among creditors and thus to benefit the consumer in keeping the price of credit as low as possible, the Code permits the making of higher rate loans in conjunction with any business (subject to licensing and supervision of the lender), unless the lender carries on the other business for the purpose of evasion or violation of the Act. With the broad powers of the Administrator, no Pandora's box is opened here.

CHARGE: Under present law the borrower cannot be required to purchase anything in connection with the loan. The Code contains no such provision.

ANSWER: The practice of selling a jackknife at a highly inflated price to get a loan of money within the maximum legal rate of interest went out of style and was penetrated and prohibited by Court decisions even prior to World War I. Clearly any such conduct would be fraudulent and unconscionable.

CHARGE: The present law provides for bonding the creditor; the Code does not.

ANSWER: Bonding a small loan lender is a hangover from the quasi-public utility approach to permitting a special class of people to make small loans of money at high rates of interest. A small loan lender does not hold any property or assets of the consumer requiring protection by a bond of the lender. Why should consumers have to indirectly pay useless bond premiums to insurance companies?

CHARGE: Present law provides for interest rates where property securing the loan is insured in favor of the lender.

ANSWER: The peculiar California provisions which at one time required a lower rate where property insurance in connection with a credit transaction contained a loss payable clause for the benefit of the personal property broker was an illogical result of a legislative rate increase compromise. That legislative horse trade was repealed in California more than two years ago.

CHARGE: Unlike present law, the Code does not prohibit loan companies from transacting business under a different name.

ANSWER: The Code requires not only loan companies but all creditors to file a notification with the Administrator specifying the name or names in which business is transacted.

CHARGE: Unlike present law, the Code does not prohibit the loan company from advertising that it is supervised by the State.

ANSWER: The Code provides for the regulation and supervision of all creditors, whether lenders or sellers, and eliminates much of the special treatment of loan companies under present law. When the Code becomes effective there would be no competitive advantage, vis-à-vis all other creditors, to advertise that a particular loan company was supervised by the State.

CHARGE: Unlike present law, there is no requirement to give the borrower a receipt for each payment.

ANSWER: Consumers of all economic strata, today, pay their obligations by checks, bank money orders, or similar instruments and the requirement for issuing a separate receipt for each payment is an unnecessary economic waste. Forty years ago when the small loan laws were being enacted, the use of checks was not very common and there was a need for such a provision.

CHARGE: Unlike present law, there is no prohibition against the use of incomplete instruments.

ANSWER: This is the so-called "blank contract" argument. The absence of this prohibition is supposed to permit lenders and sellers to fill in a blank contract form with figures different from those agreed upon with the consumer. Under the disclosure provisions of the Code, the consumer must be given, in writing, at or before the time credit is extended all of the financial details of the transaction, including the annual percentage rate of charge. This is a much more meaningful and effective method of handling the old blank contract problem. Furthermore, any creditor using blank contracts to hoodwink the consumer would be open to the full panoply of weapons at the disposal of the Administrator.

Having thoroughly castigated the loan provisions of the Code as compared with "present law," Judge Brunn then turns his attention and his attack to the field of credit sales. Here he grudgingly concedes that the proposed Code has a few good things to offer, specifically in outlawing wage assignments, prohibiting confessions of judgment, and waivers of rights, outlawing the sleazy practice of referral selling, and giving the consumer a cancellation provision on door to door sales. In his words, "So far so good but overall the Code's provisions on credit sales do not even come close to striking a reasonably fair balance between the rights of buyers and sellers. This blast is substantiated by another list of specifics.

CHARGE: The Code permits the pernicious

practice of having the customer sign a blank or imperfectly filled in sales contract.

ANSWER: This condemnation has been answered above.

CHARGE: The Code permits the seller who installs anything in the home to take real estate as security.

ANSWER: The Code permits the seller to take a security interest in land only if the debt is $1000 or more, provides a special right of recision without any cost whatsoever if the consumer changes his mind about giving a mortgage on his home, and if the sale was made by a door-to-door solicitor the cancellation rights for such transactions are also available to the consumer. Where the consumer has an equity in real estate he wishes to use to secure credit, and in view of the surrounding protections provided by the Code, there is no good reason why the consumer should not be able to use his own collateral for his own benefit. Charges by the City Judge of this character do not seem to be favorable to the consumer at all.

CHARGE: The Code does not prevent the everyday practice of side note financing.

ANSWER: The Code prohibits both sellers and lenders from using multiple agreements to obtain a higher finance charge or to avoid disclosure and this argument again completely overlooks the broad provisions of the Code against unconscionable agreements or fraudulent or unconscionable conduct.

One of the serious weaknesses of such consumer credit statutes as presently exist is the effort by the Legislatures to list and define every possible bad practice. Industry representatives vigorously opposed the unconscionable agreements and conduct section of the Code and some of them still do. A specific list of prohibited conduct in a statute enables the unscrupulous to avoid the specified harmful practices and "stay within the letter of the law." The Code approaches this problem area by specifically listing as prohibitions certain conduct but then gives to the Administrator broad authority and discretion to provide meaningful consumer protection.

CHARGE: The Code permits the deceptive practice of balloon payments.

ANSWER: The Code requires any creditor using balloon payments to extend the time and terms of payments on a basis "no less favorable" to the consumer than the original transaction. Many consumers, particularly white collar workers who receive lump sum bonuses and farmers who periodically sell crops, prefer to use a balloon payment plan to reduce the total cost of credit to them. The Code eliminates the evil of balloon payments "without throwing the baby out with the bath water."

CHARGE: In one of its alternatives, the Code allows the evil practice of taking away the buyer's rights by the simple device of the seller assigning the sales contract to a finance company.

ANSWER: Unquestionably, the proper legal approach to the problem of retaining or cutting off the buyer's rights against a financial organization which buys a contract from a seller was one of the most controversial problems covered in preparing the Code. The simplest answer, and the one contended for by Judge Brunn, is to provide that no transfer or negotiation by the seller of the sales contract with the buyer can cut off or defeat the buyer's defenses or claims against the seller. The philosophic and social justifications for this approach have been developed and set forth in a well written law review article by Professor Warren, the principal Reporter-Draftsman of the Code, and his Co-Reporter.

The difficulty in accepting this position is the impact and effect on the small businessman, who is a largely forgotten individual in our society. The large, well-financed independent dealer or chain store can and does retain its own contracts or merely transfers them to an affiliated organization. But, what of the small independent seller who must find some financial institution willing to use its funds to finance the dealer's credit sales? California in its Unruh Act, has recently taken the approach of protecting the rights of the buyer at all costs. This is certainly a permissible choice of alternatives. But, it must be recognized that it does restrict or impede the availability of funds to small businessmen to finance their credit sales. The Code adopts that position as Alternative A.

Recognizing, however, the problem of the small businessman and recognizing that many states have not reached the conclusion that the buyer should be protected at all times and at all costs, the draftsmen of the Code provide a second alternative for selection by the various states' legislatures. The second alternative attempts to give the consumer as much protection as possible without completely disrupting the availability of financing accommodations to all sellers.

Under Alternative B, a buyer's defenses can be cut off if the seller transfers his buyer's obligations to a financial institution (a) not related to the seller, (b) who acquires the contract in good faith and for value, and (c) who gives the buyer a conspicuous notice that he must notify the assignee of the contract of any claims or defenses the buyer *then* has against the seller. A transfer is not made in good faith if the financial institution knows that the seller has had substantial complaints from other buyers which he did not remedy, or from its course of dealing with the seller has notice of such a course of conduct on the part of the seller. Only if all of these tests are satisfied does the financial institution take the contract free of the buyer's defenses.

Alternatives B is a middle course which endeavors both to protect the consumer and to preserve the marketability of contracts for the smaller and generally undercapitalized businessman who must have available a method of making sales on credit to compete with the giant retailers. The Code leaves the choice of which policy a particular state follows to the legislature of each state.

CHARGE. The Code allows deficiency judgments in all sales over $1000.

ANSWER. A more accurate statement is that the Code prohibits deficiency judgments where the original cash price of the goods was $17,000 or less. The laws of most states, including California, do not now contain any such prohibition or restriction. Some people who presume to speak for all consumers want the Code to prohibit all deficiency claims. Judge Brunn, among others, argues that sellers do not get a fair price for repossessed goods and that they load the deficiency with excess charges. If that is true, then the fault lies with the Courts and the lawyers for the consumer who are not enforcing the provisions for the protection of consumers which already exist in the Uniform Commercial Code.

The draftsmen of the Consumer Credit Code recognized the evils in permitting deficiency judgments to credit jewelers, credit clothiers, and sellers of household goods who have traditionally used the threat of a deficiency judgment as a collection weapon, never intending to repossess goods which have little or no resale value. By the same token, the Code takes the position that the buyer of a new or used car or any other product with a cash price of more than $1000 should pay his own obligation and not expect other consumers to bear the costs of his default in paying for goods purchased on an installment plan. Why shouldn't the buyer of a Cadillac or a Chevrolet, new or used, be required to pay off his own obligation, if he can? If John Smith wants to buy a $3000 automobile and after a year or two stops making his payments and turns the car back to the dealer or finance company, why shouldn't he be expected to pay the difference between what the car is then worth on the market and the price he originally agreed to pay? Unless John Smith pays his obligation, then the loss sustained by the dealer or the bank or the finance company must necessarily be made up by me and all other consumers who buy on the installment plan and pay off our obligations.

The Code prohibits the use of deficiency judgments where they have been abused but protects all consumers by continuing to expect John Smith to pay his own debts and not ask all other consumers to share the burden of his debts.

CHARGE. The Code contains no meaningful protection in the hugely profitable area of selling the consumer all kinds of insurance along with what he buys or borrows.

ANSWER. The Code contains the same provisions as the Federal Act in permitting separate charges for insurance only where the consumer is given a written notice of his privilege to buy insurance from any other source or person, and in the case of credit insurance, an additional written notice that the consumer need not buy the insurance as a condition to the loan or credit sale. Going beyond the Federal Act, the Code, unlike present law, permits the creditor to sell property insurance only where the amount of the loan or sale is $300 or more and the value of the property is $300 or more. These amounts like all others in the Code are subject to the escalation provisions.

Furthermore, the Code restricts the creditor from offering insurance at a separate charge unless the insurance covers a substantial risk of loss or damage to property related to the credit transaction; the amounts, terms and conditions of the insurance are reasonable in relation to the character and value of the property insured; and the terms of the insurance are reasonable in relationship to the terms of the credit. In the case of credit insurance, the insurance may be written only for the term of the debt and the amount of the insurance must decline with the amount of the obligation, thus prohibiting the use of level term credit insurance coverages.

The rates to be charged for insurance, both for property or credit insurance, are left to the control and supervision of the State Insurance Commissioner or Department.

Some people who presume to speak for all consumers, including Judge Brunn, would outlaw credit insurance completely or at least would not permit any separate charge therefor. Whether or to what extent there have been abuses in the credit insurance area is a topic of lively current debate. Most consumers appear to want its protection. An impartial study currently being completed is expected to provide some light and some hard information on this highly emotional subject The Code generally follows present law in its insurance provisions with some additional restrictions noted above.

CHARGE: The Code does not cover pawnbrokers.

ANSWER: It does not and the choice to exclude pawnbrokers from coverage of the Consumer Credit Code was deliberate and intentional. Regulation of pawnbrokers today is primarily, if not exclusively, a police problem and the present operations of pawnbrokers are only remotely connected to the conduct of the business of consumer credit.

CHARGE: As to disclosure of interest rates, the Code alows dealers and finance companies to follow either the Code or the Federal Truth-In-Lending Law.

ANSWER: Since the provisions of the Code are not only similar but substantially identical to the Federal Act, there would not seem

to be any room for consumer compaints in this respect. Judge Brunn seems to believe that the Federal Trade Commission in Washington, D.C. rather than fifty state officials can and will more effectively enforce disclosure laws on the hundreds of thousands of retailers, loan companies and sales finance companies who are doing business throughout the United States. He also asserts that: "Many state regulatory agencies are notoriously dominated by the industries they are supposed to regulate." No comment on that kind of a charge is necessary.

The position of the Code and the Commissioners on the matter of Federal vs. State regulation of disclosure requirements has apparently been deliberately distorted and then castigated.

As State officials, the Commissioners are naturally biased in favor of State vs. Federal action wherever the problem can be handled satisfactorily at the State level. The Code and the position of the Commissioners is in no way an effort or an attempt to avoid or evade the Federal Act. Not only are the provisions of the Code substantially identical in the disclosure area but the Commissioners have drafted State regulations for use under the Code which are substantially identical to Regulation "Z."

The position and philosophy of the Commissioners and the Code is that better and more effective law enforcement can be expected and generated by the Administrator of the Code, who is a state official, than by a handful of Federal employees. Any law is only as good as the enforcement it is given. Fifty State Administrators adequately financed by the fees to be paid by all creditors under the Code should certainly be expected to do a better job of enforcement than a division of a Federal Agency which itself has been severely criticized by the press, the public and recently by a Special Committee of the American Bar Association as being inept and inefficient. If Judge Brunn and other consumer spokesmen are genuinely interested in disclosure law enforcement, they should support and applaud the enactment of the Code and not continue to raise specious objections thereto.

To sum up, The Uniform Consumer Credit Code can be a significant advance for consumers and for legitimate business in revising the state of the law regulating and controlling consumer credit and the relationships between lender and borrower, and seller and credit buyer. This Code provides for the first time a unified, harmonized, and integrated approach to the legislative regulation of the consumer credit field. Lawyers representing either consumers or creditors should be able under the Code to quickly and effectively advise their clients on legal problems arising in consumer credit transactions. The Code proposes to substitute one coherent law, well balanced between the rights and even desires of consumers and the rights and wishes of creditors, for the host of separate statutes which presently exist in the consumer credit field. It significantly broadens the scope and the area of credit regulation. Hopefully, it is flexible enough to remain the basic law for governing credit relations between consumers and their sellers or lenders for the foreseeable future.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 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?

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF DUNHAM MILL

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in the decades following the discovery of America it was the practice of the nobility to award their lords with large tracts of land in the New World. In fact, the whole State of New Jersey consisted originally of two such grants.

The lords, in turn, gave smaller grants to induce settlers to take up residence in the area. One such recipient was Jonathan Dunham of Woodbridge, who 300 years ago today came to New Jersey and contracted to build the first flour mill in our area. Mr. Dunham proved to be a leader not only in business, but in community activities as well. He was often called upon to represent Woodbridge in legal and political matters.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure for me to commemorate this anniversary of the early development in my congressional district. I would at this time like to include in the RECORD some remarks regarding Jonathan Dunham prepared by his direct descendant, Mr. Lester R. Dunham of Clifton, N.J.

The article is as follows:

JONATHAN DUNHAM OF WOODBRIDGE, N.J.

(By Lester R. Dunham)

In 1665 New Jersey gave grants of land between Rahway and Raritan Rivers to many of the settlers in Eastern New England as an inducement for them to settle their colony. Among those who took advantage of the offer were the Dunhams.

Jonathan Dunham received a grant of 213 acres of land in Woodbridge, New Jersey as a bonus for conducting a flour mill for the benefit of the people. This mill was built by him in 1670, on the creek near the first bridge after passing the Presbyterian Church. It was the first grist mill ever erected in this part of the country. The town agreed to give Jonathan 30 pounds for the improvement and all of the sod out of the meadow he might need for daming. His toll was to be one-sixteenth and tradition gives him credit for turning out the most beautiful meal. We are assured that his toll was so light that a man who brought a bag of grain to him took back two bags of flour. This old mill stood for many years grinding for the comfort of several generations.

When Jonathan Dunham's house was built, it was the fine house par excellence in Woodbridge. The house was constructed of brick, said to have been brought from Holland by vessels sailing hither and used as ballast on the voyage. The home still stands and is the Rectory of Trinity Episcopal Church, Rahway Avenue, Woodbridge, N.J. One of the grinding stones from the mill is in evidence today, having been placed just off the circular driveway near the entrance of the Rectory.

He was one of the men of great energy in Woodbridge. When he determined upon an enterprise, he passed it forward to success with indomitable perseverence. So many of his relatives lived north of the Kirk Green, that the neighborhood was known as Dunhamtown.

On May 18, 1670 he was a member of a jury sitting at Elizabethtown, and in 1671 he officiated as foreman of another jury. He became an influential citizen possessing sufficient acquired property holdings to entitle him to honorable political distinction. In 1671 he was also appointed overseer of the highways. The following year and in 1675 he officiated as Clerk of the Township Court. His acquaintance with persons and property in Woodbridge secured him the responsible position in 1674 and again in 1694 as Assessor or Rate Maker. In July, 1674 Jonathan Dunham was appointed one of the attorneys to defend the interest of his town of Woodbridge in settling a controversy between Woodbridge and Piscataway over a disputed claim for some upland and meadow.

During 1686 and later he was one of five prominent citizens empowered by the people to prevent encroachment and trespass upon the rights of the corporation, with full authority to prosecute and punish any such offenders. Mr. Dunham was also one of the principal persons delegated to superintend laying-out and appropriating the second division of land of the Woodbridge freeholders. In 1701 he was one of a dozen of the wealthiest and most intelligent citizens chosen to procure the settlement of a suitable town minister. In 1701 he was also chosen Deputy to the General Assembly, representing the Woodbridge district.

Not only on church matters was Jonathan Dunham prominently identified, but the property owners entrusted him, with other associates, to attend to important provisions of one hundred acres of land for educational purposes.

Jonathan Dunham died about 1703 and is buried in the Trinity Episcopal Church Cemetery.

(NOTE.—Source of data: "Woodbridge and Vicinity" by Joseph W. Dally; "First Settlers of Ye Plantations of Piscataway and Woodbridge Olde East New Jersey, 1664–1714" by Orra Eugene Monnette; "Town Records of Woodbridge, New Jersey.")

ORIGINAL ESSAYS OF YOUNG AMERICANS

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this spring I conducted an essay contest among high school seniors of Tarrant County. Reading these original essays of young Americans graduating from high school this year in my district has given me great encouragement for the future, and I am submitting herewith the 14 essays selected by the judges as best among all those written in Tarrant County high schools.

It is my conviction that anyone reading these essays will gain a better comprehension of the ways in which many of our thoughtful young Americans are feeling and thinking about public issues. Moreover, I believe a careful reading of what these outstanding young people have to say will inspire many to quit worrying so frantically about the student generation and its attitudes. There

has been so much publicity attendant to the frenetic and sometimes downright psychotic behavior of a small percentage of American youth that we tend sometimes to forget that the great majority are basically stable, well motivated, and firmly committed to those principles which have given this country birth and growth and progress.

The 14 essays submitted here were chosen by a panel of three judges. The judges were Dr. E. C. Barksdale, chairman of the history department for the University of Texas at Arlington, Miss Mary Crutcher, assistant city editor of the Fort Worth Press, and Eden Van Zandt, youth editor of the Fort Worth Star Telegram.

The judges knew neither the identity of the writers nor the schools which they attended. They judged solely on content and originality. They chose four winners and 10 for honorable mention. These winning student essayists, as it develops, represent 11 different high schools in Tarrant County.

The top winner, to be identified next Sunday, will be honored by a trip to Washington accompanied by his parents or other adult escort. Each of the top three runners-up will be awarded a U.S. Government bond.

Three general titles were suggested for the essay competition: "When Does Freedom of Expression Become Anarchy?" "Should the Voting Age Be Lowered to 18?" "How Can We Solve the Environment Crisis?"

Students wrote on several variations of these basic themes, and several of the essays sparkle with refreshing originality. Whether or not one might agree with everything each of the students say, I believe everyone will find these essays interesting. I commend them to the reading of all Members of Congress.

WHEN DOES FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION BECOME ANARCHY?

(By Bob Harrell, R. L. Paschal High School)

Cloaked in a dark shroud of civil disorder and internal strife, America has come to the realization that freedom of expression must be contained within certain bounds. An excess of personal freedom can lead to anarchy; an excess of order, to autocracy. Somewhere on middle ground a fine line of distinction must be drawn.

To define the limits of freedom of expression, one must first determine the extent to which protest should be tolerated as a permissible strategy to hasten change. Obviously, protests in the form of planned demonstrations, mass rallies and distributions of propaganda pose no immediate threat to the legal and political system of the United States. On the other hand, when the dissidents resort to violence and when the law is broken, peaceful protest becomes civil disobedience, and therein lies the danger to any democratic system. While civil disobedience embodies the violation of an existing law, its degrees and motives vary. The peaceful mandates of Dr. Martin Luther King were a far cry from the revolutionary tactics of the New Left.

The direct refusal to obey the specific law that is the subject of protest has always been an essential means of testing its constitutionality. By nonviolently breaking a seemingly immoral law and peacefully submitting to the penalties commensurate with this violation, redress can then be had in a legal court proceeding. This method of reform proved quite effective for King and his followers in righting many of the wrongs endured by the Negro. Unfortunately, however, civil disobedience is not limited to protests of this type.

Often times a large scale confrontation involves the violation of a law unrelated to the one subject to protest. This type of dissent is employed to by-pass the democratic processes by coercing the government into taking immediate action on a given issue. Its widespread use may sow the seeds of turmoil; then civil disobedience becomes the genesis of disorder and violence. The most pestilent use of unmitigated civil disobedience, however, is that it affects the people of the nation as a whole. By inducing others to engage in disparate forms of civil disobedience themselves, it encourages an attitude of permissiveness toward America's legal system and apathy toward its political process.

The motive of civil disobedience, whether it be to try a law in higher courts, or to stimulate sentiment on an issue never confers immunity. There is no man above the law, and there is no man who is innocent in breaking a law, no matter how noble his purpose or how high his cause. Law violations, even for ends recognized as laudable, should be duly processed in a Court of law, for they are not only assaults on the rule of law, but subversions of the democratic process.

The freedom to express oneself freely on political and social issues has, through history, been a cherished American right. Even peaceful acts of constitutional law testing have been instrumental in making this country truly a land where "all men are created equal." Nevertheless, democracy is a fragile ideal, and the uncontrolled use of civil disobedience and violence will shatter it.

EIGHTEEN YEAR OLDS SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO VOTE

(By John Gooding, Haltom High School)

The history of suffrage in America contains many glaring inequalities and injustices in who is and who is not able to vote. All except one of these injustices has been eliminated through the years. The one remaining inequality is, of course, denial to eighteen year olds of the right to vote.

Eighteen year olds may be eligible for the draft, pay taxes, and be tried as adults; but, because they have no vote, they have no say in the wars, taxes, or laws which may directly affect them. Clearly, these inequalities violate both the spirit and substance of American democracy.

Besides these obvious reasons for lowering the voting age to eighteen, there is the equally obvious reason of the improved education of our youth. In the late 1700's, when twenty-one became the accepted age for sufferage, the average child was lucky to finish elementary school. Many had no schooling at all. Today, however, the situation is dramatically different. Almost everyone finishes high school, and many go on to college. As a whole, young people today are at least as aware of what is taking place in government as their parents. The magic age of twenty-one still remains, however.

During the Middle Ages, when common law was developed, twenty-one became the age which separated maturity from adolescence. Today, hundreds of years and two moon landings later, twenty-one still remains as the voting age in forty-six of the fifty states. Only Georgia, Kentucky, Alaska, and Hawaii let persons under twenty-one vote.

Whereas the United States is lagging behind in giving the vote to eighteen year olds, other countries are rapidly granting this privilege. Such diverse and politically different countries as Guatamala, Brazil, Israel, Peru, and Russia have lowered the voting age from twenty-one to eighteen.

Support for lowering the voting age in the United States is widespread. A recent Gallup Poll shows that 60% of those interviewed favored, lowering the voting age to eighteen. Among political leaders, there are also many who are in favor of lowering the voting age to eighteen. Such diverse political figures as Richard Nixon, Edward Kennedy, Barry Goldwater, Edmund Muskie, and George Wallace all favor lowering the voting age. All of our Presidents since Hoover, with the exception of Truman, have supported a lowered voting age.

In conclusion, it may be said that today's eighteen year olds are better educated and more aware than those of past generations. The time has definitely come to eliminate the inequality of eighteen, nineteen, and twenty year olds shouldering the responsibility of adults without have the privilege of voting.

WHEN DOES FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION BECOME ANARCHY?

(By Judy Carrington, C. F. Brewer High School)

"America, the land of the free!"

Yes, America is indeed a symbol of freedom. The foundation of this great nation was laid on this one basis. The builders of this nation staked their all on the one cause. How proud the founders of this mighty nation would be if they could see their precious dream the reality of today! Yet, today's contemporary society often abuses the same freedoms which their forefathers held so dear. Although the forefathers of this nation dedicated the first amendment to the Constitution to guaranteeing every citizen freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to peaceably assemble, and the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances, in today's modern world of campus demonstrations, hippie movements, and racial riots, the question has arisen, "When does freedom of expression become anarchy?"

Of course, every citizen is entitled to advocate and to petition, whether his opinion is right or wrong. The American way is as Voltaire expressed it when he said, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." In addition, the Constitution clearly defends the right to dissent and to protest. However, it is also clear that in order to protect the rights of everyone, each citizen is obligated to accept the majority's desires and not to deliberately infringe upon the rights of others.

Unfortunately, many Americans today have confused the right to dissent with the right to disrupt. Peaceful protest does not mean deliberate disobedience of the law. By the same token, it is not the campus demonstrators dissent which is wrong, so much as it is the manner in which he protests. Certainly, a student's expression of opinion on public policy is desirable until he infringes on another's rights. For example, demonstrating college students are within their rights to protest the Vietnam war until they attempt to prevent other Americans from expressing their viewpoint on the controversy for the simple reason that it did not coincide with their opinion. It is strange that those who protest the loudest for freedom of expression would deny this same freedom to others.

Furthermore, constructive suggestions reap for better results than derogatory insults. So many times, the first to protest never stops to consider what solution he would offer to a problem if the decision were his to make, before he begins to complain. The nation's leaders do not need useless protests; they need sound advice and workable solutions. Moreover, once a decision is democratically determined by the majority of the people, the minority must learn to accept it even though they did not support it.

In conclusion, rights become riots when freedoms are abused, and democracy becomes anarchy when the minority refuses to accept the law and abide by it. If America is to re-

main "the land of the free and the home of the brave", Americans must be brave and accept the responsibilities of freedom so that freedom may remain free to all as the founders of this mighty nation intended.

HOW CAN WE SOLVE THE ENVIRONMENT CRISIS?

(By George Lee, M. L. Kirkpatrick High School)

To emphasize the importance of this subject, I would like to quote from a speaker at at the San Francisco conference, Michael Scriven of the University of California, who had this to say:

"We are not about to survive the problems of atmosphere and water supply contamination, the problems of natural resource exhaustion, and all the other problems to which the ecologist has made us sensitive by getting one percent of the population halfway familiar with the situation. We have got to get everyone, and that means every citizen educated."

It should be clear that action, not just more talk, needs to be taken quickly if we are to combat these menaces to our survival. Action is needed from an aroused public, responsible industrialists, and a concerned government. What could and should be done? As a start, I would like to make several suggestions.

Establish in each industrial nation, a "Population Pentagon" consisting of a high cabinet or ministerial level board dealing with environmental affairs. Such a board should primarily be made up of the best minds in ecology, biology, anthropology, botany, chemistry and related sciences.

This board should function as a direct Presidential Advisory group and should not be subject to pressures from our powerful lobbies or vested interests. By continual exchanging of personnel, inviting leading researchers in various fields—whether from education or industry—there would occur a continual upgrading of such a board—continual access to new methods and discoveries—and hopefully, avoidances of seeing such a group stagnate into a cloistered, ignored, obsolete island of scientific knowledge whose research is never used in practical application.

This panel of experts in each nation should be given the responsibility of advising industry and agriculture of the ecological effects of new products and processes. Its decisions such as recommending the ban of certain nondegradable products should have the full weight of governmental enforcement behind them.

Ideally, such a Pollution Pentagon would be kept completely free from partisanship and safeguarded from attempts from whatever quarter, including other government agencies—that might exert pressures or undue influence.

Pollution is already such a monumental social issue that the entire public should be made more and more aware of the personal convictions of potential political candidates concerning conservation and pollution. Further, the public should carefully appraise the past or present industrial connections of such prospective officials. Human survival is at stake in all this—not just petty politics. Industry needs to realize, for example, that not every power-draining device capable of being dreamed up should be produced. Technology, newer technology, and more clever technology is not the solution to pollution. People must come to realize this fundamental fact: We simply cannot have a continually expanding economical and technological world within a finite system-Earth.

Also we must extend our educational programs on ecology and the preservation and improvement of our environment to children and the entire adult population . . . the decision makers of today, who decree what sort of world their children and grandchildren will be living in.

It is tragic, but most people still view pollution as simply annoying—not as a threat to all life on this planet. There remains a compelling need to communicate clearly, continuously, and candidly the shocking facts about our degrading world. The public, especially in a democracy, must be aroused. Only then will the efforts of industrialists and a concerned government materialize; only then will we evidence a genuine concern for our survival and the survival of mankind in the future.

WHEN DOES FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION BECOME ANARCHY?

(By Michael Williams, Castleberry High School)

Legally, a thin, perhaps imperceptible, line exists between activities of an anarchistic nature and those generally considered to be within the realm of permissible dissent. Despite this perplexing ambiguity, however, there is a fundamental difference between rational polemics and inflammatory rhetoric. While orderly ideological argument is the basis for ameliorative governmental change, doctrinaire diatribe fails to serve as a basis for anything other than prolonged disagreement.

A communications impasse has been exploited by those who would prefer to abrogate the present system of government and replace it with a vague, theoretically utopian entity. I can sympathize with this righteous idealism; however, I cannot condone many of the tactics employed in the process of espousing these ideals. These tactics sometimes include demonstrations organized for the sole purpose of disrupting and/or sabotaging the machinery of all levels of American government.

Freedom of expression is abused and distorted when one expresses himself violently without regard for the lawful rights of fellow citizens. Unless one is a nihilist, he must concede that resorting to violently coercive methods in order to facilitate political reform does not lie within the sphere of legal freedom of expression.

Overt acts of violence directed against the Federal government are clearly seditious, but so also is revolutionary, rhetoric advocating the violent overthrow of the government. Even if this political cacophony is never carried beyond the rhetorical state, the subversive tone of these expositions presents a potential threat to internal stability. It is dangerous to regard these clarion calls for rebellion as innocuous, for many have been translated into action. Recently, Black Panther David Hilliard publicly threatened the life of the President. Although the statement may have been nothing more than angry vituperation, the government could not afford the luxury of speculatory indecision; hence, Hilliard was arrested.

To those who feel that the laws distinguishing anarchy from legal protest are vague or draconian, I must address the following comments. Constitutionally, there are explicitly defined legal methods by which changes in the existing political order may be expedited. Contrary to Marcuselan doctrine, destructive violence and speeches fomenting such violence are not socially constructive nor morally justifiiable methods for introducing change.

American society is in a constant state of flux, for a progressive society cannot remain a static institution. Therefore, freedom of expression and the new and innovative ideas it breeds must be preserved at all costs. However, anarchistic invective, which clearly transcends the legal barriers distinguishing dissent from sedition, must not be tolerated. Furthermore, conspiratorial confrontation tactics designed to encourage insurrection are obviously unlawful procedures; moreover, those who organize and participate in such activities are abusing their Constitutionally accorded rights.

In summation, because a democratic society thrives upon the exchange of ideas, ideas which are introduced through the proper channels have enhanced chances of reception and, perhaps, implementation. The tragedy of our society is that many intellectual young, convinced of the rectitude of their cause and equally convinced of the inequity of those who disagree, seek to alter the status quo by reprehensible methods.

Hopefully, a dialogue will be established between officials of the system and the alienated and idealistic young willing to work within the system.

The alternative is reactionary suppression and attendant social apoplexy.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

(By C. Jean Hackney, Kennedale High School)

There are many points of view about lowering the voting age, and if the voting age is lowered the results must be considered. This will be a major step in Texas progress.

It is the opinion of a few that eighteen year olds do not deserve the privilege to vote because of the rates of riots and disorders which have been on college campuses. However, these people constitute only a minority of eighteen year olds.

Said Theodore Sorensen, former special counsel to the late President Kennedy and a possible Senatorial candidate from New York:

"Campus disorders make sensational headlines. But nearly one-half of all 18–20-year-olds are not in college at all.

"Of the more than 2300 colleges and universities in this country, less than 1 percent have suffered serious disturbances. Of the 7 million college students in this country, less than 2 percent, according to a staff report to the Eisenhower Violence Commission, can be classified as militants or radicals."

Said Dr. Karl Menninger, the eminent psychiatrist: "Today's youth are capable of exercising the right to vote. Statistically, they constitute the most highly educated group in our society."[1]

Recently a Gallup Poll was taken by the American Institute of Public Opinion. According to this survey, six out of ten respondents do believe 18 year olds should be granted voting rights. Many of those interviewed who favored lowering the voting age maintain that "if a person is old enough to fight, he is old enough to vote."

Others believe that if eighteen year olds do receive the franchise that it then would not be a privilege any longer, it would be just another chore to perform. This, however, now stands true for a few eligible voters who do not use their votes because of apathy. A vote should be used wisely so that it will result in better people and ideas for both the country and the citizens.

The eighteen year olds who are in a branch of the nation's services deserves to be allowed to vote. These young people work, fight, and sometimes die so that the American people can be assured of a democratic nation in which to live. This has made the United States probably the most respected nation in the world today.

Many eighteen year olds wish this privilege so that they can participate in helping elect officials who can best advance the well-being of this country. Having a part in determining the country's leaders would help the younger generation become better citizens and inspire them to perhaps discover a

---

[1] Pamela Swift, "Few Militants," *Parade* (April 5, 1970), 4.

way to help solve today's problems. This would assist the progress of the nation because our younger generation will soon be the nation's leaders.

WHEN DOES FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION BECOME ANARCHY?

(By Eleanor Admire, Azle High School)

One hears a good deal about freedom today. Witness our movies, our songs, our advertisements, our newscasts, and our slogans. ("Do your own thing" carries over into almost all areas of our lives.) Indeed, the quest for freedom, the right to live each day as it comes, with no entanglements from society, is the theme of *Easy Rider;* two young men motorcycle across the nation wanting to be free. A few years ago "Born Free" won an Oscar; we sing at public gatherings "land of the free, home of the brave;" in church hymnals we find "My country 'tis of thee, Land of the noble free. . . ." Madison Avenue hucksters hawk their wares, i.e., underwear, sports cars, hair spray, with allusions to freedom. Certainly "freedom" is America's reason for being. Our founding fathers came to America to escape oppression, the Revolutionary War was fought to obtain freedom, and the Constitution was drafted so that freedom would be guaranteed to all.

The idea of freedom, however, is comparatively recent, historically speaking. Freedom, or even the concept, hardly existed before the French Revolution. Basically, there were only two distinct classes in society, the aristocrats and the peasants. The French were pushed against the wall so terribly by Louis XVI; finally, rebellion (spurred by the Romantic period's philosophy of freedom) occurred and the king was overthrown. But ironically, the French, instead of achieving democracy, went right back where they started from. The reason? Anarchy. It was part of the Romantic creed to put emphasis on the individual. The individual was considered to be almost divine; he could do as he pleased; he could make his own laws; and he could receive the truth for himself. We learn from history that the Russians, who copied from the French, went through similar stages from total anarchy to totalitarianism. Fortunately, here in America we tempered our Romanticism; we believe "one for all and all for one." Hence, we have democracy, maybe not to perfection; but certainly we are closer to the concept of democracy than any other nation. In a way, we are in another Romantic age. We have seen extremes in rebellion and riots; we have seen young people living together in communes. History may be repeating itself, for out of total anarchy—total disregard for established values—arises the other extreme, complete loss of freedom. True, many changes are necessary for our country to become truly a democracy, but the answer is not through anarchy.

In *A Tale of Two Cities,* Charles Dickens tells us "It was the best of times and it was the worst of times." The Romantic age was an era of progress and industrialization; it was a time of terror, mass murder, and anarchy.

Anarchy literally means "Absence of any form of political authority." Lincoln said, "United we stand, divided we fall." Jesus said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." No one should be denied the right to express his opinion. This is one of our basic freedoms provided in the Bill of Rights. But if everyone expressed his opinion, without any regard for rules or order, total confusion and anarchy would be the result and many good ideas would founder. True democracy cannot be found in the absence of laws. Our right to disagree is precious. Let us protect it with self discipline.

WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT OUR ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

(By Steven L. Harbes, Arlington Sam Houston High School)

Our environmental crisis, thankfully, is one problem that doesn't require endless congressional debates, exhaustive investigations, committees and sub-committees to determine just what the crisis is all about. Air, water, noise, garbage, pollution and the population explosion have been with us in varying degrees since the Industrial Revolution.

Throughout our history any major problem that has confronted us, has been solved by three basic steps.

1. Recognition that a problem exists.
2. Education and research.
3. Action and results.

In 1970 the United States appears to be in the first of these steps. Thanks to widespread publicity, Americans are now becoming aware of the monumental problems facing us.

Basically, without dealing with specifics, education is the best general answer to our environmental crisis. Education for old and young alike.

Take the Texas public school system as an example. Two years of science are required before graduation from high school. Physical science, General Biology, or Chemistry are usually the only choices offered. The reproduction cycle of a grasshopper or the chemical number of zinc, do not interest most students. Every student who breathes can relate to our state of our environment, though.

It is the writer's feeling that a national bill, asking all of the 50 state legislatures to introduce a measure requiring an environmental study course (to be taken in junior or senior high) should be substituted for the other sciences. Where pollution is worst (L.A. or New York), ecology courses in high schools are growing. In Tarrant county, this writer could not find one high school environment class.

Serious proposals such as adding a Secretary of Environment to the President's Cabinet, or establishing a "Pollution Pentagon" are being studied. Rep. George Bush has offered a bill to Congress to create a National College of Ecological and Environmental Studies. If these things come true, they will provide a much needed boost for a national environmental education program.

A major stumbling block in dealing with our deteriorating environment is human nature. People do not mind putting up with a little air, water, or noise pollution, when money and employment come from the polluters. Also, touchy subjects, such as religion, complicate the chief cause of our environmental crisis—over-population. Only by education will the gravity of these problems be impressed upon people and cause them to assume new attitudes.

Offering more Ecology courses in the public school curriculum will force our elected officials at the local, state, and national level to create anti-pollution laws with "teeth" in them. The end result of immediate environmental education is that extreme steps like legal abortion, abolishing cars in cities, or slapping luxury taxes on people with two or more children, will not become necessary.

Until science rescues us by perfecting the self-destructing can, a noiseless SST, or carbon-free gas, educating ourselves to the causes and effects of America's environmental crisis is the quickest way of eliminating it.

MY STOMACH IS CRUSHING YOUR ELBOW MAYBE?

(By Beverly Stoddard, Haltom High School)

"Move over!"
"Quit shoving!"
"You're on my foot!"
"Get that package outa my . . ."
"But I wasn't pushing!"

These are exclamations commonly reserved for elevators, football stands, and lunch lines. However, unless something is done soon, they may take a prominent place in everyday language. The truth is the human race is losing ground, that is, as in living space. There are just too many people on the way. Everybody's go to be someplace, but the time may come when there isn't any more space to put people in.

Over-population has just recently become a problem. The trouble starts when more are born than dies. It was once said that if all the people in China were marched six abreast over a cliff, the line would never end. The assumption is that enough Chinamen would be born to keep the line moving. This may not be true, however, because Chinamen would always be marching.

Over-crowding caused by over-population may not be felt for some time, but the time will come unless something is done soon. The main cause of over-population is people. People, in fact, are the main cause of most of the problems in the world. In this case the cause can be pinpointed to bored people. Human beings, being only human, need to be busy at all times. Idle hands may be the Devil's play things, but it's when the hand stop being idle that all the trouble begins.

Sports and other forms of recreation are not the answers, however. No one could get that interested in games. The only answer to over-population seems to be an effective and widely-used contraceptive. One such devise is commonly referred to as "The Pill." This is a modern, sensible solution for a modern, sensible society. In these days it's going to take more than a record of the Pope singing "I Got Rhythm" to keep the world under-over-populated.

Chemical warfare is finally coming into its own. The Pill can make life a better thing to live.

WHEN FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION BECOMES ANARCHY

(By Donald Tarrant, Polytechnic High School)

Free to speak, free to write, and free to assemble and petition, we enjoy our basic forms of expression with very little limitation. When these freedoms are used in such a way as to cause harm to a fellow human being, however, they are rightfully restricted.

Recently, our nation has witnessed numerous protests ranging from peaceful marches to rock-throwing, bloody demonstrations repelled by tear gas and clubbing. The latter disturbances have hurt their own cause beyond repair. People capable of being sympathetic to new ideas have turned squarely against them due to the unlawful manner in which they have been expressed.

Anarchy, itself, is not a word to be used loosely. Not until protesters behave in a manner resembling a complete absence of law do they become anarchists and a threat to all Americans. Destroying property and inflicting bodily harm to those around them, this small group of criminals demand more freedom while unable to handle the freedom they now possess. Numerous times they have blamed the police forces for setting off these riots only as an excuse to stage them. Our policemen are there for the purpose of stopping those who go outside the law, and until someone comes up with a better method of insuring public safety, they will always be around. Anarchists are not content to protest peacefully even if their cause is peace itself. They feel the urge to do the spectacular and thus disturb the peace at home calling undue attention to themselves and their wants. These few apparently fail to realize that

ninety-five per cent of the response is unfavorable. The majority of the American people will never be swayed by such a crude act as a violent riot. Extremists on the other side who oppose freedoms we do have will use these acts toward their own equally degrading ends.

Freedom of the press is one of our most sacred rights since it affects every American to some degree. The vast news media includes newspapers, magazines, radio, and television; the chief means by which the public keeps informed. Only in areas of giving false facts or revealing government secrets should restrictions be placed. News coverage should be thorough, truthful, and unbiased in opinion. In being thorough, it should cover any important happening regardless of the criticism that might result. Unnecessary restraints placed on the news media are not to be allowed and present a frightful threat to democracy.

Freedom of expression is one of our oldest and most cherished rights. We not only have the right to express our grievances but should be encouraged to do so as a corrective force in the democratic process. As long as this freedom is exercised in an acceptable manner, it can do no more than make even healthier our way of life.

OF LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

(By Ken Bird, Haltom High School)

A young man lay bleeding to death in the thick, black mud of a country that he never really understood fighting for. Back at home, his nineteen year old wife weeps as she rocks her small child. The tragedy which snuffed the life of this young man and ruined that of his young wife was the result of a decision made somewhere by a man elected to a public office for which neither of them could vote.

In the argument for the lowering of the voting age to eighteen, the reason most used is the one pointing out the gap between the present voting age and the present draft age. Why should a youth be forced to kill or to be killed, maimed, or psychologically injured by government officials whom he had no voice in electing? What kind of society would support such a system? If I were to name a few, the Union of Soviet Socialists Republic and the People's Republic of China would head the list.

Many people will argue that this is not a valid reason for the lowering of the voting age. In my opinion, however, it is the most logical reasoning that can be drawn from our principles of democracy. If you have the responsibility of a nations' protection in your hands, is it not just a shade hyprocritical to say you have not the responsibility to sensibly vote for the nation's leaders?

You might say, "Think of the irresponsibility of youths under twenty-one who are not fighting for our country." I say, "Look at the irresponsibility of our present so-called mature voters." Why, millions of mature voters selected George Wallace as their choice for president in 1968. Sure, there are youths who drive recklessly and smoke pot and rebel against authority, but is this worse than drinking and dressing up in silly white sheets and burning crosses and beating defenseless Negro men, women, and children?

With our present voting age, you may have a sharp, twenty-year-old, government major who is not allowed to vote for our country's policy makers. Yet, a thirty-eight-year old man who never finished the seventh grade, and who knows only that all men are created equal if their skin is white, will have a vote. This is democracy?

I have been told that the purpose of high school is to produce mature, thoughtful citizens for our society. Shouldn't these citizens be allowed to vote after they have obtained this education? Shouldn't a high school graduate be allowed to vote at the age of eighteen? Is it right to turn a youth out on his own in a society when he has no voice in the election of the law makers and enforcers of that country?

THE LEGAL MURDERS

(By Joyce Crowell, Haltom High School)

I am a stranger to your planet Earth. I come from the far side of reason, just slightly left of freedom. My planet is a wonderful place, for there survival of the fittest rules supreme. If one of the inhabitants is murdered or permanently disabled by death of "natural causes," it is his tough luck. The all-powerful fathers cannot provide means for freedom to live since it might cost too much money to maintain prisons or to enforce laws. For when one tries to make and enforce laws, one must pay individually for their service, and this is so much trouble, it is much easier to be apathetic or intentionally blind. Oh! sweet, ignorant bliss! How wise our forefathers were to avoid the use of words like "life" or "liberty." What a strange place is your planet Earth. And how tragically human are your inhabitants. It is enormously difficult to picture my people fighting over preservation of life through the all-powerful fathers. "To each his own" is our national motto. Our life-span is twenty-eight years.

Of course the situation is entirely hypothetical and unworthy of serious thought. What civilized nation would think of allowing its people to be murdered with no deterrent or punishment for those responsible? What legislation would deny its constituents the right to life or liberty or pursuit of happiness without due process of law? What nation indeed. Certainly not a nation with a tremendously high standard of living. Certainly not a nation with the resources and means of stopping such devastating situations. Certainly not a nation like ours—or is our nation like that? Isn't denying the right to breathe clean air and drink sanitary water also denying the right to life?

Okay, so we have a problem, and we need a solution, and although it is important to educate the public to the horrendous results of misusing our environment, it is not the best solution. The *best* solution is an idealistic one, but is presented here with ignorantly hopeful status. It is time that not only our legislators, but also the leaders of the business world, get off of their proverbial tails and fight environment problems with their only useful weapons—money and manpower.

During this past decade, we declared an all-out assault on the moon. For the next decade, why not declare an all-out assault on problems of our environment, namely air and water pollution? Once politics and propaganda are put aside and mankind seriously, but steadily, and without quick-kill methods, gets to work on saving itself, mankind *will* save itself. Until we do, we remain like a "hypothetical" planet, encouraging, "for the sake of economy" the senseless and wanton killing of innocent people. The tools to kill environmental destroyers are the same that keep them alive—money, manpower, and the attitudes of individuals who have power.

SHOULD THE VOTING AGE BE LOWERED TO 18?

(By Barbara Watkins, Dunbar High School)

Many young Americans are engrossed in deep thought about the things that effect their lives, their position as young people, their future, and the future of their country. To fight against the war, to fight against poverty, to fight against the establishment—these serious commitments to the problems of their society have been ignited by youth's shocking awareness of politics, war, and death.

The young people of today have been categorized, stamped, and numbered. They know and detest this. Many people tend to think that a young person, ranging between the ages of eighteen through twenty-two, is either illogical, radical, irresponsible, selfish, or corrupt. This period of any human's life is most challenging.

For this reason, the young person thinks best, attacks, compares, and analyzes today's problems with much more exuberance than the older generation.

The young people look around and see only turmoil. They try to find their way through the institutionalized jungle, but there is no "Tarzan" to help them, for *this* is not a movie, nor is it fiction. When they try to seek their way out through education it increases their knowledge of what is happening and they discover a clear understanding of what *is* and what *has to be*.

They know there is a war going on and that they are eligible to be drafted, trained, and sent to the front. They are a part of the establishment, and yet they are not. Trouble mounts as they try to answer the question, "Where do we stand?" The establishment has the power and the right to draft an eighteen year old, if he is out of school . . . yet he is not an eligible candidate for voting. That young people are irresponsible, unmanageable and corrupt is an illogical answer to a logical question: why is a boy capable of serving his country in one capacity, if not another, both deemed necessary to the maintenance of democracy.

How a country with such delicate ties with allies, a country whose every action is watched and whose slightest mistake may lead to disaster can let a boy do a man's job is totally absurd. The fact is that, when at the age of eighteen and going to war, "the boy *is* father to the man." Their country sends them because they are at the age of maturity of mind and body, the most qualified of all men, quick thinking, nimble footed, and strong willed. When the word "man" is used, it always has the same meaning, and deserves the same amount of respect, whether that person be eighteen or eighty.

War is like a disease. It can be treated but not always cured. But to even a disease, the cause must be found and when this has occurred, it is used against the disease. The same is true of war, people, and politics. People run politics, and politicians run wars. If the young men fighting the war could decide who they want making decisions which may rule their lives, then the so-called "soldier boy" cliché could be relinquished for the "soldier," a title of esteem rather than disrespect.

A young woman is just as responsible as any young man and should be given the right to vote for the governing people of her present and future.

The great question of lowering the voting age is always left on an unstable ledge. Death brings about a sense of decisiveness for all, old and young. Therefore, whether the person be eighteen or eighty he or she should be given the right to say "yes" or "no" about his future.

SHOULD THE VOTING AGE BE LOWERED TO 18?

(By Jim Church, Fort Worth Southwest High School)

Current emotions, related to public events of recent months, quite often tend to deny an objective look at the proposal of lowering the voting age to eighteen. Rash emotionalism declares the acts of the protests and moratoriums to be irresponsible, and cites them as conclusive evidence against the eighteen-year-old vote.

Too many protests take place because there is no avenue for the often disfranchised youth to voice their concerns—except in the public streets! The American form of democracy allows the vote to be the orderly plebiscite of the people. Through the system of voting, the desired representatives and policies of the people are put in charge. Is it

not rather hypocritical then, to tell them to "work within the establishment"? The very basic foundation of that establishment is the right to vote.

The best rationalization for the lower voting age is that it would provide for the American youth a meaningful inclusion into the mainstream of life.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY SPEAKERS DISCUSS STUDENT DISORDERS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Iowa State University recently held its annual observance of Alumni Days. One of the principal speakers was Dr. W. Robert Parks, president of Iowa State. Dr. Parks spoke eloquently in behalf of "the public university," and of the dangers now facing our public universities. While I do not have the exact text of his comments at the Alumni Days observance, I do have the text of his commencement address from which he drew most of his comments. I insert that address in the RECORD at this point, and heartily commend it to my colleagues:

YOU AND THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

(By W. Robert Parks)

One of the most delightful and truly humorous conversations in all of the history of the stage is, I think, a passage between Monsieur Jourdain and his tutor in Moliere's seventeenth century comedy, "The Would-Be Gentleman." It is the conversational exchange in which the tutor explains to M. Jourdain that there are just two language forms—poetry and prose; and M. Jourdain discovers, to his great pride and delight, that for forty years, albeit unknowingly, he has been speaking prose.

This scene in which a simple and extremely silly man becomes blown up with pride over his newly recognized, life-long accomplishment of speaking prose is, of course, an absurd and ridiculous farce. Yet, like much comedy, it does perhaps carry several messages. And one of these messages is, I believe, that too frequently we are unaware of, or at least take unthinkingly for granted, some of the most valuable assets we have going for us, some of the most important conditions which determine the quality of our life.

Thus, most of us here today have always—at least until the events of the past few weeks—taken the public colleges and universities, which are scattered throughout this nation, very much for granted. We have accepted the public university way of higher education as a fact of our national life, without ever pausing to consider how this public system of higher education has affected the conditions of our life, both as individuals and as a society. So secure and so permanent has public higher education seemed to be that we have not felt it necessary to ask ourselves what American life would have been like if our public colleges and universities had never existed. We have not attempted to set a value on them. They have simply been a fact of our existence in a free democracy.

American historians, over the years, have been analyzing the question of why American democracy has worked for almost 200 years, why it has thus far succeeded so remarkably well as an instrument for the social progress which we have made as a nation. Many reasons have been suggested, and all of them are good ones: Our written constitution; our bill of rights; the division of powers between federal and state governments and among the three branches of government; a rich and undeveloped continent offering a stake in society to the many as well as to the few; a vigorous mix of peoples from many nations and races.

These factors, each of them, have been important ingredients in making American democracy work. However, it is my earnest belief—and I cannot state this belief too strongly—that our public colleges and universities—located in every state, in every section, with their doors open to all kinds of young people on a low cost, low tuition basis, offering in a free and open atmosphere the kinds of educational programs American society needed and wanted—have also been of critical importance, over the past 100 years, in making American democracy function as equitably and successfully as it has. And, make no mistake about it, they will continue to serve American democracy well in the uncertain future which lies ahead for all of us. Certainly, all will agree that the scientific and technological knowledge which these universities have helped to develop and have imparted to their thousands of students over the years has helped significantly in building the economic and material abundance which is so necessary if democracy is to fulfill its promise of bringing the good life to all of its citizens.

This morning, then, I have a very specific and definite charge for your class which is graduating today. And I think it is a peculiarly appropriate one to make to this particular class. For yours is the first graduating class which has felt the burden of the heavy increase in student fees which Iowa's public universities were forced to impose upon their students last fall—tuition increases, which, if they were to continue upward in the years ahead, would undermine the fundamental basis upon which this public university was founded and upon which it operates today.

Yours also is the class which is graduating amidst an unprecedented level of campus unrest and turmoil throughout the length and breadth of this country. You are graduating in a situation of national crisis in which great universities, as well as small colleges, have been closing their doors, boarding up their windows, putting out their lights for the remainder of this school year. It is a situation in which the whole future of the university, whether it be public or private, is being called into question.

I want this morning, therefore, to make a plea for public higher education, for the kind of higher education which is publicly supported and publicly controlled. I want to make a plea for the kind of university from which you are graduating today. I want to charge you who are the direct beneficiaries of a public higher education with the responsibility of defending and supporting such education, of working, through both your words and deeds, to keep our universities truly public, and to keep their learning processes truly open.

The time has come when those who believe in public higher education must stand up and be counted. For there can be little doubt that, all over the United States, public higher education and the educational values and purposes it serves stand in real danger of being eroded away, not only by mounting tuition costs made necessary by inadequate public financial support, but also by pressures from both the far left and the far right who would limit and distort the university's functions to fit their own narrow and closed point of view.

Our public universities stand in a threatened situation, I believe, because, as a public, we have not sufficiently understood the unique combination of educational values and purposes which belong so peculiarly to the public university and which are so indispensable to our democratic society. These educational purposes, which derive from the fact that public colleges and universities are the only higher educational institutions which are both publicly supported and publicly controlled, might be summed up in three words: opportunity, relevance, and involvement. Let me speak to you about them for a few moments.

Public universities and colleges have always had one basic and over-riding purpose; to open up high quality educational opportunity to the many on a low cost, low tuition basis. Historically, public colleges were founded upon the democratic belief that higher education should no longer remain the privilege of only a chosen few. And, today, the public university's first reason for existence continues to be to bring higher educational facilities within the reach of all qualified young men and women, wherever they may live, whatever may be their race, their creed, their economic and social background.

The public university believes in the democratic ideal of inclusion, rather than exclusion. Its credo is to accept all comers who have the will and the capacity to earn an education. Therefore, it believes in mass higher education as the best means of giving all qualified young people a chance. It rejects the notion that a limited and carefully selected student body has superior virtue. Rather, it believes in a big student body, whose heterogeneous mix gives each individual student the educational experience of rubbing shoulders with many students with a wide variety of backgrounds and varying points of view.

Moreover, because the only qualifying test for entrance into a public university is generally only a student's own personal potential for earning a higher education, most public universities have developed a real feeling for excellence in scholarship and an adherence to high educational standards, without creating among their students that feeling of elitism which is so contrary to our democratic values.

The public university's egalitarian belief in mass education, in a big student body, in an inclusiveness which embraces all qualified young people, is in accordance with the democratic ideal of equality of opportunity, which, as Lincoln said so well, is really what the Declaration of Independence meant when it declared that all men are "born equal." It is based upon the realistic understanding that the kind of life an individual is able to make for himself is often affected by his educational attainments.

The public university also believes in mass educational opportunity, as Jefferson pointed out so long ago, as society's most effective single means of tapping, training, and using the best talent, the best human resources of this country, wherever such talent is to be found, whether it is located on the farm, in the ghetto, in the elite suburban community, the southern village, the small midwestern town.

The university, of course, has never fully attained its democratic ideals of making educational opportunity truly equal nor has it realized its utilitarian goal of tapping and training the most promising human resources in this nation. Yet, again to use the words of Lincoln as he spoke about the ideal of equality of opportunity, such an ideal is a "standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all, constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated." Certainly one of the most significant achievements of American society since World War II has been the progress it has made in widening our higher educational opportunity. Whereas in 1940, only one out of every six high school grad-

uate went on to some form of advanced education, today almost half of our high school graduates take advanced schooling.

Today, however, democracy's goal of making public higher educational facilities broadly available to those qualified young people who have a will to earn a higher education may be receding before us. Indeed, if tuition costs are forced upward by a lack of adequate public financial supoprt, there is a real possibility that there will be an absolute cutback in the numbers of young people who can afford a college education. For example, there are many students who are today attending Iowa State on a financial "shoe string." Their economic circumstances are such that they have been just able to "get by" financially. For these students, further increases in tuition costs could mean that they would have to drop out into the ranks of those underprivileged young people who cannot afford a college education.

During the seventies, then, we must be continuously on our guard lest the basic foundation upon which the public university operates—public financial support which permits a low student tuition—is not eroded away. For if the time should come when students, through rising fee structures, are forced to take over a disproportionate share of the support of our public universities, then, indeed, our public universities will no longer be truly public. It is as simple as that.

Broadening out higher educational opportunity, then, has been one of the great missions of the public university. It has not been its only mission, however. For the public university has also had the co-equal purpose of developing the kinds of educational programs which American society, and most American young people, needed and wanted. Supported as it has been by tax dollars, the public university is the public's business. Therefore, it has continuously had to face the hard-nosed, practical questions asked by boards of regents, governors, legislatures: Are the educational programs it is offering really worthwhile? Are they worth public support?

Over the past century, consequently, the public universities in constructing their educational programs have had to meet the efficiency test of relevancy to their society. Their central educational purpose has had to be the search for the educational programs which best fitted the needs and interests of their society. The public university has had to build solid and substantial programs which train young people to carry on the constructive work of their society. It has seldom been allowed to mistake the extraneous for the relevant.

Nor have the public universities been able to remain fixed and static in their programs. They have not been allowed to sleep through the changes which have been transforming our world. They have had to modify and accommodate their programs to their ever-changing society. And, I submit, the public universities have done their job well in building strong, workable programs. In short, I am convinced that, over the past century, public financial support and legally constituted public control over the public universities have been a constructive force for making them such enormously useful institutions in our democracy.

Unfortunately, however, because the public university is the public's business, because it is the concern of each and every one of us who are taxpayers—and we are all taxpayers—each and every one of the public university's errors of omission or commission, every untoward incident which occurs on campus, however small and trivial, stands out for all to see, takes on moment and importance, becomes magnified.

Moreover, even in good times, in quiet times—I will not say in normal times, for who is to define what "normal" is in times such as we are living in today?—but even in the best of times, the public university, because it belongs so peculiarly to the public, is subjected to pressures from the extremes of both the left and the right. In troubled times of national frustration and fear such as we are experiencing today, when Americans are groping to find answers to the difficult and dangerous problems which seem to be overwhelming them, these pressures become even more strident and demanding.

Such pressures, if they were yielded to, however, would close the university down to fit a narrow and prejudiced point of view. They would silence the voices in the university which did not speak their views. They would distort the university's educational values which have been built up over the centuries and would narrow down its course of study. And the university would thereby be transformed from a free and open educational institution which objectively studies and examines all issues and problems into a closed and darkened agency designed to promote a particularized cause.

The pressures from the extremes would also limit or distort the public university in carrying out the third important purpose it has as a public university, a function which has always been an intgeral part of the Land-Grant public university such as Iowa State. Because the public university is supported by the tax dollars of everyone, it has a unique commitment and responsibility to serve all of the citizens of the state. Since that first winter in 1868, when Iowa State opened its doors to its first students, this institution has viewed the whole state of Iowa as its campus. Iowa State has, therefore, always been involved with the larger community of the state. One of its integral functions has always been to extend the knowledge and the work of this University beyond the boundaries of its campus in Ames.

Certainly, today, the university cannot retreat into an ivory tower which has never been a structure of a public university. It cannot isolate itself from the rush and torrent of the problems of its society. For the university has vast quantities of hard, objective and impartial knowledge to bring to bear on great public problems of our times—such momentous problems as environmental pollution and the feeding and clothing of our burgeoning population. But let me make it unmistakably clear, that a public university, in continuing its involvement in the problems of its society, in bringing its knowledge and service to men and women living beyond the confines of the campus, must also continue to meet this commitment to the larger community, impartially and objectively. It cannot choose up sides. It cannot allow itself to become a political instrument. For to do so would destroy the university as a house of intellect, would destroy what the university is all about.

The decade of the seventies will, I believe, be one of the sorely troubled, historic decades in the life of this nation. It will be a deeply disturbing period when Americans will be seeking to understand what the national purpose and priorities of this rich and powerful nation should be, when they will be struggling to develop social values and codes of conduct which permit the people of this nation to live together in harmony and social justice.

As we move into the seventies, therefore, the public universities, as vital and central institutions in a deeply divided society, will face trying and difficult times. In the decade ahead, the pressures from the political extremes to change the nature and character of the public university will continue to mount. It will be a period in which the public university will probably be under the threat of having its educational values and standards compromised, its functions whittled away, its public financial support eroded from beneath it.

Whether the universities in the seventies will continue to be free and open and impartial centers of learning, whether they will continue to receive adequate public financial support will, I believe, depend upon you. It will depend upon all of you who are graduating from the public colleges and universities across the nation. For you, as educated persons, will be the opinion-makers of the future. You will set the climate of opinion within which the public universities must operate. It is you who can develop a widespread understanding of the indispensable role which the public universities play in making American democracy work.

Many of you who are graduating today will remain in Iowa to work and live. Others of you will be scattering out around the nation. But wherever you may live, whatever your position in your local community may be, you, who have the opportunity and benefit of receiving a public university education, now have, I believe, the positive responsibility of working to keep our public universities truly open and truly public. I so charge you with that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Iowa State alums honored during Alumni Days was a very distinguished editor, Mr. Lauren Soth. Mr. Soth is the editor of the Des Moines Register, and is highly regarded throughout the country. It is certainly appropriate that his contributions were recognized during the Iowa State Alumni Days by being awarded the Distinguished Achievement Citation.

Mr. Soth responded for all who received recognition during Alumni Days, and like Dr. Parks, addressed himself to the problem of campus disruptions. I insert his remarks in the RECORD, and likewise commend the careful attention of my colleagues to them:

REMARKS AT THE ALUMNI HONORS AND AWARDS CONVOCATION

(By Lauren Soth)

What can a person say when he is named a distinguished achiever by his foster mother? He can say thanks, at least. I know I speak for Dr. Calloway and Dr. Harrar as well as myself in thanking the Iowa State University Alumni Association for this citation. To be honored by one's university is a most gratifying experience. All of us are sentimental about our college days.

Universities are supposed to be places for detached and objective scholarship, where reason is king and emotionalism is shunned. Iowa State University exemplifies this devotion to rational study and thought, and we are proud of her high academic standards. Yet we know that sentiment plays its part in life and in the university. What we are doing here today, we old grads, come under the heading of sentiment, demonstrating our love for the alma mater who nurtured us in our early years.

This also gives us a chance to demonstrate our love for ourselves, which is even more fun. We can get together and tell lies about how studious, how hard working, how totally admirable we were when we were in college. We can righteously deplore the present state of affairs on the campus. It is an almost irresistible temptation to tell you how courageously we worked for an education when I was an undergraduate here at ISU (ISC then), in the early years of the Great Depression—what low wages we got, what cheap food we ate, and how heroic we were. We didn't riot or even demonstrate or take over a single college building. How magnificent we were.

But I'm going to resist the temptation to elaborate. Instead, since we are here on a sentimental occasion to show our support

for the old alma mater, I should like to say a few words about that.

Our university, like all universities, is under attack these days, and it is all too easy for us to join in, to blame the university administration or the faculty. Some college and university administrators have made mistakes in trying to handle student discontent. But in my opinion, on the whole, they have met the threat of educational disruption very well. I will say, without qualification, that one of the very best in this regard has been our own institution here at Ames.

Chancellor Roger Heyns, of the University of California at Berkeley, made an excellent point about student unrest in his speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors recently. He said that universities have played a valuable role for the entire nation in absorbing the first impact of discontent which has been sweeping the society as a whole.

Social unrest about the problems of crime, poverty, race discrimination, the militarization of foreign policy and, above all, the seemingly endless war in Southeast Asia, has been reflected on the campuses.

Chancellor Heyns said, "The shock was buffered imperfectly, but buffered nonetheless, by the traditional mechanism of the university, mechanisms which had been developed to protect students and faculties from kings and cardinals and vice versa. The universities have learned things about the dynamics of protest that have been useful far beyond the boundaries of our campuses."

I agree with that. The fact is, and we older heads ought to admit it, that the students in colleges today are more advanced than we were in 1932. They are more broadly educated and have a better grasp of the society at large. We were much younger intellectually than the students of today. Maybe that's why we were less concerned about the rise of Hitlerism and Japanese militarism, which many of us later had to fight, than today's youngsters are concerned about the war in Indochina, the cold war with Russia and world armaments.

I know I could get unanimous agreement in this meeting that we are wiser today than the students of today, that we know better how to run a university than the president does and that these kids ought to be put in their place.

Surely there have been excesses, surely there have been mistakes by students and by faculties. Undoubtedly, there are some genuine revolutionaries who seek the destruction of the universities and of our whole democratic system.

But this element is an extremely small element, despite what some high-placed politicians are saying. And I am sure we can deal with this element by democratic means if we don't lose our heads. For the most part, the students want to work through the democratic system to change it, to derive a better foreign policy, to derive a better social welfare program, to make the ideals of America real. They are forcing the adult society to say something to these problems.

The universities are our hope for orderly change. They need your support. Your alma mater needs your moral support, more in resisting the demagogues than it does in money for the football team or even money for buildings. These are important. But the university is under attack from people who would make it subservient to political power. The integrity of the university needs your backing.

There is a danger of politicizing the university from inside. Some students and a few faculty members want to close down the university as a place for study in order to work for ending the war or work for some other political goal. That cannot be permitted if the university is to stand as a center of free learning. But I don't regard this movement as nearly so great a danger as the *counteraction* from the right wing which would destroy faculty independence and freedom of thought in the university. This is the real peril in the movement to close the university and make it an instrument of social activism.

So I say support your alma mater as a citadel of independent scholarship against her historic enemies of political action and academic suppression, who are now, as always in the time of trouble, on the attack.

RICHARD K. MELLON: PITTSBURGH CIVIC LEADER

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 3, 1970, the city of Pittsburgh lost a dedicated leader and friend, Richard K. Mellon. Dick Mellon devoted much of his life to the city of Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania and the well being of her citizens.

I am honored to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following articles and editorials from the Pittsburgh Press and Pittsburgh Post Gazette, in tribute to Dick Mellon, a man I respected and admired:

FINAL TRIBUTE PAID TO RICHARD MELLON

Those who knew Richard King Mellon only by his deeds called him "perfect, honest and straight-forward."

One who knew him as a friend could only weep at his passing.

Hundreds of mourners filed in and out of the East Liberty Presbyterian Church last night, all to honor the man whose remains lay in the rose-covered casket at the foot of the altar.

Funeral services for Richard King Mellon, featuring a "Prayer of Thanksgiving," were held this afternoon in the East Liberty Presbyterian Church.

The prayer for Mr. Mellon was delivered by Bishop Austin Pardue of the Pittsburgh Episcopal Diocese.

It said, in part:

"Almighty God, giver of every good and perfect gift, we offer Thee our humble and hearty thanks for the life of Thy servant Richard.

'For his devotion to his family and his forebears and his loyalty to their ideals and traditions; for his love of country and our armed forces . . . the whole realm of nature and the wildlife therein, as well as the city of Pittsburgh.

"For his vast contributions to industry, labor commerce and banking throughout the world.

"For his unfailing sense of humor under the most trying circumstances and his modesty and wish to shun praise and publicity and for his monumental will and determination, even unto death."

The opening hymn for the service was one composed by Bishop Pardue, himself, for the Army, Navy and Air Force during World War II.

Mr. Mellon, famed financier and philanthropist, died Wednesday in West Penn Hospital of rheumatic disease. He would have been 71 on June 19.

Joining Bishop Pardue in the services were Dr. Charles Robshaw, minister of the church, and the Rev. Max Smith of St. Michael's Church, Ligonier.

Private burial services were to be held at Ligonier on Mr. Mellon's estate in the rolling Westmoreland County hills.

Tributes poured in from across the land.

Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy was here to represent President Nixon at the funeral. The President and Mrs. Nixon sent flowers.

Also here for the funeral were Sen. Hugh Scott, the Senate GOP leader, Rep. James G. Fulton, R-Dormont, and Lt. Gov. Raymond P. Broderick.

Also Thomas Gates, chairman of the Morgan Guaranty Bank, New York City, and former secretary of defense; Thomas McCabe, former member of the Federal Reserve Board and chairman emeritus of the Scott Paper Co., and three officials of General Motors Corp., Richard Gerstenberg, vice chairman; Edward Coles, president, and John Gordon, retired president.

The body of Mr. Mellon had lain in state at the foot of the alter while hundreds passed by to pay their last respects.

Two hours before the service was to start, hundreds of mourners moved into the church chapel.

At the noon hour, people from all walks of life sat huddled on tree-shaded benches along the East Liberty Mall as though they were attending the service in spirit.

Inside the chapel, the congregation was predominately of people in the middle and older age classes.

Sprinkled among them were many mod-attired teen-agers representing a togetherness in the mood of mourning.

One of last night's mourners, Robert J. Axon, an employee of the Mellon National Bank and Trust Co. in Swissvale said although he worked for Mr. Mellon, he had never really known or met him.

"But I know that we've lost a wonderful man, a man who cannot be replaced in our lifetime," Axon said of his boss.

Mrs. Clara B. Samson, another mourner and one who never saw Mr. Mellon, called him "a most impressive, honest man whose loss will be felt greatly."

And still another of those who passed the casket, Anthony Aiello, said, "Pittsburgh would be a dead city today had it not been for Richard Mellon. He was perfect."

Another man who did know the deceased could say very little. He simply cried.

The man was tall, more than 40 years old, dressed in a dark suit. As he stood just outside the doorway of the gothic church he mumbled, "I knew him once, as a friend." He would say nothing else.

Flowers were all around. Besides those sent by the Nixons, they came from Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, employes of Rolling Rock Farms and Mellon Bank, and the legions of directors of companies in which Richard King Mellon held an interest.

Flags will fly at half staff through Sunday in both the city and county in tribute to the figure called, by some, "a legend."

But probably one of the simplest comments came from a 10-year-old girl standing near the church watching those going in and out.

When asked what she thought of the man whose mark on Pittsburgh cannot go unrecognized, she said:

"I saw him once, and he looked honest and generous."

RICHARD KING MELLON

Richard King Mellon was the inheritor of a tradition—along with a vast fortune and a huge burden of financial and corporate responsibility.

His forebears had played an important role on the Pittsburgh scene for more than a hundred years. And his late father, Richard B. Mellon, who was himself active in many civic affairs, instilled in him a sense of duty toward the community.

"Live where you work, son, and work where you live," was the advice of the elder Mellon.

So it was that Richard King Mellon continued in the tradition of his father and

grandfather, Thomas Mellon, managing and expanding the bank started in the last century by T. Mellon, guiding the family's corporate holdings, and serving the community.

So it was also that Pittsburgh, once the ugly offspring of the industrial age, became a model of urban redevelopment and a city that has made impressive progress in many fields.

Richard K. Mellon was a prime mover in all this.

Quite aside from his financial contributions, which were generous, he put his managing skills and his influence at the service of the community—and helped rally the unique community movement which resulted in the famed Pittsburgh Renaissance.

It was Mr. Mellon and his associates who formed the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, the key organization in the city's face-lifting.

It was he and his group, also, who teamed up with the late Mayor (and later governor) David L. Lawrence and other officials in the public-private combine that made a new city out of an old, tired one.

And the fact that Mr. Mellon, true to his father's instruction, chose to stay in his native city and help develop it, accounts for the fact that Pittsburgh is nationally recognized as a major headquarters city for large corporations.

His death at 70 deprives the city of one of its leading citizens, and leaves a large place to be filled in the financial, corporate and civic organizations in which he was interested.

He will be remembered long for the diligence he applied to his many responsibilities and for his concern, evidenced in many ways, for his fellow man and his community.

Richard King Mellon

Richard King Mellon, the man who more than any other individual was responsible for the postwar rebirth of Pittsburgh, is dead. While financier Mellon's lifelong philanthropy produced trend-setting changes in many areas, his most visible monument perhaps is the reconstructed city which his financial and civic leadership did so much to bring about.

Although a man of his wealth could have settled almost anywhere, he chose to make his native city his home and the primary focus of his interest and his benefactions. During the physically and economically dark period immediately after World War II, he provided the organizational and financial spark that thrust Pittsburgh into the national forefront of urban and industrial renewal. He was a founder of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, through which came much of the planning and drive for the physical rebuilding of the Golden Triangle, for smoke control, for park development and for other programs that transformed a withering city into a vital and dynamic metropolis. His influence in locating corporate headquarters in Pittsburgh helped to make this city one of the great business centers of the nation.

As a guiding head of one of the world's great family fortunes, Mr. Mellon directed the bestowal of gifts on causes and institutions too numerous to mention and often unpublicized. The recent growth in scope and quality of education and medical facilities in this area, however, would not have been achieved without Mellon generosity. Through large Mellon grants to the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie-Mellon University and through smaller but substantial gifts to Duquesne University and Chatham College, among others, educational institutions in Western Pennsylvania have gained increased recognition for excellence.

Along with his role in rebuilding a city and its institutions, Mr. Mellon maintained a keen interest in people. He cared about the quality of their environment, and because of this concern, he wanted business to behave responsibly in its dealings with host communities. While much yet remains to be done, the civic consciousness displayed by the large firms in which he held power is due in no small measure to his leadership.

In almost everything that he did, Mr. Mellon shunned publicity. Though he could have had the spotlight in one or more of a dozen business or civic positions, he preferred to work behind the scenes, whether with corporate or political leaders, to achieve objectives of social betterment. At his death he was a kind of legendary figure largely unknown to the general public. And yet his work signifying many tangible as well as intangible benefits to the public, is observable on all sides in this revitalized urban center with its eye on the future.

R. K. Mellon

(By Jack Markowitz)

Who is the "next" Richard K. Mellon? There is none.

The death of the 70-year-old billionaire financier leaves a vacuum in the personal leadership of Pittsburgh's business and civic life that is unlikely to be filled by one man, according to one of Mr. Mellon's closest associates, Frank R. Denton, who was vice chairman and chief executive of Mellon National Bank and Trust Co. for 20 years after World War II.

He said for the past generation Pittsburgh had been virtually alone among U.S. communities in having "one guy completely dedicated to the improvement of his own town. There's no other individual with enough influence to pull together other leaders in the business world—and with the ability to put up substantial amounts of money of his own.

However, the death of Mr. Mellon will not visibly or soon affect the conduct of business affairs here, according to Denton.

He pointed out that the "Mellon companies"—notably Gulf, Alcoa, Koppers and Mellon Bank—"all have completely professional management and attend to their own business."

Asked who might served to flex the Mellon interests' large holdings of stock in those companies, Denton replied, "I think the greatest common denominator will be Mellon Bank."

T. Mellon & Sons, the organization on the 39th floor of the Mellon-U.S. Steel building which oversees a number of family charities and other interests, will continue in existence, Denton said.

But he suggested that the large corporate stock holdings supervised by the bank's trust department make Mellon Bank the likely "coordinator" of the industrial interests.

Denton commented at one point that "there are Mellons fully able to be" personal leaders in the community.

"I think Paul Mellon, if he decided to be, he'd be a genius," said Denton.

(Paul Mellon, son of the former Secretary of the Treasury Andrew W. Mellon, who was the uncle of Richard K. Mellon, has lived in Virginia for many years, devoted himself to art collecting, horse breeding and other non-business interests.)

But might Mr. Mellon's children or other younger relatives be able to take over personal leadership?

"These are good kids," said Denton, "but the two sons are both too young to be effective at this point." One son concentrates on outside cultural and educational interests according to Denton, the other is "in the bank and quiet competent."

But the late financier obviously commanded a larger personal fortune than his heirs will.

"Every time there is a death, there are taxes, for example," said Denton. "There is a winnowing, a lessening . . ."

He described Mr. Mellon's chief function in the strict role of business leader—as opposed to civic leader—is one of selecting executives for leadership of the major properties.

"You worked with Dick Mellon, not for him," said Denton. "If he wanted something done, the way he gave the order was, 'Would it be convenient for you to do this?'

"He made it his business to know people. Years ago, when the bank had 500 employes and just one office, he knew practically everyone by the first name.

"A retired teller told me some time ago that he would look up from his work in the 'note cage' some mornings and find Dick Mellon there waiting to say hello."

Had Mr. Mellon ever taken personal part in the major decisions made by Mellon Bank?

OUR STAR SALESMAN

Denton said that in the pre-war days when Mr. Mellon was president of the bank, "it was not a time of great borrowing. His main job was the creation of relationships resulting in deposits. He was our star salesman."

Mr. Mellon's chief qualities, Denton said, were "intuition, tact and a rule that when you do something, do it the best way possible—if it's planting trees, the right kind of trees at the right place."

When he himself was chief executive of the bank, from 1946 to 1965, Denton said his chief strength was that "the principal owners would back you up on business problems . . . they inherently backed the management."

Mr. Mellon's military service in World War II took him to other communities and provided a bird's eye view of his own city's problems, Denton thought. The banker returned to civilian life with a "great desire to rebuild Pittsburgh."

The post-war cooperation between political forces under Mayor David L. Lawrence and the industrial community under Mr. Mellon, is of course, a well-known story. But Denton said Democratic Mayor Lawrence once told him that he had willingly admitted to Mr. Mellon, a life-long Republican, "Your renaissance of Pittsburgh has made me."

He said Mr. Mellon communicated civic enthusiasm outside the circle of his own properties.

"The fellows who ran the big companies were expected to take part," said Denton.

SHY IN PUBLIC

Asked why Mr. Mellon preferred not to hold personal office in civic organizations, Denton commented, "Dick was a shy person in public. He got eventually so that he could make a good speech. But he didn't seek or like the limelight."

Braun Pays Tribute to R. K. Mellon

Arthur E. Braun, Pittsburgh financier and philanthropist, last night paid tribute to Richard K. Mellon as "a tower of strength" in the city's renaissance.

Declaring that Mr. Mellon "had a great affection for Pittsburgh, his native city," Braun said he "worked tirelessly for its betterment, physically, educationally and culturally."

His leadership in organizations "devoted to these purposes inspired the active cooperation of many others, including Pittsburgh's leading businessmen, in the improvement of life and conditions in this area," Braun said.

While visiting Harrisburg on duty as a general in the Army during World War II, Braun recalled, Mr. Mellon discussed with Gov. Edward Martin his hopes for Pittsburgh's redevelopment, particularly the Point area.

"Now we have the park," he said.

Braun, one-time publisher of the old Pittsburgh Post and Pittsburgh Sun, became associated with Mr. Mellon while Braun was president and board chairman of the Farmer's Deposit National Bank, which later became part of Mellon Bank.

He racalled that Mr. Mellon personally toured the area destined to become Gateway Center.

Mr. Mellon's death, he said, "is a very great loss to this community, as well as to the state and the nation."

LEADERS HAIL MELLON WORK—FINANCIER'S HELP PRAISED BY ALL

High esteem for the late Richard King Mellon has been expressed in eulogies from the worlds of business, politics and education.

"He supplied vital channels for new research and discovery that benefit not only Pittsburgh, but all society," said Wesley W. Posvar, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh.

EXTRAORDINARY MAN

The late financier was described by Dr. Edward D. Eddy, president of Chatham College, as "an extraordinary leader who could have chosen a life of self-contained enjoyment.

"Fortunately for Pittsburgh, he preferred to give enormous energy and support to the institutions and projects which make life better for all of us.

"Only a few men will leave such enduring and important monuments."

State Sen. Robert D. Fleming, R-Aspinwall, said the loss of Mr. Mellon "will be particularly felt by those in Western Pennsylvania.

"In my lifetime I know of no one who has done more for Western Pennsylvania than has Mr. Mellon, and he did it without any regard for personal reward.

"CITY HIS MAIN GOAL

"His only goal was to make Pittsburgh a better place in which to live and work."

U.S. Rep. James G. Fulton, D-Dormont, cited Mr. Mellon's role in the rebirth of Pittsburgh, his "fine corporate management" and "the civic accomplishments under his leadership."

"Gen. Mellon was a man who had high hopes for the county and its people," said County Commissioners Leonard C. Staisey and Thomas J. Foerster.

Mayor Peter F. Flaherty. said Mr. Mellon's death "leaves a tremendous civic and humanitarian void in our city. It would be difficult to measure accurately what his power and influence meant to Pittsburgh and its people."

Republican John K. Tabor, former mayoral candidate, said, "He did not curse darkness, he lit candles. He did not divide, he united. He did not destroy, he built. His like we shall not see often again."

Gov. Raymond P. Shafer called Mr. Mellon's death "a great shock and tremendous loss to all Pennsylvanians and Americans. Dick Mellon had been an outstanding citizen of both."

Arthur E. Braun, Pittsburgh Financier and philanthropist, said Mr. Mellon had a great affection for Pittsburgh, his native city, and worked tirelessly for its betterment, physically, educationally and culturally."

John D. Harper, president and chief executive officer of Alcoa, commented, "If any man in history did more for his native city than Gen. Richard King Mellon, it was certainly not in our time."

CITY POIGNANTLY PAYS ITS TRIBUTE TO MELLON

(By James K. Delaney)

Pittsburgh's people filed through the hours yesterday to a flowered space in the East Liberty Presbyterian Church for a silent, memoried farewell to Richard King Mellon.

They came together, the toil-worn and those of more leisurely lives, in poignant respect for the man who gave much of his own work and his fortune for the betterment of their lot in their city.

BODY LIES IN STATE

Under the vast vault of the edifice on Penn Avenue, the body of Mr. Mellon, whose abiding dedication was the Renaissance of the city out of industrial waste, lay in state from the morning hours until past sunset.

The tribute to him will continue today from 10 a.m. until noon.

Funeral services will be held a 2 p.m. in the church built with funds given by his father, Richard B. Mellon, and his uncle Andrew W. Mellon.

Mr. Mellon died late Wednesday afternoon in West Penn Hospital, where he was taken Saturday from his home near Ligonier, Westmoreland County.

DONATED MANY MILLIONS

His death apparently was caused by a heart and arterial condition which had gradually curtailed his activities in one of the world's greatest financial and industrial empires.

Untold millions of the fabulous wealth acquired by generations of the Mellon family, conservatively estimated at $3 billion, were channeled into philanthropy.

The services for Mr. Mellon, who would have been 71 on June 19, will be conducted jointly by retired Bishop Austin Pardue, of the Pittsburgh Episcopal Diocese; Dr. Charles Robshaw, minister of the East Liberty Presbyterian Church, and the Rev. Max Smith, of St. Michael's Church, Ligonier.

The body then will be taken for private burial on his estate in the hills near Ligonier.

The City and County flags will be flown at half-staff today while funeral services music is played on the Courthouse carillons.

Yesterday's overcast skies filtered little sunlight through the slender stained glass windows above the nave of the church. The shadows were in keeping with the occasion.

The silvered steel casket lay closed. A blanket of half-furled deep red roses covered it. There was only faint fragrance. Ferns and smilax made an apron below.

Floral tributes, chrysanthemums, lillies and lesser blooms increased as the day wore on, as did the visitors freed from the day's work.

Shirtsleeved men joined women in the pews for a few moments in the cool silence. There were little groups of some and others sat alone at a distance. Some knelt and gestured in the fashion of their faith, for it was a leavening gathering.

A woman whispered to a group of nuns, "He was a benefactor to so many people."

An age-gnarled man told them, "He helped get me a job when I needed it in the depression."

A fire-bronzed millworker, on his way to an open hearth nightshift, contemplated the closed casket.

"They shouldn't have done that," the man said. "I wanted to see him."

HE HAD FRIENDS

In vernacular off a Hazelwood street, he rasped:

"Every guy should go for himself, yeah, but you got to have friends, and he had 'em."

One withered little woman, who said she was "raised on the old Hill," said she remembered Mr. Mellon in his youth "at the old bank."

She looked back at the roses and raised her voice a little:

"There goes Pittsburgh."

Youth had representatives there, and they were chastened, downcast and awed at this silent presence in their lives.

The visitors' registry presented a cross-section of the people, their work, their homes, from all of Allegheny County and neighboring areas.

Dr. Robshaw's Sunday sermon theme will be "All Things Together."

SOVIET-WARSAW PACT MILITARY TOUR CONFIRMED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks of May 15, "When Treason Prospers, Enemies Are Unknown" page 15772, I placed in the RECORD the itinerary of the 1970 foreign military attaches' tour by the Department of the Army. On this tour were a Russian major general and other Communist officers from half a dozen Warsaw Pact nations.

Apparently we are engaged in a new strategy in containment of communism—we show them everything we have and hope it scares them into nonaggression—except in South Vietnam, Cuba, Africa, and the Middle East.

I insert inquiry to the Secretary of Defense a reply at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1970.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LAIRD: I am advised that in the latter part of April of this year Soviet Major General Mikhail Stolnik and some other 49 Washington-based foreign military advisors, including six Warsaw Pact military officials were given a two-day tour of U.S. military installations.

I would appreciate your advising me what prompted such action and if our military is given reciprocal privileges of touring behind the Iron Curtain, in Soviet and other Communist military training installations.

I am confident that you and your staff are aware that the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong presently involved in the killing of American infantrymen are advised and armed by Soviet military minds and materiel.

I look forward to your reply with interest.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1969.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: On behalf of Secretary Laird I am replying to your inquiries of 11 and 18 May 1970, concerning the recent visit to U.S. military installations by the Soviet Military Attache, Major General Stolnik, along with other Warsaw Pact Military Attaches as part of the Department of the Army Annual Foreign Military Attache tour.

The Foreign Military Attache tour is one in which all foreign Military Attaches or their assistants who are accredited to the Department of the Army are permitted to participate. The USSR, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia have Military Attaches accredited to the Department of the Army. On this basis, the Department of the Army extended them invitations to participate in the 1970 tour. The Military Attaches of the USSR, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, the Acting Military Attache of Poland and the

Assistant Military Attache of Rumania accepted.

In asking about reciprocity, you touch on a basic reason for these tours. If accredited foreign Military Attaches are excluded from such a tour, the U.S. Defense Attache would undoubtedly be excluded from similar activities sponsored by the corresponding host country. In this connection, U.S. Defense Attache personnel make comparable visits to foreign military installations. As recently as 6 May, for example, Colonel Welch, USA, the U.S. Defense Attache, and Colonel Senio, USAF, U.S. Air Attache, accredited to our Embassy in Warsaw, witnessed a demonstration held at Wroclaw, in which the 6th Airborne Division and 1st Mechanized Division of the Polish Army took part. Colonel Welch and Colonel Senio were hosted, along with other NATO and Warsaw Pact accredited Attaches, by the Polish Airborne Commander. Within the past year U.S. Defense Attache personnel also have accepted official invitations to visit military installations in the USSR, Bulgaria, Rumania and Yugoslavia.

The expectation of reciprocity in such matters is, therefore, a basic motive of our armed services' sponsorship of annual tours for foreign Military Attaches to selected U.S. installations. Since ours is an open society, and the Soviet society a closed one, we consider that, as a general proposition, reciprocity in these matters is to the net advantage of the U.S. Careful and deliberate assessment of the relative worth to U.S. security interests is fundamental in formulating invitations to attend.

In these matters and all others bearing on the security of the United States, the Department of Defense will continue its efforts effectively to protect our country's interests.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. MORSE,
DASD, European & NATO Affairs (ISA).

VACATION BIBLE SCHOOL

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, throughout our country schoolchildren are completing their public education for another year and preparing for a full summer of activities.

Among these activities will be vacation Bible school, which is conducted by the churches of America.

I am certain most of the Members of Congress will recall when they attended vacation Bible school as children and how worthwhile this experience was in preparing them for life.

A recent editorial appeared in the Skyland Post, published in West Jefferson, N.C., and edited by Mrs. Ed M. Anderson, regarding the value of vacation Bible school and the people who make it possible.

I would like to share with my colleagues Mrs. Anderson's editorial:

During the summer months when the public schools are not operating and students are on vacation, important and enjoyable institutions are the Daily Vacation Bible Schools conducted by the churches.

Here children and young people have an opportunity to work and play together and study the Bible. Singing is also an important part of the Bible School program.

We take this occasion to congratulate the leaders who serve as teachers and help in other ways to make these important schools possible.

Parents should see to it that their children attend Daily Vacation Bible Schools; for we believe that Bible Schools offer a type of training and wholesome recreation not available elsewhere.

Many adults today will recall that some of their best knowledge by the Bible came from these Vacation Bible Schools. Young people also enjoy working and playing together when it is vacation time. There is something different about this from regular school work and activities where there is little time for recreation.

CAMBODIA ACTION VITAL TO VIETNAMIZATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, much concern has been expressed in recent weeks about the President's decision to deploy U.S. troops in Cambodia. Many, who might have supported this move from a strategic and tactical standpoint, are dismayed because our troops were sent in without prior congressional approval. I would number myself among those who see this incursion into Cambodia as vital to the success of our Vietnamization program, but I, too, view with alarm the increasing tendency of the Executive to dispatch troops abroad without prior consultation with the Congress.

I feel that troops should not be sent into any foreign country—particularly to fight—without prior authorization from Congress. Long before the recent events in Cambodia highlighted this issue, I pointed out the hazards of "presidential wars" and escalations. The public outcry and demonstrations following the President's unilateral decision to send our men into Cambodia warns us that many of our citizens will no longer tolerate engaging our country in war by Executive fiat. I believe the President's action sets a bad precedent. He should have come to the Congress first and obtained approval.

Nevertheless, although the President's action continues a bad precedent, it appears to be a necessary step to cut off the logistic support of the guerrillas and the Communist invaders who had been operating with impunity for nearly 5 years from Cambodian sanctuaries.

I have received many letters, as have my colleagues, urging me to support amendments which would use the spending power of Congress to cut off funds for prosecution of the war. Like the writers of those letters, I would like to see the war in Vietnam terminated as soon as possible. I sympathize with and share their frustration. Nevertheless, I could not support any move to arbitrarily cut off funding for the war. The effects of abruptly cutting off appropriations could be disastrous and gravely imperil the safety and lives of our men at the fighting fronts. I think this would be a reckless course of action. You cannot end a war overnight by a denial of money. With our men still facing an enemy in many different areas of Indochina, it would be foolhardy for the Congress to tell them to fight no more at this point.

I also believe that efforts to set a cutoff date at some fixed time in the future are irresponsible. It is unrealistic and dangerous to impose such limitation on the flexibility of the President. So, as strongly as I believe the President should have brought the Congress in on the takeoff rather than having us receive a report on the landing in Cambodia, I maintain that we cannot pull the rug out from under him as some of my colleagues have recommended.

I have always opposed fighting a no-win war. If we have a valid reason for being there, we have a valid reason for taking those steps necessary to win. If it is impossible to win or we do not have victory as our goal, there is little justification for placing our men in the position of fighting a cannon fodder war—we should get out. The course of action in the middle—being there and not winning—has been very devastating.

I well recall when former President Johnson stated unequivocally that his administration was not going to send American boys to fight an Asian war in South Vietnam. That promise started L. B. J. down the road to defeat. More than 525,000 American boys have been sent to South Vietnam, and more than 40,000 will never come home.

And I remember also that while serving as Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara would periodically report to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress that we were turning the corner toward victory in South Vietnam. The soothing predictions never materialized as the victory became more and more elusive.

I think the President and his Secretary of Defense have kept faith with the American people, in contrast to their predecessors. While we had a continual escalation before, the President has reversed the course of the war, the Defense Department has been receiving less rather than more in congressional appropriations and the overall direction of our effort in Southeast Asia appears to be correct.

There is a definite phasing out of our activities, consistent with our goal of gradually turning over to the South Vietnamese the chief burden for their own war. President Nixon is going about as far as anyone can realistically expect in this regard. Many of the problems in Vietnam and now Cambodia do not reduce to simple answers. The overriding factor is the aggression by the Communists against a neighbor and free nation, South Vietnam. Unquestionably, the intransigence of the Communists prevents a peaceful settlement to this conflict.

Short of taking the necessary steps to win, I believe that following the present policy will be more apt to lead to an ultimate solution than a withdrawal policy. Unilateral and immediate withdrawal would not only assure the communization of South Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia, but also the slaughter of

possibly millions of South Vietnamese—unless the Vietnamese are able to assume more, if not all, of the combat.

The central issue in the growing debate over the extent of American involvement in Southeast Asia is whether the executive branch of our Government has the right to dispatch U.S. troops abroad to fight a war without the consent of Congress. Without question, I believe and have been saying for some time that the Congress should be a partner in the making of such monumental decisions.

During the last decade the Congress has failed to serve as a strong source of examination and advice on the basic philosophy and direction of U.S. foreign policy. We now have a concentration in the Executive of virtually unchecked power over foreign relations, particularly over the disposition and use of the armed forces.

The periodic incursions by the Executive upon congressional prerogative and the uncritical and sometimes unconscious acquiescence of the Congress in these inroads has resulted in a constitutional imbalance in which the Executive has acquired supremacy over the making as well as the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States.

The Congress is just as much to blame as the Executive for letting itself be divested of the war power, a power which the framers of the Constitution vested not in the Executive but rather almost exclusively in the legislative branch.

Congress must reclaim its historic power to declare war. It is for this reason I proposed in March of 1968 and have reintroduced in this Congress an amendment to the Constitution which would require either prior or subsequent congressional approval of the Presidential dispatch of U.S. troops abroad. If our country were directly attacked, for example, the President would make an appropriate and immediate response, but subsequent consideration by Congress of his action would be mandatory.

I am appending the remarks I made on March 14, 1968, discussing the need for legislative action in this area and explaining my proposal. The text of my resolution is also included.

One of the greatest dangers our country faces—in both foreign and domestic affairs—is the erosion of legislative authority and oversight and the growth of a vast pyramid of centralized power in the executive branch of the Government. In foreign affairs particularly this threat to our people and their welfare will become more acute for this new decade is unlikely to see any great reduction in the extent of American involvement in international affairs or any relaxation of global conflict.

It therefore behooves the Congress to stake out its position of responsibility and domain in order to make it perfectly clear that no Executive commitments of American forces can or should be made without consultation of the body vested with the constitutional right to declare war.

I include the text of a March 14, 1968, speech on constitutional amendment and text of constitutional amendment which follows the speech:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 14, 1968]

A NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS NEEDED

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I exaggerate when I state that few issues concern the American people any more than this whole matter of brushfire wars, escalation and commitment of troops to virtually every struggle throughout the world. Korea, Berlin, and Suez, Lebanon, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic. Once we get in, how do we get out? What do we hope to achieve? What are our policies? Is secret diplomacy involved? These are the questions we hear every day of the week, and most Members of this body readily admit we know few of the answers.

In a troubled world with a cold war which seems to turn hot with growing frequency, Presidential decisions, Pentagon decisions, and diplomatic decisions are arrived at, and executed, with little or no debate. As Congressman CHARLES HALLECK pointed out a few years ago, we are usually brought in for the landing but rarely for the takeoff. This observation always stuck with me, Mr. Speaker, and it was never truer than in our current Vietnam involvement.

I believe that the whole matter of troop commitment for actual hostilities should come under strict constitutional cover. I have proposed House Joint Resolutin 1162, which would amend the Constitution relating to the authority of the President to dispatch the Armed Forces of the United States outside of the United States.

The preamble to House Joint Resolution 1162 should be closely noted. I have used the word "dispatch" because there is a basic difference between sending troops and merely committing troops. There is no doubt that under many constitutionally proper treaties we have made commitments that attacks on signatory nations will be deemed as attacks upon ourselves. It should be clearly noted as intent that this proposed amendment would refer to the sending of troops under any circumstance except the mere stationing of them in "noncombative duties" as provided in section 4. I have used the words "outside of the United States" because there is no effort to become involved in the matter of how, when, and where the President should use troops or National Guard units throughout the United States in matters involving domestic disorder.

There are two basic situations which this amendment covers. First, there are events such as "military aggression, conflict, combat, uprising, or incidents" which might or might not be serious enough to "threaten the national security." There are also situations which might threaten the national security that are not the result of any specific event but, rather, involve a volatile emergency which might affect our security. The situation in Lebanon in July 1958 would be of this type and, incidentally, would be fully covered by this amendment.

Second, there are situations where we may have been directly attacked and immediate retaliatory force is needed. No reasonable person would suggest that Congress should be assembled and, as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution, declare war. The same might be necessary in direct attacks against nations with whom we have treaties. A direct attack against Canada, England, or Germany, for example, might require immediate response.

In drafting the amendment, I feel these situations have been adequately covered. In the first situation, there is a difference between the event or situation and the time at which it might be deemed to threaten our national security. If there is a serious international incident—say the assassination of an Archduke Ferdinand—and at the time it does not appear as a great threat but, as often happens, conditions deteriorate and it becomes a threat, this amendment clearly states that—

"Within twenty-four hours after the President deems any military aggression, conflict, combat, uprising incident or situation to threaten the national security, the President shall report such event or situation to the Congress with specific recommendations for the dispatch of troops or other specific measures which he deems necessary and desirable."

Thus in section 2, the significant factor is not the event itself, but when the President deems the event to threaten our national security. At that point, he must transmit to the Congress his report and appraisal of the event or situation and outline specific military steps which will be taken. If the matter can be solved by diplomatic channels, this will obviously be done and no report will be necessary under this amendment. At this key point is where the brushfire wars with their threat of future escalation commences. It is here the Congress should be brought in on the "takeoff" rather than receiving a report on the "landing." If troops are to be committed for combat, we should know at that point. If they are merely being sent to stabilize the situation, we should know that, too. It will be argued that this might restrict the President in his chess games of military diplomacy. Yes, it will; and that is precisely what we want. I am not speaking of President Johnson alone. This concern is for any future "Presidential wars" and escalations.

The Congress shall vote on these recommendations within 10 days. Obviously, if the situation is imminently dangerous, we would probably act sooner. If Congress does not act, and the President acts without authorization, other remedies still avail themselves. If Congress is not in session, the President shall summon the Congress within 48 hours after he deems such event or situation to threaten the national security.

In the second situation, one in which immediate responsive retaliatory measures are needed to repel an attack against the United States or a nation with which we have treaty obligations, a different procedure is involved. Section 3 clearly states that this amendment shall not preclude the use of necessary force by the Armed Forces of the United States to immediately repel any direct attack. However, here the President has no discretion, as he does in section 2 type situations, to deem the event or situation constitutes a threat to our national security. Any action under section 3 situations automatically makes it a threat when such retalitory force is used, and the President must report as provided in section 2. The Congress then evaluates and votes in the same manner.

No amount of drafting can cover every situation. However, this amendment makes good sense, and certainly will act as a restraint on becoming involved in Vietnam type wars and the problems intrinsic in those operations. When we do not have a declared state of war, the problems seem to escalate, too. With a Korean war and Vietnam war behind us we certainly should have learned something. Neither were declared wars, yet 30,000 men lost their lives in Korea and we have passed the 20,000 mark in Vietnam. I feel that the American people, indeed, the Congress, would look upon such an amendment with a feeling of security. Agreed, the Congress and the President can collectively make tragic mistakes. Delineating actions which can be taken in cold war type situations can at least be a step in the right direction.

The whole challenge of covering the escalation of minor wars was groped with for many hours in preparing this amendment. It is difficult, if not impossible, to cover. What is escalation? Sending 100 more troops or 100,000? Section 2 calls for a report on the event or situation with specific recommendations for the dispatch of troops or other

specific measures. This is about the best that can be done, I believe. If the Congress is foolish enough to pass another broad Tonkin type resolution, I suppose there is little that can be done to prevent it. Going back to what I just said, however, if we have not learned anything from the Korean and Vietnam wars, then there is very little hope.

At the time when the report is received with specific recommendations, it would be hoped that the Congress would nail things down exactly at that point. This can be done if there is the will to do it. Then if the situation alters, the President might be required to report again and the Congress would again vote. It would be hoped that in the matter of troop commitment or dispatch, the House and the Senate would be smart enough to not give carte blanche as it now seems we have done in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, there is a side effect, too. The minute this resolution passes the Congress—long before it is even ratified by the States—there would be a "sense of Congress" built in. The president, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense would quite properly read into congressional action on this amendment a new policy line which most of us believe is badly needed. In fact, that might be as valuable as the ultimate passage of the amendment itself. It would operate as a restraint on future actions before adopted, and this would make many Americans sleep a little better at night. More than that, it offers a responsible, affirmative answer to what is sure to be a recurring dilemma. Rather than just criticize, let us resolve to act.

H.J. RES. 1162

A resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of the President to dispatch the Armed Forces of the United States outside of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The President shall not dispatch the Armed Forces of the United States in response to any military aggression, conflict, combat, uprising, incident, or situation without the prior approval of the Congress, except as herein provided.

"SEC. 2. Within twenty-four hours after the President deems any military aggression, conflict, combat, uprising, incident, or situation to threaten the national security, the President shall report on such event or situation to the Congress with specific recommendations for the dispatch of troops or other specific measures which he deems necessary and desirable. Thereupon, the Congress shall vote on the recommendations made by the President within ten days.

"If not in session, the President shall convene the Congress within forty-eight hours after he deems such event or situation to threaten the national security.

"SEC. 3. This article shall not be so construed as to preclude the use of necessary force by the Armed Forces of the United States to immediately repel any direct attack made upon them or against the United States, its territories, or possessions, or against any nation with which the United States has treaty commitments. It shall be deemed to threaten the national security whenever such retaliatory force is used, and the President shall report to Congress as provided in Section 2. The Congress shall vote on the recommendation of the President within ten days.

"SEC. 4. This article shall not be so construed as to preclude the stationing of American troops throughout the world in noncombative duties. It shall be operative only in those situations where troops so stationed become involved in actual military hostilities or in those situations where troops are dispatched for the specific purpose of responsive or offensive military actions."

CAMBODIAN INVASION SHOWS NEED FOR REASONABLE LIMITS ON PRESIDENTIAL POWER

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago today on June 8, 1969, President Nixon ordered the first redeployment of U.S. troops from Vietnam. On June 4, 1970, there were 425,450 U.S. troops in Vietnam.

Since last year's announcement from Midway Island that the President intended to withdraw U.S. troops from Southeast Asia and to replace them with Vietnamese, 112,050 Americans have been withdrawn. I commend the President for these withdrawals.

But also within that year Cambodia has been invaded and the geographic limits of the war have been greatly expanded. The Congress has not been consulted on either the troop withdrawals or about the invasion of Cambodia.

The Washington Post has recently spoken editorially on "Vietnam: The President's Interim Report." The report was delivered by the President via national television on June 3, 1970. Many of us in the House are concerned about the President's failure to consult with the Congress and we are concerned about where the President is headed in Southeast Asia and how he is going to arrive at his destination. The Post expresses some of these same doubts very well and I insert these editorial comments into the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, June 5, 1970]

VIETNAM: THE PRESIDENT'S INTERIM REPORT (I)

Mr. Nixon's fullthroated praise of his Cambodian campaign—"the most successful operation of this long and difficult war"—cannot be entirely dismissed as self-serving. For it unquestionably has been a success by the particular standards the President applied on Wednesday night: a statistically impressive amount of enemy supplies has been captured; Communist forces have been frustrated for now in their efforts to link together the Cambodian sanctuaries they had maintained for five years and to create "one continuous hostile territory from which to launch assaults upon American and allied forces." The results in terms of reducing the danger to American troops in Vietnam, of winning more time for training of South Vietnamese forces, and of allowing further American troop withdrawals to be conducted—these are positive. Or they will be, to the extent they prove to be real.

The real measure of Mr. Nixon's Cambodian venture only begins to be suggested, however, by yesterday's news that fighting was "raging" only 10 miles from Phnom Penh. Whatever are the short term effects of the operation on the war in Vietnam—and even these are sure to remain in dispute—it is beyond contention that the effects on Cambodia are already profound. The President originally presented the Cambodian campaign as a one-shot mission against border sanctuaries, as though the country would remain the same except that it wouldn't have so many Communist bases in it. In fact, American troops are leaving behind a struggle for Cambodia which seems quite capable of sustaining itself—and of going very sour in ways that are beyond our effective influence or control.

Under American aegis, South Vietnam has sent an expeditionary force into Cambodia, traditionally Saigon's prey; Mr. Nixon on Wednesday gave this force virtual carte blanche to stay, and to do as it chooses. Moreover, another of Cambodia's covetous neighbors, Thailand, has announced plans to send "volunteers" to guard the Cambodian capital of Phnom Penh. The United States evidently is to underwrite that venture too. Meanwhile American airpower will be used in Cambodia after July 1 "where I find this is necessary to protect the lives and security of our forces in South Vietnam," as the President put it.

Left unstated by Mr. Nixon Wednesday night, as on April 30 when he announced his Cambodian plans, was a critical part of the real explanation for the operation. That part unquestionably was to keep the Cambodian government out of Communist hands. By its nature, that is a political goal requiring a sustained American effort, either by proxies or its own units, and not merely fast military surgery. For it obviously makes no sense to clean out the border sanctuaries and then to let the government in Phnom Penh go Communist, thus (1) becoming competent to call openly for aid from other Communist sources, and (2) exposing American troops in South Vietnam to later heavy assault.

This is the rub—or one of them—in the Cambodian affair. Publicly it was sold as a one-shot sweep essential to Vietnamization largely because of the time we could buy by capturing huge quantities of Communist weapons and supplies; and that was what the President featured Wednesday night—the bullets and the rice. But for those who were not entirely persuaded by this argument (supplies can be replaced, after all), high White House officials always had the second rationale of saving the Lon Nol government in Phnom Penh; privately, it was conceded that wiping out border sanctuaries got you nowhere if Lon Nol fell and Cambodia became one big sanctuary. In actual fact, what now seems to have triggered the Cambodian operation between April 20, when the President gave no hint of it in his Vietnam report, and April 30, when he announced it was evidence that the North Vietnamese were not just trying to consolidate their sanctuaries but were moving out of them in ways that menaced Phnom Penh; the alternate rationale may well have been the primary one, in fact.

So what it comes down to now is that the President has his short-term triumph, which was always there for the winning. But he remains at the mercy of events in Cambodia over which he can exercise only marginal influence without undertaking a far larger hand in that conflict than American public opinion—not to mention his own public pledge of abstinence—will allow. And while this is by no means the only imponderable, not to say weakness, in the President's latest defense of his Vietnam strategy (we will be returning to the subject in a later editorial), it is enough by itself to make it almost impossible to take any real measure of the Cambodian affair for a long time to come.

[From the Washington Post, June 8, 1970]

VIETNAM: THE PRESIDENT'S INTERIM REPORT (II)

As we said in the first installment last week, there is not much to quarrel with in the President's claim that his Cambodian campaign has been "the most successful operation of this long and difficult war." Given the unhappy record, this is not the proudest boast, but never mind; we have captured vast quantities of booty and bought some time and it is idle to argue over just how much of a difference it will make militarily in the next weeks and months because that was never the critical question about the Cambodian affair. The question was not whether it would be successful (it couldn't lose in strictly military terms) but whether it would be in any sense conclusive—what useful, lasting purpose it would serve and where it would end. And the answers cannot be measured in stacks of captured rifles or the tonnage of liberated rice—they must be found in a larger frame, in the total context of this tormented war.

For the Cambodian sanctuaries were always there to be smashed, just as the port of Haiphong has always been there to be mined, and Hanoi to be leveled, and North Vietnam to be conquered by a land invasion—if the war was to be fought in the old, conventional way. The question from the beginning was whether the conceivable gain from this sort of war would be worth the risks of widening the conflict and of ultimate confrontation with the Russians and/or the Chinese. And the answer was always No. This was to be a limited war with limited aims; we were to supplement the South Vietnamese until they are strong enough to go it alone; the idea was to intensify our military pressure *gradually*, in an effort to alter the balance of force in a way which would either cause the North Vietnamese to give up the game entirely or bargain for some compromise settlement.

It was a thumbscrew strategy and it didn't work because every time we tightened our pressure the North Vietnamese tightened theirs and finally, after our involvement reached a certain level, the American public wouldn't buy the next turn of the screw. That was the real meaning of Lyndon Johnson's decisions to stop the bombing in March, 1968, and to cancel the next increment of American troops. While it was never admitted at the time, what we did then was to abandon the thumbscrew and it left us with three alternatives: to give up and get out immediately; to ease out in an orderly way which would still give the South Vietnamese a reasonable, realistic chance to determine their own destiny; or to resume the squeeze.

President Nixon rejected the first course out of hand and had seemed—until Cambodia—to be working the middle ground of the second alternative. And that is what is so deeply disquieting about his latest progress report, and his own reading of where Cambodia fits into his scheme of things. For he seems, inescapably, to be unable to face the brutal facts that Lyndon Johnson faced up to more than two years ago; he does not sound as if he sees any limits to this limited war; he seems, in short, to be toying perilously with this third alternative of taking up the thumbscrew once again, not as a one-shot, time-buying affair, but as a matter of fixed policy.

It is hard to read any other meaning into his sweeping promises and menacing threats. "There is one basic commitment yet to be fulfilled," the President said, adding: "I have pledged to *end* this war. I shall keep that pledge." How? Certainly, the President can end *our involvement* in the war, at the expense of American influence over what comes next; but this will hardly insure the great and global stakes he insists on attaching to the outcome. "Only this administration can end the war and bring peace," he said at another point and while this was probably a way of saying that he, rather than the opposition at home, has the power and the responsibility, it is also another way of suggesting that the United States can somehow determine the outcome unilaterally; it ought to be obvious by now that this can only be done either by *winning* in the conventional way or with the cooperation, one way or another, of the North Vietnamese.

This is where it all breaks down—in the President's seeming belief that he can bluff or threaten the Other Side into playing the game his way. "If their answers to our troop withdrawal program, and to our offer to negotiate, is to increase their attacks in a way that jeopardizes the safety of our remaining forces in Vietnam, I shall, as my action five weeks ago demonstrated, take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation." Well, that is one way to look at the President's action five weeks ago—as a token of his resolve—although it is a little curious to hear the President justifying the Cambodian operation, in part, on the grounds that, had he not made good on a warning which he himself issued, it would have "eroded the credibility of the United States before the entire world;" one way to avoid that might have been not to make the threat in the first place.

But there are far better reasons, of course, for not reviving the discredited thumbscrew and the first one is that it doesn't work. We talked a little last week of the Cambodian quagmire and the danger of pinning our Vietnam policy to the fortunes of the Lon Nol Government in Phnom Penh and this is only one piece of it. Assume that the old Cambodian sanctuaries have been neutralized for a time; new sanctuaries and new supply routes are already developing farther back in the Cambodian hinterland; there are miles of Vietnamese frontier with Laos; there is a massive North Vietnamese build-up above the DMZ and just below it in I Corps the war is hotting up.

It is all very well to argue that Cambodia is proof that Richard Nixon means business; it is as easy to read it as further evidence that Hanoi, which has been threatened by experts, is not much moved by threats. And it is all very well to deal in melodrama at the expense of a union leader whose soldier son might have been spared the bullet that killed him had we only cleaned out the sanctuaries sooner; Lyndon Johnson used the same argument about a grenade and a brave Marine who might have been spared, so the President said, had the President not halted the bombing in early 1967. If the history of this war tells us anything, it is that presidents can't control the destination of bullets or the flow of enemy forces and material down the trails and across borders and into Vietnam and Laos and Cambodia. So it is nothing short of reckless to pile so many chips on so many imponderables—unless the President seriously believes that he can return successfully to the thumbscrew strategy and make it work, not just in Indochina but in the universities and in the streets and in the Congress of the United States.

In our view he cannot, and he ought not to pretend that he can; there are limits to what we can do and we have reached them; there are no "strong and effective measures" left to be taken that would not involve unacceptable risks—in Asia and at home. The genuinely bold thing to do now would be to acknowledge reality; to accelerate an orderly withdrawal with the time bought in Cambodia; to stop pretending to power and influence which we do not possess and ought not to be expected to have. If the President thinks he has it—if he believes he can re-invade Cambodia, or resume bombing of the North, or otherwise revive the tightening squeeze—then this becomes the most eloquent argument yet for passage of the Cooper-Church amendment to restore some measure of congressional influence over events. If we have read the President wrong, this amendment will not inconvenience him. And if we have read his meaning right, there is all the more reason for Congress to begin to define some reasonable limits on the power of the President to conduct a limited war.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include with these remarks a Post editorial entitled "A Showdown on the War Power":

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1970]

A SHOWDOWN ON THE WAR POWER

President Nixon's willingness to accept the Byrd amendment to loosen the proposed Cooper-Church restriction on future operations in Cambodia narrows the issue before the Senate without substantially changing it. The basic question continues to be whether Congress will assert its authority to de-escalate the war. Apparently a majority in the Senate is now determined to cancel, at least in some measure, the blank check Congress gave the President when it passed the Tonkin Gulf resolution in 1964. It is some gain to have the White House withdraw objections to Congress getting into the act at this point in some way. But the hard fact remains that the President is still maneuvering for what would in effect be a free hand in Indochina.

The chief complaint against the Cooper-Church amendment is that it would encroach upon the constitutional duty of the President acting as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces. The views of the administration on this subject were spelled out the other day by Assistant Attorney General William H. Rehnquist. He dismissed the legal and constitutional arguments against the incursions into Cambodia by saying that they reflect "precisely the sort of tactical decision traditionally confided to the Commander-in-Chief in the conduct of armed conflict." It is, he went on to say, "a decision made during the course of an armed conflict already commenced as to how that conflict shall be conducted, rather than a determination that some new and previously unauthorized military venture shall be taken."

Of course the Commander-in-Chief does have broad authority over the conduct of a war that has been authorized by Congress. But in this case there has been no specific authorization by Congress, unless the Tonkin Gulf resolution can be so construed. Mr. Rehnquist does so interpret it, but the State Department recently consented to repeal of Tonkin Gulf on the ground that the administration was not relying upon it for the conduct of the present operations in Southeast Asia. That would seem to leave the entire war in Vietnam as well as the Cambodian affair hanging precariously on the powers of the Commander-in-Chief, without any congressional authorization.

It is interesting to note that when Mr. Nixon was a senator he voted to restrain the President in a relatively mild exercise of his power as Commander-in-Chief. President Truman had sent troops to Europe to support our commitment under the NATO alliance, without going to Congress as his administration had promised to do. Senator Nixon was among those who passed a resolution saying that "no ground troops in addition to . . . four divisions should be sent to Western Europe in implementation of Article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty without further congressional approval." In this instance it was simply a question of putting muscle behind the NATO guarantee that an attack upon one member would be regarded as an attack upon all—a guarantee which

the Senate itself had approved. Now, Mr. Nixon, who voted to deny that relatively minor discretion to President Truman, seems to be claiming unlimited authority for himself to extend the war, not in our vital security area, but in remote Southeast Asia where no treaty commitment extends.

The Senate is trying to clear up this anomalous situation. By adopting the Cooper-Church amendment it would say to the President: "We are in a limited war. The Congress forbids any expansion of the war across the Cambodian border." The general effect would be to put Congress on record in favor of winding down the war—the policy that the President himself repeatedly proclaims—instead of beefing it up.

In some degree, of course, this would restrict what the Commander-in-Chief could do in the name of protecting the American troops in Vietnam. But it is a very limited restraint that ought to be implicit in the nature of international relations. Even if we were at war with one country under a congressional declaration, the Commander-in-Chief should not take it upon himself to invade a neighboring country that might be giving aid to the enemy. That would be a question of solemn national policy which could not be legitimately made by one man who happened to occupy the White House.

Senators Cooper and Church and their supporters are trying to say to the President that he must not make such a decision again without congressional consent. Senator Byrd would undercut that by providing that the President could send troops into Cambodia again if he concluded it was necessary to protect the U.S. forces in Vietnam. This goes right back to one-man decisions. It breathes the spirit of Tonkin Gulf—that the President alone shall determine the nature and extent of our participation in the war in Southeast Asia. It would open the door to expansion of war if the President should deem it wise or desirable.

Congress cannot afford to settle this historic effort to recapture the war power with a rhetorical gesture that would be devoid of substance. It needs to tell the President that the powers of the Commander-in-Chief do not include an unrestrained license to make war any place in the world at his sole discretion. Instead of yielding on this initial showdown, Congress should go on to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and to enact a policy of terminating the war at the earliest feasible date. The time for unlimited executive discretion in these matters has passed, and the government ought to be able to devise a rational means of returning to constitutional processes without a bruising fight in Washington or in the country.

MISS JANET LAX—1970 PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLAR

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the 1970 New Jersey Presidential Scholars, selected from among all high school graduates in the State, arrived in Washington last Tuesday, June 2. Among those honored was Miss Janet A. Lax of South Orange.

Miss Lax, an attractive, pert young lady, stopped in to visit my office before returning home. I was most impressed by the caliber of young person chosen as a Presidential Scholar. Janet was one of 119 young people chosen from among nearly 3 million young Americans graduating from public and private high schools throughout the country. A boy and a girl from each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and another 15 chosen at large, are picked on the basis of outstanding scholarship and demonstrated leadership capabilities.

Janet plans to attend Princeton University next year. She had participated in community activties such as the educational goals program of Columbia High School in Maplewood, and she was involved, well informed and well spoken.

I wish Janet Lax much success in whatever she undertakes, confident that she will manage to achieve it.

CUSTOMS FIGHTS DRUG SMUGGLING

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have often spoken of the efforts being made by the Bureau of Customs in the narcotics smuggling field. As a member of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee for 12 years, I have watched this work very closely.

I would like to include in the RECORD an address recently given by Myles J. Ambrose, Commissioner of Customs, on the work his agency is doing. I hope my colleagues will read it closely and bring it to the attention of all our citizens who are concerned about the drug problem.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS MYLES J. AMBROSE

I was delighted with the invitation from Northeastern University to participate in the 1970 National Law Enforcement Seminar. It is an honor to represent the oldest and one of the most distinguished arms of the Treasury Department—the United States Customs Service, which has been guarding American frontiers against smugglers and wihch has been collecting revenue since 1789.

The central theme of this seminar—"Unity of Polarization"—within the broad context of law enforcement, is especially appropriate in light of the problems confronting this Nation in its current effort to stop the illegal drug traffic. Your timing couldn't be better in view of the announcement by President Nixon that the last week in May will be Drug Abuse Prevention Week.

The word "unity" has many definitions. Webster defines it as "acting in concert" or "entering into an association." Another: "Joining of strength or identity for a common purpose."

The word "polarization" is of recent vintage. Webster defined it as "the relationship between two apparently opposed objects which nevertheless involve each other by being dependent upon a mutual factor, such as day and night, or birth and death."

Of course, today, the word "polarization" is used to reflect the concept of alienation by the youth of America to estabilshed institutions which they characterize as the "establishment."

It has been said that we are in the throes of a revolution. We have been through revolutions before. People seem to forget that this nation evolved from a revolution and that we are all inheritors of revolutionary traditions. Successful revolutionaries, however, necessarily become the establishment because the true revolution can only come about as the result of repressions and the inability of those oppressed to achieve any relief by traditional methods.

I submit the changes in American institutions can and are being made and that we do have the means by which this can be done in an orderly fashion. Those who would use mob tactics to pervert the term "revolution" in its traditional American sense should remember that some of the countries they so admire would treat demented acts like bombing not as a lone violence against the state and its institutions, but in a swift and sure manner without recourse to their rights or to trial.

I think it is incumbent upon us to firmly advise these terrorists that no intelligent society can have its decisions made by the irreverent irrational acts of street mobs.

What does narcotics smuggling have to do with the unity or the polarization of the American people?

Can there be a shadow of doubt in anyone's mind that the scourge of our time is the misery, the suffering, the degradation caused by the illicit use of drugs.

What other single force for evil so rents and tears at the fabric of our society today, separating parents from their children, teachers from their students, governments from their people?

Glance at the headlines in your morning newspaper:

"Scientists and students at colleges find increasing use of heroin."

"Heroin epidemic hits school children."

"City teachers arrested with coed on dope charge."

Recently a nationally known columnist questioned the value of spending money and energy to educate modern youth on the dangers of drug abuse.

He feels that drug-abuse education is wasted, simply because the kids "already know everything that we can teach them."

"Education," he writes, "is the solution only to the degree that ignorance is the problem. And in the urban high schools, there is not much ignorance on the subject of drugs."

The writer admitted that there is stupidity, immaturity and self-denigration, and the misguided isn't likely to be moved by arguments based on saving himself from destruction.

Another reaction, he said, is simply a kind of "ecological religion" or simple resignation to pollution of the earth's atmosphere, and eventually to the end of the world.

"If you've booked passage on the *Titanic*, you might as well go first class."

What about this?

If this writer is right, and if his thinking were to be carried out to its logical conclusion, we might just as well fold up our tents—all of us—and give up the fight here and now.

Should we abandon the advances, the idealism, the progress, and the development of centuries of civilization as we know it? I think not.

Abraham Lincoln once wisely said: "The dogmas of the past are inadequate to the stormy present."

This is a time to consider our possible shortcomings and failures: to build on the past, not to destroy the foundation. There is an inscription on the National Archives building in Washington which says: "The Past is Prologue." When I asked what this meant, a cab driver once said it simply means "you ain't seen nothing yet."

Many of our most respected institutions—our schools, our courts, our social mores, our laws and our traditions—are under attack, even as they were in Abraham Lincoln's day, and they have been in every generation since.

Shall we all book passage on the *Titanic*,

first class, because the Red Chinese launched a rocket?

Shall we burn our homes to the ground because a water pipe burst in the basement?

Shall we commit mass euthanasia against the aged and infirmed, the mentally ill, the incapacitated, as was done by Nazi Germany within our own lifetime because these unfortunates were deemed to be socially "useless"?

Are we to hang all policemen because a few of them were caught accepting bribes, thereby undermining confidence in and respect for the law?

I equate this logic with the grim cynicism and the nihilism of those who would leave the drug problem to the street corner mythology which has filled the vacuum left by our failure in the past to deal with America's youth on a *mature, reasoned,* and *factual* basis.

In the past, society took the easy but ineffective posture of "Do as I say because I say so." It avoided the more challenging route of presenting the facts which are essential as the basis on which to make decisions.

I refer to the point made by Professor K. Ross Toole, of the University of Montana, quoted in *U.S. News and World Report.* Professor Toole observed that:

"Every generation makes mistakes, always has and always will. We have made our share. But my generation has made America the most affluent country on earth; it has tackled, head-on, a racial problem which no nation in the history of mankind had dared to do. It has publicly declared war on poverty and it has gone to the moon; it has desegregated schools and abolished polio; it has presided over the beginning of what is probably the greatest social and economic revolution in man't history.

It has begun these things, not finished them."

What we need and crave today is not a polarization of our people in a smouldering Cold War between young and old, between the radical and the conservative, but as President Nixon has said, "a lowering of our voices."

We need to synthesize, to unify, to adjust, each one of us doing his thing, to use the vernacular. Hold fast to that which is good, rooting out that which is not so good, and replacing it with new ideas for creative excellence in our society. There is no room for nihilism and cynicism in this effort.

The Bureau of Customs, which I have the honor to head, plays a significant role in the continuing war on narcotic drugs, not only by youth but all segments of our society. We consider our role to be the first line of defense.

President Nixon directed the Secretary of the Treasury, thru the Customs Service, to "initiate a major new effort to guard the Nation's borders and ports against the growing volume of narcotics from abroad."

I think it would be helpful to tell this audience some of the programs that we are currently engaged in:

Congress has given us a supplemental appropriation of nearly $9 million to halt drug smuggling. This bill permits us to nearly double our investigative strength and increase our inspectional personnel by over 900 employees.

We have set up international narcotics intelligence units in key cities to evaluate and act on the information we and other enforcement agencies develop on narcotics smugglers.

We are installing a computerized intelligence network which will give our agents and inspectors instant access to information on suspected smugglers 24 hours a day. By late fall, this network will cover the entire Mexican border and, hopefully, by early 1971, all our major ports of entry.

We are stressing narcotics smuggling techniques in a major employee training program.

Even the most skilled and dedicated employees are handicapped without the right tools. An important item is new equipment. We have increased our fleet of conventional aircraft; purchased helicopters, boats for use on the oceans and lakes along our borders, and over 150 new police interceptor automobiles. We have expanded our radio network along the Mexican border.

We are intensifying inspection of passengers and baggage at international airports, and inspection of foreign mail parcels and commercial cargo.

In addition, we are looking into legislative proposals to prevent the theft of international cargo at airports and seaports.

We are reviewing some of our passenger speed-up methods . . . such as preclearance in foreign countries and accelerated inspection at our own gateways.

NOW, HOW CAN YOU HELP US?

We need increased assistance and coordination with all types of law enforcement agencies. This is a MUST because without information we cannot be effective. Our current drive will mean that international travelers are going to be inspected more closely, that more baggage is examined and that new inspectional techniques will be employed for detecting criminal smugglers.

It will mean some inconvenience. It may require a few extra minutes for customs clearance. *We suggest that this is a small price to pay to help keep drugs out of the hands of your children, my children, and the boy or girl next door.*

I am convinced that through education we can and must arouse the American public to the seriousness of the drug problem. The crisis is becoming an epidemic.

I am not a psychiatrist, nor a doctor, nor a social worker. I am a lawyer, representing an agency which has been charged with certain responsibilities.

I am also an American parent, with young children whose security is suddenly threatened by evil forces beyond their control.

I appeal to other parents and to other American citizens, to join with us in getting at the root of the spreading evil.

We must broaden, not shrink from, our educational programs. We must sharpen, not dull, the edge of our awareness to the depth and breadth of the attack by the corruptors of our society.

But the younger generation cannot be handed the world on a silver platter. They, too, have to meet their responsibilities.

We need more communication . . . not less. We need more education . . . not less. We need more and better law enforcement . . . not less.

These concepts are completely interrelated and should have as a result unification, not polarization.

A HEALTH CARE LESSON FOR THE UNITED STATES?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News of June 3, 1970, carried an excellent article on the national health insurance plan now in operation in Canada. The headlines accompanying the article make an interesting point—"Canadian plan proves success" and "A health care lesson for the United States?"

So that my colleagues will have an opportunity to see the article in question, it appears at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A HEALTH CARE LESSON FOR THE UNITED STATES?

(By Harry Nelson)

Most Canadians now enjoy a national health insurance plan but a visitor hears the same complaints from Canadian patients that are heard in the United States:

"My doctor doesn't spend enough time with me . . ."

"The doctors are getting rich on my money . . ."

But there is one worry most Canadians don't have—the fear of being wiped out financially by a serious illness.

Practically all Canada's 20 million citizens have almost unlimited hospital coverage and seven of the nation's 10 provinces have joined a federal plan that guarantees payment of most doctor bills.

In spite of complaints, most patients and their doctors appear satisfied with the plan.

In view of rising interest in national health insurance in the United States, some observers think Americans should pay more attention to developments in Canada, a nation which more closely resembles the United States than any other.

Canada has far outstripped the United States in devising publicly administered hospitalization and medical care plans. But problems have not ended simply because the bills are now paid by a government agency.

Just as happened in this country when medicare and medicaid went into effect in 1966, Canadian patients flooded doctors' offices and hospitals because they no longer had to worry about the bills.

The result—soaring medical costs and longer waits.

Thus it appears that merely paying the bills is not enough.

Equally needed, say many health planners, is a new method of making health care services available to all.

They say the experience in Canada—especially in Ontario—should be heeded by Americans, who will soon be asked to consider several bills proposing national health insurance.

Dr. Arthur Kelly, a fomer secretary-general of the Canadian Medical Association (CMA), is surprisingly frank about the merits of Canada's national plan, considering that the CMA was not a strong backer.

"Many of my colleagues in the states say, 'it won't happen here' but believe me, it will," Dr. Kelly said recently in Toronto.

"It used to be unpopular to use the word 'inevitable' here, too. But anyone with detachment can see the direction of events."

At the end of an interview, during which he capsulized the 25-year history of public-administered medicine in Canada, Dr. Kelly concluded:

"You will notice that I haven't once used the word 'Socialism.' We have been much more cooperative with government than you have in the United States. It hasn't been as bad as we had suspected."

Many Canadian doctors are resentful of Americans who equate the CMA with the American Medical Association (AMA) CHA in matters of governmental medicine.

"The CMA's social attitudes have been entirely different from the AMA's," says Dr. W. Harding Le Riche, a professor at the University of Toronto's School of Public Health.

Some Canadian experts warn Americans to scale down their expectations.

"Americans must get over the idea that it's possible to have total insurance for the total country," Dr. Le Riche said. "The costs would become astronomical. I would not prescribe what we have for the United States."

Many observers have said that not only

are U.S. doctors more used to having their own way, but a significant percentage of the public has been spoiled by its good private care.

How many middle class Americans would be happy with a four-bed hospital room, the standard accommodation in Ontario hospitals?

"The people want more and more and the doctors think up more and more to do," Dr. Le Riche pointed out. "This leads to a perpetuating system with no controls."

Canadian doctors expect their first controls to be on their fee schedules.

In the United States, "fee schedules" are dirty words to doctors. But in Canada they accept the idea of being paid for each service on a fixed schedule, rather than by a "usual and customary" fee, as in this country.

One reason Canadian doctors tolerate fee schedules is that they are set by their own provincial medical associations. This started years ago when doctors formed insuring associations similar to Blue Shield.

Yet even with modest fees (by U.S. standards), the government will almost certainly take away fee controls from the medical associations to help stem spiraling costs.

Dr. Kelly predicted the doctors would give up this privilege without a fight.

If costs rise beyond the tolerable point even with a government set fee schedule, it is possible patients will be deprived of certain services.

Already Saskatchewan has begun charging $1.50 for each doctor visit up to $180 a year for a family, to discourage unessential doctor visits and hospital stays.

In 1966, federal legislation made it possible for Canada's other nine provinces to form their own medical insurance programs, with federal funds subsidizing the plan by 50 percent.

It is this plan which seven provinces have joined.

Ontario, the most populous and richest province, refused to join until last October. It said 92 percent of its population was enrolled in voluntary insurance programs that provided comprehensive physicians' services for only $60 a year for a single person or $150 for a family of three or more.

Persons on welfare paid nothing. Others with low incomes were subsidized with provincial tax money for as much as 60 percent of the premiums.

"Why should we be taxed extra for a federal program we don't want or need?" Ontarians asked.

But the national government was determined to make comprehensive medical coverage available for all, especially the 25 to 30 percent who had no health insurance.

In the end, Ontarians gave in because they realized they were paying for the 50 percent subsidy given to provinces that did join.

Nationally, the cost for the doctor and hospitalization plans is about $5 billion a year. The United States, with a population roughly 10 times of that of Canada, spends about $60 billion a year for all health care services.

Canadian physicians and public health experts familiar with conditions in the United States say the quality of care in Canada is comparable.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO AID POLLUTION FIGHT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a concurrent resolution which, upon enactment, will state the sense of the Congress regarding methods and priorities for further reducing pollution of our air, water, and soil in rural areas, and for protecting and improving the quality of our environment. This resolution will further the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91–190), and it is directly related to H.R. 17631, which I introduced on May 14, 1970. H.R. 17631 would amend and improve important legislation in the field of conservation and pollution control and abatement: the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

This resolution is needed to express priorities in the application of the watershed protection and flood prevention (or Public Law 566) program and the agricultural conservation program, or ACP, on the projects and farms to which they apply throughout this country. Neither Public Law 83–566—Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act sets a percentage of the Federal share in the cost-sharing agreements with individual farmers. The legislation permits, and the ACP has been designed to allow, flexibility in administration in order to achieve the conservation goals sought. In some instances, the full out-of-pocket cost of putting key acreage into conserving practices has been assumed by the Federal Government, and the percentage of compensation has ranged well above 50 percent in many instances—even though the average is about 50 percent. This has proved invaluable to get such practices established, or in removing limiting economic hurdles for many small or low-income farmers.

This flexibility coupled with long-term ACP agreements could be of immeasurable value in developing pollution abatement practices and special projects. It could, by regulation, along with appropriate legislative history in connection with appropriation acts, become an integral and vital tool in helping to secure early signups for critical conservation practices in small watershed project areas.

Coupling this authority (by regulation) to make early commitments to farmers for land-treatment measures urgently needed to bring such projects into being, with new statutory authority to enter into long-term ACP agreements, would provide an arsenal of additional progressive weapons to materially advance a publicly endorsed and proved program. This action would help attain and maintain a high level of water quality in our lakes, rivers, and reservoirs, as well as help prevent the loss of capacity by siltation.

Giving preferred or priority treatment, or "bonuses," to get new, urgently needed practices, programs, or industries underway is a well accepted procedure. It has been used to get new consideration technology applied in a problem area or by a special-need group, and to get social, economic, or educational projects or innovations underway for similar reasons.

In the case of Public Law 83–566 projects, there is a provision of law which requires that:

As a condition to providing Federal assistance for the installation of works of improvement (there shall be) agreements to carry out recommended soil conservation measures and proper farm plans from owners of not less than 50 per centum of the lands situated in the drainage area above each retention reservoir to be installed with Federal assistance.

In many—perhaps most—cases the farms above these reservoirs—which must be protected from siltation—are the farms which benefit least from the works of improvement, yet have some of the most severe conservation problems which urgently need treating. To these farmers, committing themselves to carry out a farm plan to help protect the reservoir may be a major obstacle unless they can get liberal cost-share rates for the key land treatment measures in their farm and watershed conservation plans. "Bonus" or extra incentive cost-shares for priority practices on the farms of those who contribute to meeting the 50-percent requirement would make it possible to get the needed project underway and the major works of improvement.

While we do not believe amended legislation is necessary to do this—when cost-share funds are available—if there is some aspect of this situation which you believe would make special authorizing legislation desirable, we shall be glad to provide drafting service upon your further request.

The concurrent resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 641

Whereas the need for a national effort to control and reduce the cause of pollution of our environment is of prime national importance to the well-being of our citizens and coming generations; and

Whereas pollution control and abatement programs are most effective when located at the source of possible pollution; and

Whereas this is especially so for those types of pollution affecting our reservoirs, lakes, and waterways; and

Whereas the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 calls for the Federal Government to use all practicable means to accomplish such environmental safeguards and benefits; and

Whereas President Nixon's Task Force on Rural Development has recommended accelerated appropriations to develop more small watersheds each year; and

Whereas the Task Force has recommended that adequate funds be provided to complete such projects; and

Whereas the most efficient and practical methods of establishing sound conservation and pollution control and abatement practices can be greatly enhanced to the public's benefit by authorizing adequate federal assistance under tested, existing programs widely available to landowners and operators: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Department of Agriculture of the United States

(1) shall endeavor, to the maximum practicable extent, to assist landowners and operators to establish on their lands enduring, pollution abatement measures along reservoirs, lakes, and waterways, and on other areas which are likely to be significant

sources of pollution to either the air, water, or soil, and

(2 shall give preference to implementing those programs which are available for use on eligible lands and are in operation, namely, the Agricultural Conservation Program and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Program, by providing a share of the cost of such practices adequate to expedite their installation wherever they are needed.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this resolution shall be held and considered in effect until such time as Congress deems otherwise.

SAVE THE BOZEN KILL

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in my district lies one of the unspoiled nature spots of the eastern metropolis.

More than a half century ago, the great Naturalist John Burroughs referred to the Bozen Kill Valley in Albany and Schenectady Counties of New York as a splendid untouched spot for man to refresh himself in Nature's unlimited wonders. The Bozen Kill remains as such even today. I myself frequently find rewarding enjoyment in strolling and climbing the valley's slopes.

Many of my constituents in the valley, or who know of its natural beauties, are concerned about its future because of an interstate highway building program which might touch or cross the Bozen Kill. They are determined that this should not happen, and I share their determination.

An ecologist of the area, Daniel L. McKinley, assistant professor of science at the State University of New York at Albany, recently made an excellent statement on highways' deleterious impact on areas such as the Bozen Kill. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues because of the importance of his message and the clarity with which he expresses the imperative that so many of us feel, to "Save the Bozen Kill."

His statement follows:

SAVE THE BOZEN KILL

As an ecologist, I know that all processes on Earth, even those we think of as nonliving, are a vast sponge of interrelationships. You cannot, as the poet said, damage a flower without troubling a star. Man is an ecological agent of great impact today, yet most of us have even forgotten how long it takes nature to make a baby chick or a plate of beans. It would not do for us to have to arrange every molecular event within our bodies and, much less, out in the world we live in. But all this insulation results in an isolation from nature that is the source of many of our troubles.

We never know until it is too late that anything is wrong. We compartmentalize our activities. We "make a living," we "take a vacation," we "buy a car." Separate events? We pass a law guaranteeing jobs; other laws insure health, food, pure water, clean air. These items are quite separate on the books but they are really very much connected.

For example, as an ecologist, I am especially aware that DDT does not stay compartmentalized! And the laws we pass to protect our health do not always save us, for as long as there is one profiteer from the making, selling or applying of DDT, we cannot prevent its continued spread through the ecosystem we all live in.

This divides us and conquers us. We are divided from a good world, because there are so many of us, by our needs. We also are divided from it by our greeds—and we do not always seem able to disentangle the two. We shall be conquered by the same ecological processes of nutrient circulation, energy flow, biological breakdown (or lack of it) and biological accumulation that now guarantee our survival. Our expertness in compartmentalizing life turns out to be a part of the insulation and estrangement from reality that keep us from seeing the floodwater creeping upwards in the basement. If we had looked to the health of the ecosystem rather than the health of man alone—or the "health" of our pocketbooks—we should not now be in this fix. Will a few more miles of freeway help us?

A recent calculation has it that every man, woman and child in America (and, incidentally, the world) has about 10 acres of ice-free land. There is, unfortunately, little hope that there will not be twice as many people in the world within 35 or 45 years—with at least 10 times as much garbage as now and probably 40 times as much violence—and there will then be only 5 acres per person.

Here our dividing and conquering begin again. Ten acres is a lot of land: but only if half the people of this country and three-fourths of the people of the world are willing to live in restrictive slums, see the quality of their lives decline, watch the rich proteins and the nonrenewable resources of their countrysides and waters flow (in the economic banditry that we call international trade) into American affluence. But 10 acres is not going to be much land, 5 acres is going to be very much less, as our impact upon land and our uses of land continue to increase even faster than we do. On that early twenty-first century 5 acres of land, for example, at a very mnimum, we shall have to feed ourselves—and we may well have to do so without widespread use of chemical pesticides and without saturation use of commercial fertilizers. Those acres will have to provide us with timber and fibers; with suburban lots, with mines and oil wells; with factory sites; with roadways and power-line rights-of-way; with airports and ski-slopes; with forests to produce oxygen and, I should hope, some desert, plain, mountain and valley habitats that will feed our feelings of need for natural beauty.

Thus, we face increasingly great competition for the uses to which a decreasing resource is going to be put. We do not have 10 acres for food; *and* 10 for highways; *and* 10 for power lines; *and* 10 for factory sites. We already have enough plans on the drawing boards to *saturate* the only 10 acres we now have. We already have too many people and too many highways and too many cars, if we consider that the proper aim for all of mankind ought to be higher than the maximum provision of transport. I venture to say that there are already as many roads for as many people as the Bozen Kill ought to support.

Obviously, we have to settle for less than a maximum of anything, unless it is a maximum of mere human numbers. But when are you going to ask us to stop producing more people? When are you going to tell us that we cannot have more roads—and the more cars that make more roads possible so that we can have more cars? Is it not time that engineering experts started being socially responsible by telling us the true price of the products they sell us?

Human economic competition feasts upon externalized costs. Such is the land slavery that has eaten up its own resources in our country. Human slavery is now unpopular, especially with the slaves. Colonialism is no longer profitable. In fact, only international economic raiding makes it possible for us to sit here tonight and consider permanently embalming additional square miles of American land under concrete and steel. All that, I suspect, will soon change.

Building this road—especially if it destroys the Bozen Kill—is a kind of High-Grading. Within a generation, every high quality tree, every individual of a high quality species of tree can be high-graded from a forest. This can be done inconspicuously, so that apparently no harm has been done. But we never know what processes the missing species carried on nor can we more than guess at how much less well the ecosystem now operates. Almost accidentally—partly through lack of economic pressures but mostly because of a former lack of capability in dealing with tough terrain—some of the best scenery has been left in our hands. We now engage in the worst high-grading of all: the replacement of this region's most striking natural beauty with what will be ecologically degrading and ugly (or, at best, of neutral esthetic value).

A truly high quality environment is more than the lowest common denominator of what's left when we've all profited maximally. What a dung heap to pick over we shall have left those who come after us! Make no mistake about it. We are not now just removing white oak or white pine in a cozy little nineteenth century skimming operation. Our high-grading is a vast leveling operation from which the biotic pyramid as we know it will not recover. If you value the inspiration of natural beauty, there is even less likelihood of recovery.

There are many "uses" for natural areas. The Nature Conservancy is not simply preserving scenic views. I do not claim that areas preserved by Nature Conservancy and its friends are going to serve a vast number of Multiple Use functions. But, within limits imposed by the nature of the terrain, the kinds and numbers of plants and animals and their needs, these areas will serve many people.

Relatively enormous numbers of well behaved sightseers can share some of the Bozen Kill preserves for an indefinite future. Picnicking for a limited number of people might, perhaps, be judiciously provided for. The preserves may never produce a shootable surplus of game animals but many species of interesting birds, mammals and plants live there now that will have no place to continue their kind if we destroy their habitat. Perhaps most of all, the land can, within limits, be a perpetual incubator for future naturalists and for much needed scientists educated by more than laboratories. Places where such education can go on are fast disappearing.

This is not an isolated plea for wilderness preservation alone, however much that may be justified. It is more than a prayer for rescue of a particular species of endangered animal or plant, although I believe that a defensible aim. It concerns us and our children.

We have constitutional guarantees and zoning laws that allege to protect us. But we are now endangered by exercise of the Right of Eminent Domain, by self-confirming social predictions of Infinite Growth and by an endless amount of private greed disguised as Economic Determinism and enthroned as "You Cannot Stop Progress."

If we destroy the Bozen Kill valley or insidiously degrade any substantial portion of it, we shall have gone a step farther toward eliminating the possibility that local people with modest incomes can see such beauty. Now, it may seem to some of us that more people forced onto the highways for fewer vacations to more distant spots is a good thing. Such expenditures by individuals force them to demand high salaries. It cuts down on the number of times per year they can get into contact with nature. Its focusing their attentions upon the few remaining areas essentially is another form of high-grading, which destroys what they set out to enjoy.

One final note. I think there is still room for a limited number of homesites along the Bozen Kill and its tributaries. But the quality and the accessibility of these sites will not be enhanced by freeways! The mere fact that you can recruit people willing to live there in spite of the degradation of the countryside is not an argument for degrading it. Rural slums are ultimately no more an answer to surplus people than urban slums have proved to be. People, it turns out, just do not continue to like living in slums. I cannot see how superhighways help at all in curing or preventing slums, either rural or urban. I think we ought to be careful not to expand the slums we already have.

FACTS CONCERNING OUR RAPIDLY GROWING CRISIS IN IMPORTS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, again I want to give Congress an opportunity to read more of the important facts concerning our rapidly growing crisis in imports.

Not more than 2 years ago, Great Britain had a deficit of $850 million from imports. Last year this was changed to a $950 million export surplus. How was it accomplished? Very easy; we bought more and sold less to Great Britain than we did previously.

Great Britain also clamped down on imports, especially steel and high value-added products by giving a bonus to steel users who used only British steel. They easily overcame any G.A.T.T. restrictions on high tariffs by selling the United States a major part of their aerospace industry products. The United States is their largest customer with over 100,000 unemployed U.S. aerospace employees, while Great Britain has full employment for 245,000 workers.

Of the 200 largest corporations in Europe, Britain has 107, exporting more than 1½ to 2 times as much as the United States. Authority for these figures is the Financial Post, May 30, 1970.

I warn again, this Nation cannot survive as an industrial complex with its markets wide open to cheaper labor and goods.

Incidentally, while we are going broke and living on borrowed time and money, we are gradually taking over all the old British problems of world diplomacy, world peacekeeping, and world free trade problems. Britain had to go broke before she awakened to the realities of life. Do we have to suffer from the same type of awakening?

The British were fed the same cliches and propaganda that the U.S. economy has been weaned on the last 20 years. Somehow or other, after hundred of years, starting with the times of crude weapons and little or no transportation during which the British fought many wars in other lands for its own protection, she now lives in a world of sophisticated weapons and means of conquest, apparently feeling rather secure on a little island surrounded by its moat. We too think that we are so very safe that we have got to go bankrupt morally, politically, and economically to prove it.

NATIONAL AIRPORT

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, continuing decisions of the Federal Aviation Administration leading to increased congestion of air passenger traffic at National Airport is a matter of growing public concern to the entire metropolitan Washington area. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will conduct hearings this week on legislation sponsored by Senator SPONG of Virginia and by myself in the House which would create a regional airport authority for the major metropolitan airports of National, Dulles International, and Friendship International. This hearing will provide an opportunity for appropriate public discussion of the role of local planning considerations in the operations of these major area airports.

Mr. Speaker, Washington station WRC–TV has spoken directly to this issue, and I submit for the benefit of my colleagues the following WRC editorial of May 27, 1970:

Washington National Airport is here to stay and it should. It is a tremendous asset to the entire Metropolitan area, but it must not be permitted to become a monster.

The recent decision of the Federal Aviation Agency to permit the stretch-jet to continue to use National raises just such a specter. The issue is the future of the facility and what part should it play in the overall concept of air transportation in the Washington area.

In the early 1960's, the FAA said jets would not be permitted into National—but they were. The decision was proper. Then the FAA said the stretch-jets with higher passenger capacity would not be permitted. But during the recent controllers slow-down, they were, and now they will be continued.

The next threshold is the airbus. If that is permitted, plus the stretch-jets, the whole concept of National will be changed. The tremendous passenger flow will necessitate additional ground facilities, including new access roads to move people into and out of the airport.

But perhaps most important, it will mean that Dulles will cease orderly growth and continue as a major burden to the taxpayers and Friendship may whither on the vine.

Preserve National by all means, but not at the expense of the area's environment and the development of other airport facilities.

WRC–TV recommends that a major study of an integrated air facilities system for the Washington-Baltimore region be undertaken at once, and if necessary, an authority set up to properly utilize the present facilities and plan for the future.

THE COMMUNIST MYTH

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues well realize from my activities in and out of Congress how strongly I oppose Communist regimes throughout the world for, among other things, the manner in which they deny fundamental human freedoms. In this regard, I am proud to have been the recipient of the Assembly of Captive European Nations award in 1966 for my activities against totalitarianism.

However, we must bear in mind that substituting a repressive regime of the right, which denies human freedoms, for one of the left, which denies human freedoms, does not mean progress.

The problem inherent in incorrectly labeling one form of totalitarianism less acceptable than another was excellently stated in an editorial in the June 4 issue of the Locust Valley, N.Y., Leader which is ably edited by Edith Hay Wyckoff.

Because Mrs. Wyckoff's editorial is so relevant to current debates in the Congress and throughout the country, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE COMMUNIST MYTH

One of the biggest problems confronting us today is the need to understand what communism is and what we are letting it do to us. During the 50 years since communism replaced Russia's creaking, despotic monarchy we have tended to give communism more power than it has, enveloping it with an aura of mystery it does not deserve. Communism is only one more oppressive, aggressive, anti-liberal, fascistic, autocratic form of government very much like the Russian monarchy it replaced. Few of us have recognized that. Instead, obsessed with the idea that communism is something special and somehow more evil than any other autocracy, we have allowed it to tear us apart, exactly as the communists have planned it would.

Too often communism, which some mistakenly consider liberal, has been credited with advances it has not made. With many others we watched in dismay as the whole labor movement and its leaders such as Walter Reuther once were damned as communists. There was great violence in the labor movement and there are those today who still think of every member of a union as a communist. And yet today, such a short time after labor won advances after bitter and often violent struggle, many union members have become a part of the most reactionary forces in the country, denying other segments the right to seek the same kind of advances for which labor fought so fiercely.

The right to strike does not exist in any communist nation nor does the right to dissent. Neither do these rights exist in any

other nation ruled by a dictator. The strength of the communist poison has been the willingness of too many to call everyone with whom he does not agree a communist. This thoughtless misunderstanding of the meaning of communism has led us to justify every action we take if somehow we can make it appears as if what we do in some mysterious way will defeat communism.

In the name of anti-communism the U.S. has supported nearly every modern dictator. By doing this we have helped create a vacuum that could not resist change. Because the U.S. so often was the support of the friendly dictator, those who wanted to overthrow the dictator were forced to seek help elsewhere. Too often the only alternative to the in autocrat was the out autocrat—Russia. This happened in Cuba where for decades we kept dictator Batista in power. When his rotten house collapsed Castro and his communists moved in. It happened in China where we kept dictator Chiang Kai Shek in power. Communism also moved in when his rotten house collapsed. The same thing has happened in Viet Nam, where in the name of defeating communism, we have kept several dictators in power and failed to make the country self governing. Even though nearly everyone agrees that we cannot win that war, we continue to fight there, accomplishing nothing except what the communists want. This draining of our human and material resources is their way of destroying us and we are letting them do it just as they have told us they would.

The dictatorship known as communism is evil. It must be defeated. But the victory against it will not come by fighting in Korea, Viet Nam, the Middle East or anywhere else in the world. The victory will be won within our own country when it has become so free and so strong it is unassailable, leaving no vacuum to be filled by anyone. In rushing out with fists raised to do battle against every communist threat we have done what the communists expect us to do. The years of this kind of reaction finally are taking their toll. To defeat communism we must recognize it for what it is—an archaic form of government that in time will collapse under its own rotten weight. If we are not strong and healthy when this happens then the world is lost. And if we continue in the fool hardy direction of war that is exactly what will happen.

WAKE UP TO THE AUTOMOBILE CHALLENGE OF JAPAN

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent for some time that United States and Japanese automakers were on a collision course over the matter of imports and exports.

American automakers have become frustrated and increasingly angry over the present situation. Not only are they prevented from selling their cars in Japan because of stringent trade barriers, but they must sit by and watch Japanese car sales in the United States, unhampered by trade restrictions, increase at an astronomical rate.

In the following article written by Sylvia Porter, one of a series I have been inserting into the RECORD, the auto crisis is clearly defined. According to the article, which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Japan's 1969 car sales in the United States increased 44.5 percent; truck sales went up an astounding 98.8 percent. On the other hand, United States car sales in Japan rose only 2.7 percent and truck sales were not even computed since only 10 vehicles were sold.

Miss Porter reports Japanese automakers are gearing to increase their exports by 19 percent this year. It is possible her sales in the United States will double the 1969 figure, ranging from 350,000 to 475,000.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to read Miss Porter's column. The figures are shocking. The resulting collision is inevitable unless Japan allows United States automakers free wheeling access to her markets or we slam the brakes on Japanese imports to our shores.

The column follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: WAKE UP TO THE AUTO CHALLENGE OF JAPAN

(By Sylvia Porter)

TOKYO.—Last year alone, sales of Japanese cars in our market soared 44.5 per cent and sales of Japanese trucks to us rocketed 98.8 per cent! In the same months, U.S. auto sales in Japan rose a puny 2.7 per cent and truck sales (a total of 10) were ridiculous.

This year Japan's automakers are scheduling production of a mighty 5,600,000 motor vehicles, up 13.6 per cent over '69 and projecting 1,100,000 exports, up 19 per cent. Japan's sales in the U.S. market could be double '69—range from a low 350,000 to 475,000.

The Battle of the Automobile is on in full force.

From all over the world, small cars are pouring into the U.S.—with Japan's Toyota and Datsun well up on the list of popular invaders.

In response, Detroit finally is rolling out America's new sub-compacts. You have not yet signaled the outcome, but authoritative guesses are that Japan will both make strong inroads into the Volkswagen's sales and be tough competition for all U.S. makes.

Confident of this, Japan's automakers are forecasting production will continue to rise 15 per cent a year and exports will continue to rise 18 to 20 per cent a year. And Katsuji Kawamata, president of the Japan Automobile Manufacturers Assn. as well as of Nissan Motor Co. (Datsun), told me he expected total motor vehicles on Japan's roads to double in the next five years to 30,000,000.

There's no doubt that the battle of the Automobile is just beginning and that it will become far more important than the current collision over Japan's tremendous textile exports to us—a collision now up to a level of dangerous emotionalism on both sides.

Japan points out that she is knocking down her barriers and will permit our automakers to invest 50 per cent in new joint ventures in Japan as of October, 1971.

Detroit retorts that this is hypocrisy, for it'll take another five years after 1971 to get going.

How could Japan build up one of the world's greatest automobile industries in less than 15 years?

Some explanations leap out to the serious observer:

The unique government-industry-finance-labor cooperation and planning to build the industry; the billions of dollars the government and Japanese banks (by agreement) poured in; the modern plants, put up so recently that they are automated beyond most of ours; Japan's fabulous capacity for copying the U.S. original and improving on it; the help we gave her with our industrial know-how as well as a "nuclear umbrella"—and, of course, her protectionist tariff-tax policies which alone boost a $3,000 car in Detroit to more than $9,000 in Tokyo.

And again, I go back to the Japanese worker. I spent a full day touring the Datsun plant near Yokohama and, as in other factories, I was almost hypnotized by the sight of hundreds of young workers on the assembly line, utterly absorbed in their little tasks, enthusiastic, gay.

The fact that each of these young men is hired for life and will not be fired except for extreme cause hasn't made him lazy. On the contrary, he repays his employer with great loyalty and he is more eager to make his company prosperous because he prospers with it.

The fact that each worker can count on a paycheck, a semiannual bonus and an almost incredible variety of fringe benefits hasn't made him fear automation will undercut his security.

On the contrary, he welcomes work-saving innovations just because he knows they do not threaten his job.

Japan won't have it as easy in the '70s as in the '60s, of course.

And what I'd like to see come out of this new automobile competition is the first world car in history—a car which would be at home on the roads of all nations and which would have the size and styling to cross all boundaries.

I'd like to see it made in the U.S.A.

If it is, it will be at least in part because the challenge of the compulsively industrious, ambitious automakers of Japan forced us to make it.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, as an indication that the debate going on by the liberals over in the other body is not changing the thinking of substantial people in the United States, one of the outstanding radio stations in my State ran a series of spots urging everyone who wished to sign a petition in support of President Nixon's Cambodia move to stop in their office and sign.

In a 2½-day period 255 persons stopped at the office of KWYR in Winner, S. Dak., and signed this petition. Seventy-two more signed other petitions carried by individuals. The petition simply said:

We, the concerned citizens of South Dakota, back the President on Cambodia.

That, Mr. Speaker, was accomplished in 2½ days, during the week of May 18.

During the week of May 22 KWYR radio station carried a similar campaign for those who might desire to sign petitions in support of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment to end the war. In a 3-day period only 36 persons had stopped in to sign the petition favoring the McGovern-Hatfield stand. One letter favoring his stand was also received by the station.

In reporting this activity, Mr. Al Clark, the principal owner of the station, wrote as follows:

In summary, with 94 promotional spots run for each campaign, and an additional half-day allowed for the McGovern-Hatfield supporters to come in and sign, KWYR's responding listeners voted more than 9 to 1 in support of the President's move into Cambodia in an effort to speed the safe return of American military men from Southeast Asia.

One would think that similar results might be received in every section of the United States.

CIVIL RIGHTS ON SADISM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, that leading civil rights organization, the ACLU, is about to embark upon its own "trip." The ACLU's latest reported venture is to claim rights of the individual under the Constitution to destroy his body as he wishes—including the right to take harmful drugs and refuse treatment for narcotic addiction.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article pertaining to this subject, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 8, 1970]

ACLU Is Pressing Right To Use Body As Person Wishes

(By Karl E. Meyer)

New York, June 7.—The U.S. Constitution should protect the right of any person to use his body as he wishes, including the right to take harmful drugs and refuse treatment for narcotics addiction.

This was among the controversial policy recommendations that will be submitted to the board of directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, which this year is observing its 50th anniversary and is being beset, like everything else, by change.

The recommendations were approved after spirited debate by a biennial conference of 500 ACLU leaders that ended today after five days of exploring such problems as drug abuse, abortion, data banks, environmental pollution and women's rights.

INTO NEW FIELDS

The mood of the conference suggested that in its second half-century the ACLU will be involved in Bill of Rights controversies extending far beyond such traditional areas of concern as free speech, racial justice and police procedures.

The changing direction was suggested by a paper presented by Jeremiah S. Gutman, a New York lawyer who is co-chairman of the ACLU Privacy Committee. The title of his paper was: "Inhaling, Ingesting, Imbibing, Injecting, Inserting, Incising, etc."

Gutman opened with these challenging words: "How personal can you get? The right of a person to control his own body is certainly, at least literally, the most personal of all rights."

APPEARS WILLING

"We are in the process of establishing on the student level the right to groom one's own hair and deck one's own body and progress is being made with a defeat here and there. It is not much of a step to include the right as a civil liberty, to deal with one's body as one will."

The conference appeared more than willing to take that step. By substantial majorities, it approved five basic policy recommendations on the use of drugs. Though the proposals are well in advance of present American opinion, it is worth noting that today's ACLU policies often become tomorrow's court opinions.

The five recommendations were:

That every individual has a right to use his own body as he wishes, and this right includes the use of drugs.

That the use and possession of drugs is not per se a crime and should not invoke criminal penalties, though antisocial acts resulting from the use of drugs should be subject to punishment.

That the state may regulate the sale of drugs, but the power to regulate does not include the power to forbid.

That involuntary treatment of addiction is a violation of civil liberties.

That the above resolutions apply only to adults, and the ACLU should take no position on the use of drugs by juveniles except to recommend a study on the rights of juveniles on this and other matters.

DISSENT NOTED

These proposals met with some dissent. A California delegate said he feared the ACLU would become "the unpaid lobby of the narcotics industry." An Ohio physician said it would be "criminally irresponsible" to contend that a pregnant woman had a civil liberty to buy thalidomide sleeping pills that might deform her baby, but the majority view was that this would be an unlawful act since it would harm another living person.

Additionally, the ACLU leaders, who met at New York University, felt that the right to live in an unpolluted environment was also a constitutional right which the courts should uphold.

The conference also decided that the ACLU itself has been insufficiently sensitive to the rights of its women employees, who with a few exceptions, hold no policy-making positions. It was pointed out that no woman was involved in planning the conference, and that only one chairman of its 15 workshops was a woman.

All of these expressions will be placed before the controlling board of directors. If the board specifically rejects a recommendation, it must be submitted to a referendum of ACLU's 150,000 members who are represented in 47 affiliates in 45 states.

RESPONSIBLE OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in February I distributed to Members an article from Arizona Architect entitled "Why Outdoor Advertising Must Be Controlled."

The article by Phil Stitt was a strong attack on uncontrolled highway billboards which he termed "a form of visual pollution."

I have a friend in Arizona, Karl Eller, president of Combined Communications Corp., whose activities include outdoor billboard advertising.

Karl and I differ on the approach but both of us favor control of highway billboards. He is a responsible leader in the outdoor advertising field and, in the interest of fair play, he has asked me to place in the Record a statement on "The Role and Record of the Outdoor Advertising Association of America Relating to Control and Improvement of the Environment." I am happy to do so and hope the Members will study it:

The Role and Record of the Outdoor Advertising Association of America Relating to Control and Improvement of the Environment

During Senate consideration of S. 1075, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Senator Jackson made reference to the fact that ". . . Congress over the past decade has passed a procession of landmark conservation measures on behalf of . . . (among others) beautification of highways . . . and other related areas . . . All of them in specific and specialized ways, constitute Congressional mandates on various aspects of environmental policy."

Moreover, Senator Randolph, in introducing the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1969, made reference to the Highway Beautification Program as an example of recent legislation that ". . . represent significant steps toward the enhancement of environmental quality . . ."

The standardized outdoor advertising industry supported the enactment of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965—the legislation referred to by Senators Jackson and Randolph as an early example of concern with the environment. Mr. Phillip Tocker, President of the Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., the national association of the standardized industry, consisting of approximately 500 members who erect and maintain outdoor advertising structures in over 10,000 markets throughout the nation, during Congressional hearings when the bill was first being considered, declared that ". . . our Association is in complete accord with the aims of the Administration in its efforts to beautify the countryside, and has tendered its complete cooperation to that end . . ."

One may ask, and properly so, why did the Outdoor Advertising Association of America support this legislation? It did so for two reasons:

First, OAAA's support of the Highway Beautification program was, in essence, an extension of its own policy against the erection of advertising displays in areas of natural scenic beauty or in rural areas where other businesses are not permitted. This policy of self-regulation is contained in the OAAA Code of Practices and is a reflection of the industry's sharing in the public interest and concern in maintaining a natural environment in the open countryside.

Secondly, OAAA supported the legislation because that measure confirmed the contention of the industry that outdoor advertising is a legitimate business that rightfully belongs with other businesses in commercial and industrial areas.

In this connection, it is noted that one of the principal objectives of the Highway Beautification Act itself was . . . "to promote the reasonable, orderly and effective display of outdoor advertising . . ." (23 U.S.C. Sec. 131(d)). The accompanying House Report to that measure stated: "The criteria to be followed in setting standards in both zoned and unzoned areas, designated as commercial or industrial, would be designed to assist the advertising industry to achieve an orderly development of this important and legitimate enterprise."

The Senate Report on the Highway Beautification Act contained the following statement: "The basic postulate of this provision

is that outdoor advertising is an integral part of the business and marketing function and an established segment of the national economy; as a legitimate business, it should therefore, be allowed to operate where other industrial and commercial activities are conducted".

We believe that the Highway Beautification Act has played, and will continue to play, a vital role in controlling our environment and improving its quality.

"THUMBSCREW STRATEGY" IN VIETNAM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the President's "Interim Report" on the Cambodian operation was no doubt intended to be reassuring to the American people. Yet it contained ominous overtones, as the following editorial from today's Washington Post points out:

VIETNAM: THE PRESIDENT'S INTERIM REPORT (II)

As we said in the first installment last week, there is not much to quarrel with in the President's claim that his Cambodian campaign has been "the most successful operation of this long and difficult war." Given the unhappy record, this is not the proudest boast, but never mind; we have captured vast quantities of booty and bought some time and it is idle to argue over just how much of a difference it will make militarily in the next weeks and months because that was never the critical question about the Cambodian affair. The question was not whether it would be successful (it couldn't lose in strictly military terms) but whether it would be in any sense conclusive—what useful, lasting purpose it would serve and where it would end. And the answers cannot be measured in stacks of captured rifles or the tonnage of liberated rice—they must be found in a larger frame, in the total context of this tormented war.

For the Cambodian sanctuaries were always there to be smashed, just as the port of Haiphong has always been there to be mined, and Hanoi to be leveled, and North Vietnam to be conquered by a land invasion—if the war was to be fought in the old, conventional way. The question from the beginning was whether the conceivable gain from this sort of war would be worth the risks of widening the conflict and of ultimate confrontation with the Russians and/or the Chinese. And the answer was always No. This was to be a limited war with limited aims; we were to supplement the South Vietnamese until they were strong enough to go it alone; the idea was to intensify our military pressure *gradually*, in an effort to alter the balance of force in a way which would either cause the North Vietnamese to give up the game entirely or bargain for some compromise settlement.

It was a thumbscrew strategy and it didn't work because every time we tightened our pressure the North Vietnamese tighened theirs and finally, after our involvement reached a certain level, the American public wouldn't buy the next turn of the screw. That was the real meaning of Lyndon Johnson's decisions to stop the bombing in March, 1968, and to cancel the next increment of American troops. While it was never admitted at the time, what we did then was to abandon the thumbscrew and it left us with three alternatives: to give up and get out immediately; to ease out in an orderly way which would still give the South Vietnamese a reasonable, realistic chance to determine their own destiny; or to resume the squeeze.

President Nixon rejected the first course out of hand and had seemed—until Cambodia—to be working the middle ground of the second alternative. And that is what is so deeply disquieting about his latest progress report, and his own reading of where Cambodia fits into his scheme of things. For he seems, inescapably, to be unable to face the brutal facts that Lyndon Johnson faced up to more than two years ago; he does not sound as if he sees any limits to this limited war; he seems, in short, to be toying perilously with this third alternative of taking up the thumbscrew once again, not as a one-shot, time-buying affair, but as a matter of fixed policy.

It is hard to read any other meaning into his sweeping promises and menacing threats. "There is one basic commitment yet to be fulfilled," the President said, adding: "I have pledged to *end* this war. I shall keep that pledge." How? Certainly, the President can end *our involvement* in the war, at the expense of American influence over what comes next; but this will hardly insure the great and global stakes he insists on attaching to the outcome. "Only this administration can end the war and bring peace," he said at another point and while this was probably a way of saying that he, rather than the opposition at home, has the power and the responsibility, it is also another way of suggesting that the United States can somehow determine the outcome unilaterally; it ought to be obvious by now that this can only be done either by *winning* in the conventional way or with the cooperation, one way or another, of the North Vietnamese.

This is where it all breaks down—in the President's seeming belief that he can bluff or threaten the Other Side into playing the game his way. "If their answers to our troop withdrawal program, and to our offer to negotiate, is to increase their attacks in a way that jeopardizes the safety of our remaining forces in Vietnam, I shall, as my action five weeks ago demonstrated, take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation." Well, that is one way to look at the President's action five weeks ago—as a token of his resolve—although it is a little curious to hear the President justifying the Cambodian operation, in part, on the grounds that, had he not made good on a warning which he himself issued, it would have "eroded the credibility of the United States before the entire world;" one way to avoid that might have been not to make the threat in the first place.

But there are far better reasons, of course, for not reviving the discredited thumbscrew and the first one is that it doesn't work. We talked a little last week of the Cambodian quagmire and the danger of pinning our Vietnam policy to the fortunes of the Lon Nol Government in Phnom Penh and this is only one piece of it. Assume that the old Cambodian sanctuaries have been neutralized for a time; new sanctuaries and new supply routes are already developing farther back in the Cambodian hinterland; there are miles of Vietnamese frontier with Laos; there is a massive North Vietnamese buildup above the DMZ and just below it in I Corps the war is hotting up.

It is all very well to argue that Cambodia is proof that Richard Nixon means business; it is as easy to read it as further evidence that Hanoi, which has been threatened by experts, is not much moved by threats. And it is all very well to deal in melodrama at the expense of a union leader whose soldier son might have been spared the bullet that killed him had we only cleaned out the sanctuaries sooner; Lyndon Johnson used the same argument about a grenade and a brave Marine who might have been spared, so the President said, had the President not halted the bombing in early 1967. If the history of this war tells us anything, it is that presidents can't control the destination of bullets or the flow of enemy forces and material down the trails and across borders and into Vietnam and Laos and Cambodia. So it is nothing short of reckless to pile so many chips on so many imponderables—unless the President seriously believes that he can't return successfully to the thumbscrew strategy and make it work, not just in Indochina but in the universities and in the streets and in the Congress of the United States.

In our view he cannot, and he ought not to pretend that he can; there are limits to what we can do and we have reached them; there are no "strong and effective measures" left to be taken that would not involve unacceptable risks—in Asia and at home. The genuinely bold thing to do now would be to acknowledge reality; to accelerate an orderly withdrawal with the time bought in Cambodia; to stop pretending to power and influence which we do not possess and ought not to be expected to have. If the President thinks he has it—if he believes he can reinvade Cambodia, or resume bombing of the North, or otherwise revive the tightening squeeze—then this becomes the most eloquent argument yet for passage of the Cooper-Church amendment to restore some measure of congressional influence over events. If we have read the President wrong, this amendment will not inconvenience him. And if we have read his meaning right, there is all the more reason for Congress to begin to define some reasonable limits on the power of the President to conduct a limited war.

ECONOMY IN TROUBLE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, an exceptionally perceptive analysis of the current condition of the American economy appeared in the Sunday, June 7, edition of the Washington Post in an article entitled, "Market Decline: A Crisis of Confidence."

The authors of the article have, I think, hit on the two major facets in the current crisis of confidence. Initially, they have focused on the failure of the present administration to fulfill its proper and necessary leadership role relative to the economy. This vacuum at the top is the predominant cause of the rather shaky condition of today's economy.

Second, Messrs. Rowan and Greer have very correctly considered, in depth, the lack of liquidity which is holding a sword of Damocles over our credit-oriented economy. The inability of the administration to responsibly deal with this, and other problems has brought about the erratic and almost disastrous recent actions of the stock market.

For some time. I have been endeavoring to point out to my colleagues these very problems. I commend this article to the Congress and to the public and urge a careful and thoughtful consideration of the revelations contained therein:

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1970]

MARKET DECLINE: A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

(By Hobart Rowen and Philip Greer)

At New York's Goldman, Sachs & Co., one executive said to a vice president as the stock market dropped to its broadest and deepest loss since the great crash of 1929: "Is the world coming to an end?" And the vice president responded:

"For the first time in my life, I can't say an absolute 'no' to that question."

In part, the gloom pervasive on Wall Street represented problems in an industry that got caught up in an inflationary, speculative fever and saw the bubble burst as trouble developed at mutual funds headquarters, in conglomerates and in the stock brokerage houses themselves.

But what began in early April and lasted until late last month was something beyond an in-house affair. The wild sell-off from early April until the end of May changed the character of what, in the first 16 months of the Nixon administration, had been the slowest bear market of the century.

The emotional response in a divided nation to widening war in Southeast Asia culminating in the killing of Four Kent State students by National Guardsmen, spilled over into the markets. Wall Street hates uncertainty—and all that could be conjured up with some degree of likelihood was more spending, higher interest rates, a possible liquidity crisis (no cash to run business and banking) and higher taxes.

The latter prospect, indeed, was underscored by the fact that without any announced increase in funds for Cambodia, the earlier-announced budget surpluses in fiscal 1970 and 1971 disappeared, assuring greater borrowings by the Treasury. "The decline reflects deeper concern about many more things than just the economy," summed up David Rockefeller, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Monte Gordon, research director of the mammoth Bache & Co. brokerage house, put it this way: "The market is just crushed with disappointment. Interest rates are higher now . . . corporate profits are off much more than was anticipated . . . unemployment is higher . . . the economy is still coming down . . . you have an obvious decline in personal income . . . the gross national product is declining. So you have all the factors that would have happened which they (the Nixon administration) in effect said wouldn't happen.

The coup de grace, practically everyone agrees, was supplied by the invasion of Cambodia, which appeared to contradict the administration promise that the bitter war in Southeast Asia would be allowed to wind down.

What followed was nothing less than collapse of confidence in the Nixon administration—triggered by its performance on foreign policy, the cumulative evidence that its pollices were not producing the desired results on the anti-inflation front and traumatic evidences of a divided society at home.

Gabriel Hauge, president of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. and a former economic adviser to President Eisenhower, says the market "obviously is telling us something about disappointments, frustrations, unhappinesses of some sort or another. I think Cambodia and high interest rates are involved. I think the rise in unemployment is serious to some people and the unrest in the country, in the universities and elsewhere. I think all these can come to a focus in a place like the stock market."

STARTED IN 1968

To 26 million people who own stock directly, to another 5½ million who hold shares indirectly through mutual funds and to countless men and women who are tied to the stock market through pension plans, profit-sharing plans, insurance companies, banks and other intermediaries, the great bear market of 1969–70 has been a traumatic experience which, most experts agree, could leave scars for years to come.

The stock market started its decline in December, 1968—a month after Richard Nixon became President-elect. For the next 16 months, it was a slow decline. On April 10, 1970, the decline picked up in tempo and the Dow Jones industrial average plummeted 150 points—19 per cent—in the next seven weeks to reach its lowest point since the end of 1962.

Hindsight is a popular tool among Wall Street experts. Using that tool, they see sound reasons why traders and investors began cashing in their chips.

They go back to the erratic fiscal and monetary policies of the Johnson administration, which tried to fight an escalating war in Vietnam without a tax bill to pay for it. They point out the premature response of the Federal Reserve Board in lifting its pressure on credit markets as soon as the 10 per cent income tax surcharge was enacted in June, 1968, thus feeding inflationary pressures. Then the central bank applied the monetary screws with vigor throughout most of 1969, a policy that many—especially the Milton Friedmanites—warned would create recession.

And finally, the experts say that Mr. Nixon and his aides incorrectly assessed how tough it would be to subdue inflation without creating recession—a belief that led to its somewhat discredited policy of "gradualism."

In all their public pronouncements, Nixon administration men have doggedly stuck to their forecasts that the "game plan" for the economy is fairly close to schedule, although Chairman Paul W. McCracken of the Council of Economic Advisers lately has confessed to some deviations. They assumed they could bring off a sensational victory (Treasury Under Secretary Charles E. Walker calls it the "greatest hat trick of all times") in which economic growth—now stalled—would be resumed without requiring policies that would bring a sharp reduction in investment or a serious increase in unemployment.

FEEBLE EVIDENCE

But the evidence the Administration could produce was far from convincing to the public or to investors. Inflation rates in the first quarter of the year accelerated; moreover, the decline in real output was more severe than either the plan or the preliminary figures had led people to believe. Then, unemployment scooted up to a 4.8 per cent rate in April—far above the 4.3 per cent average for the year that the Council of Economic Advisers had predicted.

To put it bluntly, the business community would no longer believe the steady chatter from the government's mimeograph machines assuring the world that all was just fine with the U.S. economy, and that the vaunted "game plan" was on schedule.

One high Nixon administration official said privately: "Sure, we're on schedule, and we're ahead of schedule in getting to high unemployment, and we're behind schedule in reducing excessive inflation. Just average those two things out, and you can see we're on schedule."

Or, as a sophisticated New York analyst put it: "There is little credibility in the administration's continued statements that the inflation problem is coming under control. Many believe that further action will be required, and concern grows about what this might mean after the congressional election. Voluntary controls could turn into mandatory controls, and some form of credit rationing is already being talked about in the highest circles."

Particularly unnerving was the talk of a "liquidity" crisis—the question of whether the banking and corporate structure will have enough cash and access to capital for normal operations and expansion. A swing into substantial deficits with no tax increase to compensate for the red ink would once again make the Treasury a heavy borrower, making it difficult for others to get funds. Even before the Cambodian crisis erupted, Henry Kaufman of Salomon Bros. & Hutzler estimated that the Treasury's net new cash requirements in the six months starting July 1 would be $13 billion to $15 billion, or as much as $5 billion more than in the comparable period of 1969.

PRESSURE ON INTEREST

Unless accompanied by a massive new shift toward greater money supply for the banking and industrial system, this could mean continued and greater pressure on interest rates.

And by all the usual historical standards, a decline in long-term interest rates should precede a recovery from recession. Thus, what worries financial men is not only that long-term rates are still at or near peaks, but the prospects are that they will stay high. So long as they do, economic recovery may be elusive.

By consensus, the market's fall resulted from a severe case of starvation. Credit sources were cut off, both for market operators and for the corporations in whose shares they traded. Interest rates rose to all-time peaks, as high as 11 percent for high-grade bonds, around 12 per cent for money borrowed in foreign markets and 8 per cent for financing by the U.S. Treasury itself.

Interest rates at such levels pulled money out of the stock market, as investors, watching values drop, found they could reap big returns in corporate bonds and government issues. This was only part of an enormous change in the pattern of savings, making the bond market an investor market for the first time in decades.

In the three years ending 1968, according to expert Sidney Homer, private investors placed an average of $9 billion into the bond market and $27 billion into savings accounts (most of which eventually went into mortgages). In 1969, this flow was reversed: about $29 billion of private investors savings went directly into bonds, and only $8 billion into savings account (which helps explain the housing depression).

While the economy was being cut off from its raw material—credit—the market itself seemed to believe government predictions that the difficult period would be short. A huge froth of speculation built up, fostered by the "go-go" mutual funds. Even as blue-chip foundation issues in the market were declining, speculation in such fields as conglomerates, franchising, gambling casinos and nursing homes ran rampant.

In May, 1969, the Federal Reserve's determination to squeeze the inflationary spiral broke through the speculative clouds and the market started on its first straight-down drop. Prices fell from mid-May to the end of July. The Dow Jones industrial average slumped from 975 to near 800 and the speculative favorites lost as much as half their value.

THE FALL RESUMES

The government's promises to go easy on the deflation held the market in a narrow trading range for the remainder of the year and prices began falling early in 1970. Another selling spree accompanied each sign that business activity was slowing but that the rate of inflation was still barreling along at an annual rate of 6 per cent and higher.

In April came word that unemployment was up to 4.4 per cent of the work force (it has since touched 5 per cent and that first-quarter corporate profits were down 11 per cent from the year-earlier period, more than 5 to 10 per cent decline that had been generally forecast. The rate of price increases, though, was reported at better than 7 per cent.

That seemed to be the last straw. The

market began its precipitous plunge, with the selloff ending on May 28, when the market staged its biggest one-day rally in history and followed up by pushing the Dow industrials ahead 80 points in four days. For the moment, at least, the near-panic was ended. But the problems remained.

"The single greatest specter hanging over the economy," says economist Paul Samuelson, "is what is now called the war in Indochina. The single greatest blessing that could affect the pocketbook of the American public would be for us to get right out of Southeast Asia and cut our losses."

If, needed, it is a "Cambodian market," it could cut both says: Walker, for example, says that "once the Cambodian clouds lift, things will look a lot better. Like New York Stock Exchange President Robert W. Haack, Walker attributed the spectacular recovery in the market to repeated reassurances by the President that the U.S. would be out of Cambodia by June 30.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE STATE OF THE NATION

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times continues to provide us with the most thoughtful and penetrating editorial analyses of the difficulties facing America today, and I would like to share with my colleagues three recent outstanding columns by Arnold Toynbee, Anthony Lewis, and Tom Wicker with insights that can be useful to all of us.

The three articles follow:

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1970]

PRIDE, PREJUDICE AND PERSUASION

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, May 15.—In one of the great Supreme Court opinions on freedom of speech, Mr. Justice Brandeis wrote that those who won America's independence thought "the deliberative forces should prevail over the arbitrary" in society. They wrote into the Constitution what they thought would be "the path of safety" for the Republic: "The opportunity to discuss freely supposed grievances and proposed remedies." They believed in "the power of reason as applied through public discussion."

But the democratic theory of free speech as a corrective for official error and a safety valve for public resentment cannot work when people get the idea that no one is listening. And that feeling, if one can judge from a distance, is a dangerous element now in America opinion.

LETTERS FROM HOME

A law student at the University of Pennsylvania writes to a friend abroad that he should be able to think rationally about Government policy and express reasoned criticism. But "I have lost this ability—I can only scream at the excesses and moan at the hypocrisy. If you can offer me any reason not to give up this Government for lost, I implore you to tell me what it is."

Or, from a woman in Flushing, N.Y.: "What should people do who sincerely believe in the American heritage of reform and checks on arbitrary power? Most such Americans detest violence, but also detest silence and inaction. All protests against arbitrary power have proved ineffectual."

And from a man in Allentown, Pa.: "I am sitting around watching my wonderful country be torn apart and feeling powerless to do anything about it."

THE DESPAIRING NOTE

Powerlessness. That must be a widespread feeling. Certainly it is a consistent despairing note among Americans who come to Europe these days and try to explain to their English or French or German friends what has gone wrong.

For on the face of things, Americans might well believe that nothing they say can affect the course of policy in the most ill-conceived disastrous foreign adventure in our history. No election, no protest, no reasoned argument, no lesson from experience seems to alter the central fact of American policy in the Indochinese war. That is our commitment to the Thieu-Ky Government in Saigon.

President Nixon may go down to the Lincoln Memorial in the early morning and soliloquize to a group of students about college life. He may redefine the limits of his Cambodian invasion to make it seem more acceptable to American opinion.

But a week later the South Vietnamese generals are talking about indefinite operations in Cambodia. The same men who have drawn us into an endless war on their behalf—men whose power rests entirely on American money and American blood—now confidently assume that we will suport them in a new theater. It is in that light that the issue now before the Senate, the proposed mild restriction on American warmaking in Cambodia, has to be seen.

The significance of the Senate proposal does not lie so much in the constitutional question of the President's power, which it cannot resolve. It lies, rather, in offering critics of the war some hope of change through the political process. For there would at least be hope; the President could not altogether ignore the feelings reflected in a Senate vote.

What the Senate can do, then, is to show that the system is still open to persuasion. It can prove wrong those who say that violence and revolution are the only answers. It can renew confidence in the power of reason. Or, to put it more modestly and more accurately, it can begin to do those things.

The picture of the United States as a country where minds are almost closed to persuasion is not one held only by frustrated American critics of the war. A sense that the political process is not working underlies the deep fear for America now felt, for example, by many leading British politicians.

"We depend so much on the United States," one man said the other day. "Not only in economics and defense but so much more broadly, in politics. We need your leadership. And now the basis of that leadership, the whole relationship between your Government and your people, seems to be falling apart. There is a dialogue of the desperate and the deaf."

TO RENEW CONFIDENCE

The comment came not from the trendy left but from one of the most solid figures in British political life. That is not surprising, for he and others like him care about the United States, indeed love it. They are afraid when they see its politics reduced to mutual invective, hate and violence.

The democratic process is not dead in the United States—far from it, as the reaction to the Cambodian invasion showed. But frustration has put it under terrible strain. By insisting now on a voice in policy, the Senate can begin to ease the frustration and renew confidence inside and outside the country.

IN THE NATION: BUT DOES IT REALLY WORK?

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—Sporadic violence is still breaking out on some college campuses, and once again, at Jackson State, wanton shooting by the forces of "law and order" has unnecessarily taken students' lives. But it is now clear that the primary response of students to the Cambodian invasion and the student deaths is not in the streets. They have returned to "the system," even to the "old politics," with a vigor and ingenuity that has astonished many politicians. So a major question now is what the response will be from "the system."

All week, student and faculty lobbyists have roamed Capitol Hill, working for yea-votes on such proposals to limit the war as the Church-Cooper amendment (putting Cambodia off limits to American forces after July 1) on the McGovern-Hatfield resolution (which would cut off funds for the whole war by mid-1971). Under the auspices of Dartmouth College, a "Continuing Presence in Washington" office, complete with computer, has been set up on Connecticut Avenue to coordinate the lobbying effort, and to keep new groups coming in.

Others are organizing something called Project Pursestrings, a citizens' group supporting the McGovern-Hatfield proposal and which claims to have nearly a hundred colleges lined up to send student-faculty-alumni delegations here in the coming weeks. The group also aims to organize letter-writing and other campaigns in the home states and Congressional districts of members of Congress.

Then there is Law Students Against the War, which is organizing law school delegations. Such ad hoc groups as a delegation of North Carolinians who are students at Northeastern universities have been buttonholing Congressmen and Senators, and more established organizations—for instance, Referendum '70 and the Young Republican Ripon Society—are taking on new energy.

CAMPUS MOVEMENTS

On the campus itself, the new activist organizations can hardly be counted. Princeton began the movement to make two weeks available to students next fall for working for or against Congressional candidates; this practice obviously will be followed by many other schools. In Ohio, sixteen campus groups have established headquarters at Oberlin to organize support and opposition in that state's Congressional races.

The University of Rochester started the National Petition Committee, which seeks 20 million signatures on an end-the-war petition, and at least 50 cents per signature. The resulting $10 million peace chest, sponsors say, will go to an "all-media campaign" to convince Congress that there is public support for measures to end the war. About 150 colleges are said to be taking up the petition plan.

The Peace Commencement Fund organized at Yale also aims at 100 campuses and its goal is $1 million to be poured into various Congressional campaigns. Participants are graduating seniors who will not wear caps and gowns, contributing to the fund the substantial rental fees for these garments.

This is by no means a complete accounting of what is happening, but it is perhaps enough to support the moving remarks of John Dixon, a University of North Carolina professor who came with students to visit that state's Congressional delegation, and told its members:

"It is vital to know that the students you see around you are not radicals or rebels. . . . They passionately believe that what we are doing in Vietnam, in Cambodia, in Laos, is un-American, unpatriotic, an offense against the basic principles which should give meaning to our country. . . . They have done exactly what we have told them all along to do—they have come forward once more within the system.

"They are now the moral conscience of the nation . . . for perhaps the last time in this

generation, they are back in the system. God grant that the system will be worthy of them."

But how is it to be demonstrated that it is? Thousands of other patriotic Americans express their patriotism through support of the President and his stated efforts to end the war; others, strange as it may seem, see patriotism in prosecuting the war even more vigorously. It cannot really be argued, therefore, that whether Congress passes the McGovern-Hatfield resolution is an all-encompassing and final test of democracy and "the system."

THE TEST OF FAILURE

What has to be determined, nevertheless, is, whether, in the nuclear age, Congress and the people have let the war-making power slip beyond any feasible democratic control, and whether, in the instant case, the political and propagandistic powers of the Presidency and the military make the war basically invulnerable even to massive popular opposition. Only if so has "the system" truly failed.

That will almost surely prove to be the case if the debate centers on such sophistical assertions as that the President will be embarrassed and his "credibility" impaired, or that, a limitation on the scope of his policy erodes the constitutional power of the Commander in Chief. These obfuscations are designed to prevent the people's representatives from moving "within the system" directly to a democratic determination of whether they will any longer permit the costs and casualties of a war that has no definable purpose and no visible end. If they have no right to end or limit that war, who does?

A DIRE VIEW OF THE UNITED STATES FROM ABROAD

(By Arnold J. Toynbee)

How does the United States look to the rest of the world these days? The Times put the question last week to the eminent British historian, Arnold J. Toynbee. The following is his reply.

LONDON.—To most Europeans, I guess, America now looks like the most dangerous country in the world. Since America is unquestionably the most powerful country, the transformation of America's image within the last 30 years is very frightening for Europeans. It is probably still more frightening for the great majority of the human race who are neither Europeans nor North Americans, but are Latin Americans, Asians and Africans. They, I imagine, feel even more insecure than we feel. They feel that, at any moment, America may intervene in their internal affairs with the same appalling consequences as have followed from American intervention in Southeast Asia.

For the world as a whole, the C.I.A. has now become the bogey that Communism has been for America. Wherever there is trouble, violence, suffering, tragedy, the rest of us are now quick to suspect the C.I.A. has a hand in it. Our phobia about the C.I.A. is, no doubt, as fantastically excessive as America's phobia about world Communism; but, in this case, too, there is just enough convincing evidence to make the phobia genuine. In fact, the roles of America and Russia have been reversed in the world's eyes. Today America has become the world's nightmare.

Like Communist Russia, America has committed atrocities in the cause of truth and justice, as she sees them. We believe that American fanaticism, too, is sincere. This makes it all the more alarming.

In terms of the number of lives taken and of lands laid waste, America's score is, unhappily, far higher than any other country's since the end of World War II. Would I rather be a Vietnamese who was being "saved" by the American Army, or be a Czech who was being "saved" by the Russian Army? Of course I would rather be the Czech. The number of lives taken and the amount of devastation caused by the 1968 Russian military intervention in Czechoslovakia were small, measured by the standard of America's record in Vietnam.

How is America dealing with her problems? As we see it, she is failing to deal with them, and this is the most terrifying feature of American life today. The American people seem to us to be moving rapidly toward civil war: middle-aged noncombatants against young men subject to the draft; the affluent against the poor; white against black; students against the National Guard (the most immediately perilous of all these multiple confrontations).

The American home front is more crucial than the ports in Vietnam and Cambodia and Taiwan and Korea and the Middle East. The decision on America's home front is going to decide the fate of the world, and the rest of us can do nothing about it. We have no say, but we, too, are going to be victims of America's domestic agony.

With growing anxiety, we watch a spectacle that we never expected to see. Who would have foreseen that America would repudiate George Washington's warning against entangling alliances? Or that America would cease to be a land of hope? And who would have expected to find himself wishing that America would box the campus for a second time within one lifetime—wishing, I mean, that America would retreat again into the isolation from which we were once so eager to see her emerge?

Is there, then, no hope of reconciliation on America's home front? I catch a gleam of hope when I recall some words that I heard an American officer let fall two years ago in a discussion on the international situation. "There are going to be many more Vietnams," this officer said, "though the mothers of America won't like it."

The mothers of America: This representative of the Pentagon had detected the great power that was going to be the Pentagon's most formidable adversary. The Pentagon versus the mothers of America. In Cambodia we now already have a second Vietnam.

The mothers of America have still to go into action, and I believe this is a battle that the Pentagon cannot win. In the mothers of America I do still see some hope for the world.

MEMORIAL DAY MESSAGE BY FRITZ HEINEMAN

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day, 1970, was a time to pause and reflect upon the sacrifices made by our brave soldiers. Such has been the tradition of this noble holiday in years past, and such will be the tone of remembrance in years to come.

One of the outstanding messages delivered this year was by Mr. Fritz Heineman, executive director of the United Fund for Franklin County, Mass. It was reprinted by the Greenfield Recorder, and I would like to include it in the RECORD and bring it to the attention of my colleagues and the American people at this time:

MEMORIAL DAY MESSAGE

(By Wayne A. Smith)

The most stirring, meaningful, timely address on the urgencies of the times we have heard came from the lips of Fritz Heineman, executive director of the United Fund for Franklin County, in the form of a Memorial Address with the 10th annual concert by the U.S. Air Force Band on the East here this week.

As our contribution to the spirit of the occasion and as a tribute to brave men throughout American History, we offer it here on this somewhat confused, yet nonetheless purposeful "Memorial Day Week". It follows:

"The opportunity to join in this auspicious occasion and share a few brief thoughts appropriate for our setting is one I accepted gladly; yet not without some feeling of humility and inadequacy.

"It is proper and fitting that we set aside these moments to honor the memory of those who paid the supreme sacrifice in the service of their country. It is particularly timely that we gather in this manner and demonstrate our respect for the bravest of America's brave—the men and women of the U.S. armed forces.

"For a longer period of time than most of us would like to admit, we have been subjected to a systematic and carefully rehearsed demonstration against the basic principles of Freedom's Foundation—Virtue, Patriotism, and Personal Integrity.

"We have witnessed, time and time again, a calculated endeavor to crush and destroy the wholesome pillars of society that have made our country great since the moment our Founding Fathers first set foot on American soil.

"On every side we are encouraged daily to: Tear down, protest, overthrow, subvert, undermine and disregard.

"The mere fact that tradition benefits from the experience of time is reason enough for some groups of people with questionable motives to establish a course of destruction and rampage, forget personal responsibility, cast off national obligation, disregard our heritage.

"Certainly today, as never before, America stands at the crossroads of destiny and awaits that moment when we pursue a course of action that will once again bring us together and unite us under the banner of the Stars and Stripes.

"The path of democracy is never easy! The worthwhile never comes inexpensively. The freedoms we enjoy today—including the freedom of privilege of dissent—are guaranteed not only by our Constitution, but by the lives of those who we honor tonight.

"Shortly after his inauguration, the late President Kennedy said: The path we have chosen for the present is full of hazards, as all paths are. But it is the one most consistent with our character and courage as a nation and our commitments around the world. The cost of freedom is always high, but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission.

"In that brief statement we catch a glimpse of the intangibles that once brought excitement and enthusiasm to the hearts and minds of the American people. Those precepts of courage, character and commitment.

"As we gather together this evening, it is imperative that we take this moment to rededicate ourselves to those American ideals for which so many have died. It is no less true today that it was at any other time in the history of our country that America stands as the only truly great nation where freedom and opportunity have dominion over oppression and a dictatorship that forceably imposes a political philosophy.

"I am told that in some circles it is no longer fashionable, acceptable, or socially correct to display any emotion or act that might be interpreted as an expression of American patriotism. Little encouragement is afforded the cause of flag-flying. July 4th celebrations are largely a thing of the past. Prayer in school is outdated; the singing of our National Anthem brings a moment of complaisancy!

"Addressing himself to the matter of individual complaisancy with regards to national patriotism, Lawrence M. Gould, president emeritus of Carlton College, issued the following statement: I do not believe that the greatest threat to our future is from bombs and guided missiles. I don't think our civilization will die that way. I think it will die when we no longer care. Arnold Toynbee has pointed out that 19 of 21 civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. There were no bands playing and flags waving when these civilizations decayed. It happened slowly, in the quiet and in the dark when no one was aware.

"With that thought in mind, I believe the time has come when we need to fly the flag. When we need to pray and sing our National Anthem. The time has come for us to expose, as frauds, those who attempt to burn our country and degrade us as a second rate nation. The time has come for us to establish our national priorities and determine that before any domestic problems can reasonably be solved we need to once again unite as Americans, proudly protecting and advocating a national policy of liberty and justice for all, tempered with a basic belief in God and the American ideal of individual freedom and coupled with the inalienable rights of happiness, equality, and the pursuit of personal initiative that allows each to achieve maximum potential.

"To those who advocate revolution and riot, disorder and destruction, I say look around you. Certainly there are areas that need improvement. But change, adjustment and progress come from building, not destroying.

"To those who say the system and establishment are no longer relevant—I say look around you. Unlike East Berlin, where walls have been erected in an attempt to keep its people from personal and political freedom, there are no walls in America. The only barriers evident in American society today are those created as a result of extremism promoted on behalf of personal gain at the expense of established American traditions.

"America is great because her people are free. Because they can compete. America is great because we are still the only country where the individual is more important than the system! Tonight we honor the dead. And yet, we also honor the living.

"I am reminded again of a comment President Kennedy once made at a gathering similar to ours this evening. Said he: Without belittling the courage with which men have died, we should not forget those acts of courage with which men have lived.

"Families continue to live on with the memory of loved ones who gallantly laid down their lives in defense of democracy and freedom. And in the last analysis, the depth of one's conviction and belief is not really meaningful nor convincing in the burning of an ROTC Center, the pelting of police with rocks and the wanton destruction of someone else's property. Again and again, the message of love so many say they wish to convey is best understood in terms of the Scripture as we read: 'Greater love than this hath no man than he lay down his life for his friends'.

"Just a few days ago many of us were saddened to learn of the death in Vietnam of Brig. Gen. Carroll E. Adams, Jr., son of Col. and Mrs. Carroll E. Adams of Charlemont. Forty-six years of age, lovely wife and family, community leader, pillar of his church—American extraordinary.

"He didn't have to go to Vietnam. He volunteered. I drove his parents to the airport last February to see their son off. Returning, I asked why he volunteered for a tour of duty in Vietnam when he didn't have to and already had a son serving there. The simple reply was 'He felt it was his duty and he had a commitment'.

"Following his funeral at West Point I spoke again with his father, Col. Adams, and as we talked he said this of his son: He loved his country and he died doing what he wanted to do, where he wanted to do it, when he wanted to do it.

"Ladies and gentlemen, it is this kind of dedicated servicemen we honor tonight."

FUNDS FOR SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, no one is hurt more by our current economic slump than the inner city teenager—particularly if he is nonwhite. This month, as millions of young people enter the job market at the end of the school year, teenage unemployment rates—now over 30 percent for black youth in most cities—will continue to rise.

In view of these grim statistics, it is difficult to understand why the administration has picked this year to scuttle an important source of summer employment for ghetto youth, the OEO summer program.

Last summer, 400 teenagers were employed in summer programs funded by the antipoverty agency in my district. This year, only 45 jobs for youth will be available under OEO's new emphasis on full year rather than summer employment.

Now that OEO is no longer in the business of providing summer jobs, we must look to a related program—the Neighborhood Youth Corps—to do even more this summer than in the past.

I am happy to see that a bipartisan group of 16 Senators has taken the lead in proposing legislation to provide an additional $100 million for Neighborhood Youth Corps. These funds mean 227,173 additional summer jobs for disadvantaged teenagers in public and private nonprofit agencies. A recent study conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors shows that our larger cities could easily and quickly make use of the extra NYC slots if funds were available.

Today, I am introducing companion legislation in the House. If Congress acts promptly, the new NYC funds can be allocated before we are too far into the summer vacation months.

The following article from the Minneapolis Tribune describes the bleak summer employment picture in Minneapolis. I am sure that the same story can be told in virtually every district in the country:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, May 24, 1970]

SUMMER JOB SCARCITY EXPECTED

(By Sam Newlund)

It's time to worry again about summer jobs for poor Minneapolis youths and the worriers are worrying hard this year.

Jobs are less plentiful than they were last year, whether you're under 21 or over. A general economic downturn, with layoffs in some industries, gets the blame.

And local antipoverty officials are embittered that the federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) has rewritten the rules in a way that means less than half as much poverty money will be available this summer for youth jobs as was the case last year.

But the poverty-program jobs are only a small part of the picture. Most youth jobs come from commitments from private business—and it's private business that is suffering from the economic squeeze.

At worst, the picture is what Mrs. I. G. Scott, former chairman of Hennepin County's antipoverty board called it: "Bleak."

At best, all poor kids who really want jobs can get them—but recruiters will be extra careful this year to make sure they are really poor. That's the view of Lloyd L. Brandt, summer job coordinator for the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce.

The youngsters, too, will have to be less selective, according to Robert Andre, manager of the Youth Opportunity Center, the agency that does most of the youth recruiting for business jobs.

Andre, who describes 1970 as "the leanest year we've had in the past several years," said his recruiters are trying to persuade disadvantaged youths that "they'd better take whatever they can get."

Because the inner city is the most heavily studded with poor families, jobs in that region are those gobbled up first by the poor job-seekers. And because industry and commerce is pushing to the suburbs, an increasing proportion of the total jobs can be found in those environs—if the job-hunter can get there.

For the past several years, industries affiliated with the National Alliance of Businessmen have pledged certain numbers of summer jobs to poor youths, many of them members of minority races.

Last year, the total number was 2,000. This year it's 1,500.

Last year, OEO granted the local antipoverty agency $180,000 for employment of 400 youths in governmental and public service jobs lasting about 10 weeks.

This year the figure is $90,000, but it must be spread over six months as part of a program that will eventually go year-around. Because of this and other funding cutbacks, only 45 youths will be employed in this year's summer program, according to Edgar D. Pillow, county antipoverty director.

There are other sources of summer jobs for needy youths—the Neighborhood Youth Corps, federal and state governments (including the Post Office), YMCA and YWCA programs and various agencies in city and county governments.

Civil service rules in local government agencies, however, are another barrier that job recruiters are trying to surmount.

In sum, an estimated 4,000 needy youths will again be job-seekers this summer. As of last week, according to Brandt, who coordinates Chamber efforts with NAB, the deficit was from 700 to 1,000 jobs.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Radio Station WHBL, of Sheboygan, Wis., has over the past several weeks aired a series of excellent editorials on environmental quality.

Although much has been written, said, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the environment, this series is most worthy and will provide valuable reading, I believe, for my colleagues.

The articles follow:

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—I: APRIL 27, 1970

As the crippled spaceship Apollo 13 limped home ten days ago, clean air for the crew to breathe and sufficient water to dissipate the great amount of heat generated became the keys to survival.

Our condition on the Spaceship Earth today is analogous. We live in a closed environment on Earth, with only limited amounts of air and water. Just as the astronauts of Apollo 13 contaminated their own air by exhaling carbon dioxide after the explosion, we on Earth continue to contaminate our vital environmental resources of air, water and land.

There is one difference—they couldn't help it. We can.

With the first national Earth Day, April 22nd, now past, we believe that the quest for a quality environment must continue to receive top priority from all segments of society, including the communications media.

With that thought in mind, WHBL will present a series of editorials on environmental quality during the coming weeks.

The record of accomplishment in Wisconsin during recent years is encouraging. Government and industry have responded with foresight and imagination in several areas of environmental concern.

We have led the nation with the enactment of the 1965 Water Resources Act which established water quality standards and reorganized our efforts. Secondary sewage treatment by Wisconsin communities is close to 80 percent, far ahead of most other states. We have banned the distribution, sale and use of the harmful pesticide DDT. ORAP–200 will provide the funds necessary for the construction of more advanced sewage treatment operations, while providing money to set aside land for public recreational use. Air pollution control standards have been implemented.

We have done all these things in Wisconsin, but just as surely as population growth, productivity increases and pollution are inter-related, we must do more.

In each of the major areas of pollution, there are short-range and long-range consequences. There must be short-range, immediate solutions as a holding action to deal with the effects, and there must be long-range unconventional programs to get at the causes of the problems.

In coming weeks we will address ourselves to this two-pronged approach.

Man has survived the ice age, the atomic age, and a space age, but it may be if he does not soon enter an environmental age, he will not continue to survive.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—II: MAY 4, 1970

A recent public opinion survey by Lou Harris found that the American people seem to be willing to move faster and further in curbing pollution than they have yet to be asked by their political leaders.

This finding was confirmed during the recent Earth Day and events related to it across the country. People are concerned. They are willing to support those leaders who will take action to improve the quality of the environment.

Consistent with this concern, we present today the second in our series of editorials on the environment. While we don't claim to be experts, we do have a few suggestions which we think merit consideration. Today we will address ourselves to the area of water pollution abatement; in future weeks we will consider air and land pollution.

Wisconsin communities lead the nation in percentage of secondary sewage treatment plants. But this is not enough. Such treatment is simply inadequate for any state bordering the Great Lakes. We are very familiar with the death of Lake Erie. Lake Michigan will suffer a similar fate if action is not taken soon. Advanced sewage treatment to remove all or almost all contaminants must be our goal. Since municipal government is one of the greatest water polluters, action at this point will do much to alleviate the problem.

State government funds will be available under the ORAP–200 measure to help in such advanced treatment. By 1975, if the ORAP program is followed, removal of phosphorus in the Lake Michigan and Lake Superior drainage basin will be largely accomplished.

This program must, we believe, have top priority and rapid follow-through by the State Department of Natural Resources.

In other areas, Wisconsin needs intensified research by public and private groups to develop new methods of reducing agriculture pollution. Agriculture practices must be modified. Greater care must be taken in the disposal of animal wastes. Better soil conservation methods are needed.

Although Wisconsin has led the nation in a complete ban on the distribution, sale and use of DDT, new rules to control the use of other harmful chemicals must be developed through the newly established Pesticide Review Board. At the same time, new kinds of pollution-free fertilizers and chemical pesticides must be researched.

Strict enforcement of existing pollution laws and development of stronger regulations must be demanded of state government. We believe that this state cannot afford the locking of horns between different agencies or departments of state government when it comes to the enforcement of pollution abatement orders.

With the construction of two nuclear power plants along Lake Michigan north of Manitowoc, we must consider the question of establishing strict thermal pollution controls and radioactivity levels. We believe that federal standards are not strong enough, and that compacts among Great Lakes states should be utilized in this matter.

Just as we must act now to purify our waters, we must be concerned with the contamination of our air—a subject we will consider in next week's editorial.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—III: MAY 11, 1970

Just breathing normally in a larger city today is equivalent to smoking a pack or more cigarettes a day. Air pollution is a critical health hazard for many of us.

In our third editorial on environmental quality, we will propose several actions that should be considered in meeting and correcting the problem of air pollution.

Most air pollution is produced by burning fuels, and about half of that is produced by motor vehicles. Wisconsin motor vehicles pour a million tons of waste into the air each year.

While the federal government has established auto emission standards, we believe that states must be responsible for enforcing the proper use and maintenance of air pollution control devices on cars.

Wisconsin should consider the implementation of a statewide inspection of such devices through its current program of random auto inspections. Automatic equipment is available which can do the inspection in about one minute. Since it is the state's responsibility to regulate motor vehicles, expansion of the inspection seems to us to be a logical action.

Reducing the number of cars on the road, especially in the larger cities of our state, also gets at the problem. Mass transit concepts should be researched for the Milwaukee area.

Wisconsin has been in the vanguard of establishing air pollution control standards for the entire state, with special emphasis on the federally designated air quality control region in the metropolitan Milwaukee area. These special standards will be implemented in June, and it may be advisable to extend them to other parts of the state.

Clean air to breathe and pure water to drink and enjoy are two of the three objectives that the state must adopt in its efforts to improve the quality of the environment. The third area pertains to our land. It involves the question of solid waste disposal. This area will be examined in our next editorial in this series.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—IV: MAY 18, 1970

Each day, every one of us contributes between six and eight pounds of trash to the solid waste disposal pollution problem. We throw away 50 billion cans, 28 billion bottles and jars, and 30 million tons of plastics each year.

Waste discarded by our advanced consumer society threatens to literally suffocate us if it goes unchecked. Increasing in volume, solid wastes litter our landscape and strain the facilities of municipal government.

It is on this third major pollution problem that we will offer some suggestions in today's editorial.

A two-pronged attack is necessary, we believe, in meeting the problem of solid waste disposal. We must strive to reduce the sheer volume of wastes, and we must develop methods of recycling wastes, thereby treating them as raw materials to be utilized.

Reducing the volume is largely an individual matter. It can be promoted by the development and use of containers which are degradable and returnable for reuse. Each of us can do something about the problem by being conscious of what we throw away and purchasing products that don't contribute to the problem.

As for recycling, state government and private industry should commit their full research and resource facilities to the development of recycling methods.

Others have done it. Lynn, Massachusetts, for example, plans to burn its garbage to generate electric power, thus saving on fuel costs and reducing air pollution from coal. Crushed glass from unreturnable bottles has been used as a base for more than a mile of interstate highway near Toledo.

Under a new federal pilot project in Madison, three federal agencies are researching ways of converting waste to woodfire for paper which will be made into boxes, corregated board and other paper products.

Each year, Americans scrap six milion automobiles. The junking of cars and their parts is becoming a major source of land.

If private industry cannot cope with junked cars, waste paper, empty cans and plastic containers, then we may have to consider a bounty payment financed by public funds. This may require new forms of taxation to cover the disposal cost.

Since a major obstacle to improvement of present waste disposal methods is political in nature, regional cooperation must be fostered.

While the suggestions we have made today and in the other editorials in this series are constructive actions, we must recognize that in the long run we are talking more about habits and attitudes. We will discuss this approach to environmental quality in our next editorial.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—V: MAY 25, 1970

If we are to improve the quality of our environment in Sheboygan, the state and the nation, certain basic habits and attitudes must be modified or changed completely.

We will direct our comments in this editorial, fifth in our environmental series, to the question of change as it applies to pollution control.

Our objective must be to convince people that they should take the necessary steps to accomplish what is socially desirable; that it is in their best interests to stop pollution.

One of the major incentive tools is usually associated with the pocketbook or profit-and-loss statement. A manufacturer, for ex-

ample, is under great pressure to offset rising labor and material costs by developing new techniques. He has been under no comparable pressure to clean up the air, water and land. We have instead provided a market incentive to pollute. This must be reversed through tax incentives and tax policies.

President Nixon has proposed a "user's tax" which would be sufficient to cover the cost of treating industrial wastes.

Habits and attitudes as they apply to population growth and balance must be confronted openly and intelligently. There is simply no question that there is a direct relationship between population growth and environmental pollution.

In the present decade, Wisconsin will gain more than 360,000 citizens. And by the year 2000, Wisconsin's population is expected to increase 33 percent.

We agree with Stanford Biologist Dr. Paul Ehrlich that the birth rate must be brought in balance with the death rate, or, as Ehrlich says, "mankind will breed itself into oblivion."

Too many cars, too many factories, too much detergent, too much pesticide, multiplying contrails, inadequate sewage treatment plants, too little water, too much carbon dioxide—all can be traced easily to too many people.

This opens up the whole question of abortion, birth control sterilization and the like, on which we do not propose to pass judgment. It is enough to say that new methods and new ideas are demanded by the seriousness of our population explosion.

In past weeks we have discussed specific programs and ways to change habits and attitudes. Next week, in our last editorial in this series, we will present our views on how to accomplish the goals of environmental quality.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—VI: JUNE 1, 1970

In achieving our quest for environmental quality, we believe it is important that all segments of society act in concert and share mutual goals and objectives.

The Sperry Rand Corporation, through its national advertising, says that it seeks to be "synergistic." This simply means that through the cooperation of all its divisions, the total effect is greater than the sum of each done independently.

In confronting our environmental problems, we must be synergistic. Government, business and industry, old people, young people, rich and poor, can achieve much greater results by a coordinated effort, not a fragmented, frenetic approach which seems to be developing in some quarters today.

Government must work together, avoiding duplication, eliminating contradiction of effort, and engaging in regional cooperation.

Younger people and older people must work together. Young people need the older people to complement their idealism with experience. Older people need the regenerative strength of youth. Youth, more than age has the capacity and the opportunity to talk across the borders between industry, science, finance, education, technology and government. There is much in the American experience that suggests powerful common incentives among all Americans on this question.

Wisconsin is a great state. We have much that is worth saving. The majesty of Lake Michigan on our east . . . the might of the Mississippi on our west . . . the beauty and solemnity of our wilderness on the north . . . the life-blood river arteries throughout the state . . . the thousands of smaller lakes and streams that add a respite from the teaming life of our urban existence . . . the grasslands, villages and meadows of our midsection . . . the fresh breath of clean Wisconsin air. Will all this pass on? Will the Lake die, the northwoods disintegrate, the rivers, streams and lakes become cesspools, the glasslands and meadows give way to unbalanced, uncontrolled urban sprawl; the clean air become the cause of respiratory disease?

The answer to these questions will not be determined by some government official or industrial giant; the answer will be determined by what all of us individually and collectively do to protect our environment.

Our environmental fate is in our own hands.

CAPT. GEORGE IRANON OF HILO, HAWAII, DELIVERS VALEDICTORY AT FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as Hawaii's Representative to Congress I learned with great pride that Capt. George Iranon of Hilo, Hawaii, was elected president of the 35th anniversary class of the FBI National Academy and that he delivered the valedictory at the graduation ceremonies held on May 27, 1970. The deep dedication which men in the field of law enforcement possess is strongly reflected in the address of Captain Iranon. It is with a hope that others may find some inspiration in his words that I offer his speech for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. Hoover, Senator McClellan, distinguished guests, families and friends, and members of the 85th session of the FBI National Academy.

Several weeks ago one of our instructors recited to our class the words of the song "The Impossible Dream" from the musical play "Man of La Mancha." The theme of this song may well have become the theme of this class: "To dream—the impossible dream,—to fight—the unbeatable foe—to bear—with unbearable sorrow—to run—where the brave dare not go." We came here to the "West Point of Law Enforcement" seeking an impossible dream—the answer desired by all law enforcement—the elimination of crime.

We came from every State in the United States, from the Nation's Capital, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico and seven foreign lands. We came determined to dedicate ourselves—to concentrate our efforts together—to prepare ourselves for the realization of our dreams, for the future of mankind. As we now prepare to return to our own departments—as we gather for the last time under one roof—I have the singular honor and with humble pride—speak for the 99 members of this 35th anniversary class.

We leave today with a deep regard for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the National Academy. The wisdom of Mr. Hoover in establishing this fine academy is self-evident in the exceptional contributions those graduates before us have made to law enforcement all over the world. To you, sir, we say with deep affection, "thank you"! We urge that you continue for many years as the spokesman of law enforcement. May I commend to you the high quality of instruction and administration we received for the duration of the course. The professional attitude of your staff, the honor and respect in which you and the bureau are held, was evident in their every word and deed. The courtesies, patience, understanding and assistance, day or night, of the counselors who receive diplomas with us today could never be adequately acknowledged.

We must convey to our administrators who made our attendance here possible, our deep appreciation, and assurance it will prove to be well worth the time and effort.

It is not possible to properly thank our wives and families who kept things moving at home. Especially, we are aware of the endurance, spirit, courage and understanding demanded of the families of law enforcement officers. We are as proud of you today as we can ever be; for any accomplishment of ours is equally yours.

We have been called the finest National Academy class ever. This is as it should be. I have witnessed an interchange of ideas and knowledge and an insatiable desire for learning that I would not have thought possible. I have never associated with a group of any kind so intent on self-improvement for the express purpose of better serving mankind.

There is no doubt that the exposure to men of all levels of law enforcement from many different agencies has broadened our horizons of knowledge, reinforced our courage and strengthened our integrity—the motto and the promise of the FBI National Academy.

As we leave here today to join with great pride the distinguished alumni of the FBI National Academy, each of us accepts the quest of the "Man of La Mancha" as our pledge: "To reach—the unreachable star! This is my quest, to follow that star, no matter how hopeless, no matter how far; to fight for the right without question or pause, to be willing to march into hell for a heavenly cause! And I know, if I'll only be true to this glorious quest, that my heart will lie peaceful and calm, when I'm laid to my rest—and the world will be better for this."

Aloha!

GEORGE C. WALLACE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post on Friday had a thought-provoking editorial on the election of George C. Wallace as Governor of Alabama and what it could bode for the 1972 presidential election.

Mr. Wallace as a third-party candidate in 1968 came very close to throwing the election into the House of Representatives by denying either of the major party candidates a clear-cut majority. The editorial points out, however, that the upshot probably would have been a deal with Wallace throwing his electoral votes to the candidate who could offer the best terms.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress strongly enough the importance of acting now in getting the House-approved amendment to abolish the electoral college in favor of direct elections before the Senate for a vote. It will take a long, hard campaign to win approval in 38 States to effect this vital change in our Constitution.

Many of my colleagues hold the same opinion. And I am convinced that, like myself, they will work hard to get ratification by the States before the next election. We cannot afford to do any less.

The editorial follows:

WALLACE AND THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The election of George C. Wallace in Alabama should be the signal for a full-scale drive in the Senate for enactment of the direct-election amendment. Foes of the amendment were prepared to say, if Mr. Wallace had lost, that abolition of the electoral college was no longer urgent. But with Mr. Wallace in a position to repeat his presidential race in 1972, Senator Bayh is quite right in pointing to the possibility of chaos in the choice of a President two years hence.

Of course the direct-election amendment was not designed as a means of saving the country from Wallaceism. It was written after long study by legal and political scholars to give the country a modern, workable and reasonably risk-free system for election of the President, Mr. Wallace comes into the picture only because he threatened to turn the country's existing crude electoral machinery into a horse-trading imbroglio in 1968, and came close to succeeding.

There is not much comfort in the fact that the Wallace margin of victory on Tuesday was a narrow one. As governor, he will once more have a power-base from which to operate, and there are many indications that he will again be pleading for support in the South on the basis of his "segregation forever" slogan. It might not be necessary for him to win 46 electoral votes, as he did two years ago, to hold the balance of power in the so-called electoral college. If the division between the Republican and Democratic Parties is once more close, he could win fewer votes and still be in a position to dictate who would be President and to exact a price for his favors.

It is well established that this was the strategy Wallace intended to follow in 1968. If neither of the two major candidates polled a majority of electoral votes, he did not intend to let the contest go into the House of Representatives. Rather, he indicated that he would decide it my switching his electoral votes to the candidate willing to make a deal with him.

The Senate is now squarely faced by the issue of closing the door to such unprincipled deals by abolishing the obsolete electoral college and providing for direct election of the President by the votes of the people. But it will have to shake off its lethargy if the constitutional amendment already approved by the House and the Senate Judiciary Committee is to be sent to the states and ratified by them in time for the 1972 election. Only a major effort involving the White House, congressional leaders and both political parties can produce a two-thirds vote in the Senate and ratification by 38 states before next April 15. But the objective of safeguarding the integrity of our electoral system is worth the effort. A special drive to get the amendment onto the Senate floor as soon as possible is in order.

ADMIRAL McCAIN

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 3, 1970, a great American gave the commencement address to the 1970 graduating class of midshipmen at the U.S. Naval Academy. That gentleman is Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., U.S. Navy, our Commander in Chief, Pacific. His message to the midshipmen is, in my judgment, so vital and pertinent that it should be made available and read by every American who loves his country. The address by Admiral McCain requires no commentary from me—it speaks for itself.

The full text of Admiral McCain's commencement address follows, along with a biography of this outstanding naval officer and military leader.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY ADM. JOHN S. MCCAIN, JR.

Exactly 39 years ago to the day, on the 3rd of June 1931, I sat where you are now with the expectations of youth and the stamp of the U.S. Naval Academy indelibly impressed on my character. And to save my life as I stand before you now I cannot remember who gave the graduation address for the Class of 1931. I hope you may manifest a somewhat higher span of attention and that I will make a more lasting impression on you.

You have just finished four years of intense study and training such as you will never experience again. There are those amongst you whose future intentions may include transferring to the other services or returning to civilian life as soon as circumstances permit.

To those who leave the service the schooling and training you have received will stand you in good stead. To those who stay, the Naval Academy trains the professional.

Your country expects you to take this schooling and serve the Nation to the extreme limits of your ability. There are times when this service will lead you into the valley of the shadow of death. And for some, unto death itself. I have friends and classmates who gave their lives that the citizens of the United States would be free to live lives of their own choosing, which includes your freedom to choose to become a Midshipman.

The greatest tribute that can be paid to the United States Naval Academy is recognition of the long succession of naval officers who have passed through these gates and have gone forth to give their lives for freedom. The historic battles in which they fought are recorded on both sides of this beautiful stadium. Their names are memorialized on plaques on the back of seats now occupied by your families and friends. These officers were imbued with a sense of loyalty and dedication that scorns vacillation and doubt. From your class, the class of 1970, will come the heroes of tomorrow. Sitting here in front of me are those who in keeping with the highest traditions of the Naval service will make the greatest sacrifice that a man can make for his Country.

This, gentlemen, is your heritage. You have been exposed to traditions that ultimately will become a part of your character. You will not question where your duty lies.

Today as so often in the past we are living in a troubled world. We are at war far from home under difficult and complex circumstances. Our leaders seek an early and honorable end to the struggle. There is reason for hope and measured optimism. One of the great acts of moral courage and discipline in this search for peace was when President Nixon ordered the execution of the Cambodian operation. This campaign has met our fondest hopes.

It has set back the enemy time table. The resources the Chinese Communists and the Russians are willing to divert and the problems of transportation have great bearing on this time table. The U. S. went into Cambodia to protect allied forces by destroying enemy sanctuaries. We did just this. By 30 June we will be out.

We have taken caches consisting of millions of rounds of small arms ammunition, over 5000 tons of rice and thousands of weapons. To give you some idea of the amount of captured rice, it would have fed over 15,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong for one year on a full ration. Even though the Communists return to the sanctuaries it will take them 5–10 months to bring in arms, ammunition and supplies to resume the same level of action. By this time the South Vietnamese Armed Forces will be in a better position to take over.

In South Vietnam the story is the same. The President's policy is sound and the current plan for withdrawal of 150,000 men is both safe and reasonable, particularly in view of our success in Cambodia.

CHALLENGES TO PEACE

However, I hasten to caution you that peace in Southeast Asia or elsewhere is not just around the corner. The challenges for the military officer have never been greater and service to country never more meaningful. The expanding projection of Soviet power world-wide through military, political, psychological, and economic means is well publicized.

First of all, and of particular importance to you fine young naval officers we honor here today, is the challenge provided by the recent emergence of Soviet seapower throughout the oceans of the world.

Secondly, there is the problem of the border conflict between Russia and mainland China, both Communist nations. It may appear on the surface that the United States has no interest in this dispute but we do. If war should come to these two nations, the rest of the world will be affected if not drawn into the vortex of this conflagration. We must continually guard against actions on the part of either Red China or Russia which by design or accident entangle or embarrass us.

Third, there is the very dangerous situation that exists in the Middle East.

Fourth, is the continuing question of the two Germany's.

Fifth, is the conflict in Southeast Asia.

And finally, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in Vienna are a forum in which the United States and Soviet Russia confront each other critically important interests at the conference table.

THE STRONG MAN ARMED

It is apparent that the United States must maintain a strong military and political posture in the world if we are to survive. This means a strong Army and Air Force, a strong Navy and Marine Corps. Although concerned with all four, the primary interest of most of you for the near future will be the Navy and Marine Corps.

The Navy and Marine Corps bring a mobile base philosophy to the defense establishment that applies directly to over three quarters of the earth's surface. One of the most profound changes in the history of warfare and yet little recognized has been the inland reach of naval power. The aircraft carrier, the Polaris submarine, the amphibious capability of the Navy-Marine Corps Team are outstanding examples. The profession in which you have been and will continue to be trained involves every aspect of modern warfare—land, sea, and air. Today the Nixon Doctrine places increasing emphasis upon the mobile forces of our entire military establishment.

As you embark on the profession of arms the single most important factor in reaching your objective is an understanding of the basic role of the Bluejacket and the enlisted Marine. This applies equally to the Soldier and the Airman. The highest accomplishment that an officer can achieve is mastering the art of leadership which means the ability to inspire the enlisted men to the highest performance of duty, particularly under enemy fire.

I now want to discuss the art of leadership. There is no "Masters Degree in Leadership." It does not lend itself to a mathematical formula recognized by certificate of diploma. It is above this. Although the greater num-

ber of us can never rise to the heights of John Paul Jones, David Glasgow Farragut, Ernest Joseph King and others, there are certain principles that act as buoys clearly marking the channel beyond which you are in trouble.

QUALITIES OF LEADERSHIP

As each man seeks his own way to heaven so each officer develops his own method of leadership. When you step aboard ship and stand in front of your first division of Bluejackets they will evaluate you accurately and without delay. In fact there is no more exacting method of determining an officer's worth. Furthermore you can't fool Bluejackets. They are quick to recognize the phony. If you lose the respect of these men, you are finished, you never regain it.

When you become a Commanding Officer, air, surface or subsurface, you are working at what has been referred to as the court-martial level. You are held strictly accountable for your command. You are the only one who can make the ultimate decisions. By the same token, you are the one who must bear the responsibility for failure. When matters go wrong you are the one who is subject to possible court-martial. Thus, and properly so, the road to high command is hard, tough and demands the highest of human qualities.

A mark of greatness is willingness to listen. In fact one commits a grave error who fails to seek advice. I listen to any member of my staff regardless of rank or rate. One of the most difficult problems to solve is the reticence of subordinates to speak out in the presence of seniors. To a certain degree this stems from custom and tradition which should not restrict the junior at the appropriate time. To surmount this barrier takes time and patience. If a seaman on the foc'sle says there is something dead ahead, I stop the ship to find out.

There is an expression, "officer and gentleman," and it applies as fully today as it did one hundred years ago. In fact, under the circumstances today that tend to degrade values of the past it becomes even more important. To quote John Paul Jones, "A gentleman is one who has the nicest sense of personal honor." His instincts are of such a high order that he never unintentionally hurts another person. This does not mean that he can't and won't if it becomes necessary to do so. In the days of the square rigger the oncoming officer of the deck in applying the code of an officer and gentleman made it a point not to change the set of the sails for the first fifteen minutes of his watch out of deference to his shipmate whom he had just relieved. Obviously certain conditions of wind and sea might require a departure from this rule. An officer must be prepared to move with equal ease as officer of the deck or in the highest and most complex diplomatic circles. The social graces are as much a part of his life as the rules of seamanship. These are requirements which remain unchanged through the centuries.

VALUE OF INITIATIVE

As you execute your duties, another attribute to cultivate is initiative. This trait is invaluable but also can lead to real trouble if not balanced with judgment and common sense. In this connection the regulations are to guide and not fetter the judgment. The only time I studied the regulations was in time of trouble. However I repeat that each officer must find his own way to effective leadership. The detail and style of leadership varies from one man to the next as much as the character and personality of two individuals.

The Naval Academy has subjected you to continual exposure to discipline which today is little appreciated in so many circles. Discipline is a basic and an indispensable element of success. The art of leadership and discipline are synonymous. No man is worth his salt without self-discipline. If you cannot discipline yourself you can rest assured that you will fail where others are concerned. He who lacks self-discipline cannot command.

This trait is equally important in the civilian world. You know of those signs that say "make love not war." You belong to a fraternity whose members are men enough to do both.

In this regard, the fact that you have earned your commissions is ample evidence that you are dedicated to the preservation of our values and institutions. This is in direct contrast to those we read about in the newspapers who preach destruction of the fabric of our society often without even the vaguest concept of what kind of structure and value system would replace it.

I once heard a distinguished gentleman say that the world consists of two broad categories of men, the S.O.B.'s and the good fellows. The good fellows are always helping each other up the ladder to success. But the S.O.B., you have to give him full credit, he got there on his own two feet. Your career as a leader falls somewhere between these two. It is just as bad to be a popularity jack as it is to be a S.O.B. You must be fair and square. You must be consistent.

HUMAN RELATIONS AND THE GOLDEN RULE

The cardinal principle of leadership is the Golden Rule—"do unto others as you would have them do unto you." It takes moral courage to issue an unpopular order and then to make sure of its execution. In this regard a policy of permissiveness at sea does not work any more than it does any other place in the world. A good officer instead of telling the crew that the Captain wants a certain order carried out executes in his own name without leaning on higher authority.

Men who have faced danger do not have to be introduced to religion. It has been said there are no athiests in a fox hole. Although I have never been in a fox hole, I spent my wartime years in a submarine and know that nothing makes a man turn more quickly to God than the uncertainties of battle. The brave man needs no lesson, while the coward thinks with his feet. I believe in God. He answers prayers. Never be afraid to acknowledge belief in a higher power. The profession upon which you are entering is dangerous and exciting. God is ever present.

In a few moments you will be sworn in as commissioned officers. You will take an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States of America and with this goes an obligation that is a privilege accorded to relatively few. Some of you may not understand the full import of this statement. In time you will. It means hard work, long watches, hours of flying, hours of fighting in swamps, heavy seas, and so on ad infinitum. You are on duty 24 hours a day.

You are about to become guardians of a great legacy. One handed down to you by generations of Americans, dedicated men and women, who placed their nation's welfare above personal ambition. The proud responsibility which you will share in passing on to a new generation our priceless values and institutions will continue to give quality and meaning to the American tradition.

Gentlemen, you are about to join the most exacting and honorable profession in the world. The future of the Country will rest in your hands. I am proud of the United States Navy. I am proud of you. God Bless each and everyone!

BIOGRAPHY OF ADM. JOHN S. MCCAIN, JR., U.S. NAVY

John Sidney McCain, Jr., was born in Council Bluffs, Iowa, on January 17, 1911, son of Mrs. John S. (Katherine Vaulx) McCain and the late Admiral McCain, USN. He attended Central High School in Washington, D.C., prior to his appointment (at large) to the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, in 1927. He was graduated and commissioned Ensign on June 4, 1931, and subsequently advanced to the rank of Admiral to date from May 1, 1967.

From June 1931, he served for two years in the U.S.S. *Oklahoma*, a unit of Battleship Division One, Battle Force. He reported in June 1933 for instruction in submarines at the Naval Submarine Base, New London, Groton, Connecticut, and, after completing the course in December of that year, served successively in the U.S.S. *S–45* of Submarine Force, Pearl Harbor, and the U.S.S. *R–13* of Submarine Division Four, attached to the Naval Submarine Base, New London.

From June 1938 until May 1940, Admiral McCain served as an Instructor in the Department of Electrical Engineering at the Navy Academy. Following duty at the Naval Academy, he served in the Submarine U.S.S. *Skipjack* until April 1941.

He next reported as Prospective Commanding Officer of the *U.S.S. O–8*, which was being refitted in the Philadelphia Navy Yard. He commanded her from her recommissioning until May 1942.

Ordered to the Electric Boat Company, Groton, Connecticut, he had charge of fitting out the U.S.S. *Gunnel*, and assumed command of that submarine at her commissioning August 20, 1942. Under his command, the *Gunnel* arrived at Fedala, French Morocco, a few days before the D–Day bombardment, in time to photograph the proposed beachhead and make a general reconnaissance of Casablanca and Fedala. Later, he took *Gunnel* to the Pacific, where she sank an enemy destroyer and sank or damaged additional Japanese shipping.

On July 14, 1944, he was ordered to New London, where he served briefly before reporting in October to the Electric Boat Company, to fit out another submarine, the *U.S.S Dentuda*. He served as Commanding Officer her first (and only) war patrol in the Pacific; turning over command of the *Dentuda* at the cessation of hostilities on August 14, 1945.

For service in combat during World War II, he was awarded the Silver Star Medal, the Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V" and two Letters of Commendation, with authorization to wear the Commendation Ribbon, Star, and Combat "V". One Letter of Commendation came from the Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, and the other from Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

The Silver Star Medal was awarded for "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action as Commanding Officer of a submarine (the USS *Gunnel*) in enemy Japanese-controlled waters . . . (in which he) succeeded in sinking an important amount of Japanese shipping, including a destroyer. His bravery under fire and aggressive fighting spirit were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service . . ."

The citation to the Bronze Star Medal, awarded for "heroic service as Commanding officer of the USS *Dentuda* during the first war patrol of that vessel in enemy Japanese waters of the East China Sea and Formosa Straits Area . . ." commends him for "sinking an enemy vessel of 4,000 tons and damaging two small crafts totaling 350 tons" and subsequently returning his ship to port.

The Letter of Commendation (CINCLANT) reads in part: "For meritorious service . . . during November 1942. Commander John S. McCain, by extremely skillful and daring handling of his ship performed special missions which contributed materially to the successful execution of an extremely difficult landing of a large expeditionary force on a strange and poorly charted coast. (His) successful performance of hazardous duty resulted in the unqualified success of future operations . . ."

Letter of Commendation (CINCPAC): "For distinguishing himself . . . during a

war patrol . . . With a well planned attack, he sank more than 9,000 tons of enemy shipping . . ."

Returning to the United States in November 1945, he served in the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., as Director of Records, until January 1949. Again ordered to duty afloat, he commanded Submarine Division Seventy-One for eleven months and then commanded Submarine Division Fifty-One for two months. In February 1950, he joined the heavy cruiser USS *St. Paul* as Executive Officer and in November of that year returned to the Navy Department. Reporting to the Office of the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations), he served as Director of the Undersea Warfare Research and Development Branch until March 1953, when he became Commander Submarine Squadron Six.

In July 1954, he assumed command of the USS *Monrovia* (APA–31), and in May 1955 was detached from command of that attack transport for duty as Director of the Progress Analysis Group in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

In August 1957, he was designated Commanding Officer of the then heavy cruiser, USS *Albany* (CA–123), and the following March was ordered detached for duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. On June 23, 1958 he reported as Chief, Legislative Liaison, Executive Office of the Secretary of the Navy, and on November 9 of that year was promoted to Rear Admiral. On August 10, 1960, he became Commander Amphibious Group TWO, and on May 26, 1961, he assumed the duties of Commander Amphibious Training Command, Atlantic Fleet.

In September 1962, he reported as Chief of Information, Navy Department, Washington, D.C. He left that post one year later to assume, as Vice Admiral, the duties of Commander Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet. While serving in that post the Admiral received his first Legion of Merit for his leadership of naval forces in the Caribbean during the crisis in the Dominican Republic. He received a Gold Star in lieu of a Second Legion of Merit for his outstanding performance as Commander, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet.

In June 1965 he reported as Vice Chairman of the Delegation to the United Nations Military Staff Committee, New York. At the same time he became Commander Eastern Sea Frontier and Commander Atlantic Reserve Fleet. In October 1966, with the reorganization of the Reserve Fleets, he was relieved of the latter command.

Immediately prior to his detachment as Vice Chairman of the U.S./U.N. Delegation, Military Staff Committee, in April 1967, he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of his Third Legion of Merit. The medal was for meritorious service during the period July 1965 to April 1967 while serving in that post.

After being detached in April, he assumed the duties of Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe, on May 1, 1967 and for "exceptionally meritorious service . . . (in that capacity) from April 1967 to July 1968 . . ." he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. The citation further states in part:

"Responsible for maintaining the United States Naval Forces in the European area at a high state of readiness, Admiral McCain anticipated U.S. requirements and prepared his command with great professional skill for contingency operations during the Middle East crisis, resulting in the strategic location of surface, air, and amphibious forces in the Eastern Mediterranean for the most effective utilization in any contingency. The clarity, forcefulness, and wisdom of his guidance to subordinate commanders during the Arab-Israeli War, the USS LIBERTY incident, and the Cyprus crisis of 1967 ensured alert and prepared forces promptly deployed in a maximum state of combat readiness, and thereby contributed significantly to a decrease in international tension in each instance. Throughout his tenure in command, Admiral McCain took innovative and sound measures to increase the readiness of naval forces. By his efforts, the Sixth Fleet was provided the guidance and organizational assistance to make it an effective and ready force for peace.

In July 1968 he became Commander in Chief, Pacific.

In addition to the already mentioned decorations, Admiral McCain has the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp; American Campaign Medal; European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with engagement star; Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with three stars; World War II Victory Medal; Navy Occupation Service Medal, Asia and Europe Clasps; China Service Medal; National Defense Service Medal with bronze star; the Korean Service Medal; Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal; and the United Nations Service Medal. He also has the Korean Presidential Unit Citation Badge.

He and Mrs. McCain, the former Roberta Wright of Los Angeles, California, have three children, Mrs. Jean McCain Flather, Lieutenant Commander John Sidney McCain, III, USN, and Joseph Pickney McCain. Their official residence is Washington, D.C.

IN THE AFTERMATH OF CAMBODIA

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks all of us in Congress—and indeed all American citizens everywhere—have been deeply concerned and anxious about the Southeast Asian situation, no matter where our judgments lie about the U.S. military effort there. I have received thousands of letters and telegrams from constituents and many thousands of names more have come into my office on various petitions. These communications reflect, among other things, the tremendous public interest in our present policy not only in Vietnam, but in Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand as well. They reflect, in part, the tragic, dangerous polarization between citizens of this Nation. They reflect the anxious concern of the young for the world they are about to inherit; and they reflect the troubled exasperation of many older Americans who feel that the young are irresponsible, if not dangerous.

Some of the letters which I have received—on both sides of the question—have been couched in extreme, intemperate language and have not been constructive. Some have been prompted by organized efforts to procure signatures and many have been mimeographed "form" letters. But hundreds and hundreds have come without noticeable impetus from any group, and merely reflect the deep interest of many sincerely troubled citizens.

In addition to the great volume of mail, I have also visited with many individuals and groups who have come to Washington to talk about what the proper congressional role should be in the difficult and frustrating task of extricating our Nation from Vietnam. There have been roughly 25 of these delegations, comprised of hundreds of persons, and I have opened my office to all of them because I think it is important that we make every effort to talk to one another—especially in times of great national strife—rather than shouting past one another.

This was also my basic motivation in agreeing to be a member of an ad hoc committee of Congressmen who held hearings on the question of our Indochina involvement and the collateral crisis on the campuses of our country. We sent invitations to approximately 1,200 colleges and universities throughout the country, asking them to send representatives to testify. Young people from over 50 college communities responded and the statements which they read—and the questioning these statements elicited—gave them an opportunity to present their views in a systematic way to the House of Representatives for 2 full days.

In addition, I was pleased to have students from Cornell University—which is in my congressional district—use my office during the 2 days preceding the May 9 Washington demonstration to help coordinate the arrivals and activities of the thousands of college students who came from the Ithaca, N.Y., area to the Capital for that event.

Throughout this difficult time, I have attempted—through my public comments—to keep the citizens in my district fully apprised of my opinions on these most important matters. The issues are not easy ones, and I am now more convinced than ever that the solutions are not easy either. But to make some of my present positions as clear as possible, I thought that it might be useful to set forth three items at this time. First, I present portions of the statement which I made to the hundreds of student and faculty visitors I had in my office just before the May 9 demonstration in Washington. Second, I set forth a speech I recently made to both the Purchasing Management Association in Elmira, N.Y., and the Masons at their annual dinner-dance in Owego, N.Y. Third, I include a statement which I made at the time I introduced a resolution urging the President to establish a high-level commission to investigate the tragic deaths at Kent State and Jackson State and to consider the causes and underlying problems behind recent campus unrest.

The items follow:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE YOUNG PEOPLE AND OTHER INTERESTED RESIDENTS OF THE 33D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

On the eve of the May 9th Peace Demonstration, I would like to communicate with those students and other young people from the 33rd Congressional District of New York who support that demonstration. My thoughts are those of a man well over thirty, and I would be the first to admit that my ability to communicate with younger men and women suffers from that fact, but there is much that we must try to say to one another.

For my part, I understand your frustration, your anger and your sorrow. If I read you at all correctly, you are frustrated at your inability to stop the violence in Southeast Asia; you are angry that the present Administration seemingly ignored you (among many others) in making its decision to move into Cambodia; and you are sorrowful that America has come so close to losing her sense of

balance in this complicated and dangerous time. And, although we see the events of recent days from different perspectives, I think you and I share one underlying belief—that the Vietnam war is the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and for the wrong reasons; and that whatever military value or moral justification the conflict might once have had for this Nation, there is virtually none now.

Significantly, the first major "pressure group" which recognized the major fallacies behind our Vietnam involvement was the young. It was the energy and idealism of the young which largely served as the impetus for a change in our posture in Southeast Asia, and until the recent Cambodian decision, I would have argued that you had indeed helped reverse the tragic escalation and the senseless buildup in Vietnam.

The President says that his Cambodian decision has not changed his intent to withdraw from Vietnam and even argues that success in Cambodia will facilitate that process. Though I hope and pray he is right, only time alone will tell. But, in the meantime, even such a temporary and limited escalation of the conflict has cost us much at home in terms the President may have failed to reflect upon—not the least of which is the fact that, from now on, the Administration and American youth will have an even harder time communicating with one another.

Then, as if to further widen that gap, two days ago the House of Representatives refused to adopt an amendment to the Military Procurement Bill which—though there are some signs that the President would not have objected thereto—would have confirmed what I believe is the underlying "sense-of-Congress" against any widening of the war into such adjoining areas as Cambodia, Laos or Thailand. I supported the strongest of such amendments because I saw its adoption as *necessary* to clarify and confirm what I believe to be Administration policy, and *necessary*, too, as a step towards reinserting Congress back into the foreign policy decision-making process.

Though other reasons were also involved, when that amendment failed, I voted against the bill in question—becoming one of only 69 Congressmen to do so.

I do not question the motives of my colleagues who took a different position—that is their prerogative—but I can well see how this bit of inaction could appear to you to be part of the "same old story.

And so it is in large part these two events—the President's decision and Congressional indecision—which, combined with the tragic occurrence at Kent State, form the backdrop for the present tension and confused anxiety that brings so many of you here to Washington this weekend.

For myself, I welcome your coming—and I know that many other young people who will not come will, nevertheless, be here with you in spirit.

Yet, unfortunately, there will be others here who would play upon your emotions, who would ignite your frustrations, who would encourage your demonstration of convictions to become a study in volence. Some of these people will hope for violence to use it as a vehicle for subverting the values which you cherish; and I suppose that some others will hope for violence in order to discredit you and brand you all as senseless anarchists.

I know that the pressures are intense, and I know that the events of the past few days have caused you great heartache and dissatisfaction, but I implore you to refuse to bend to the heat of the moment and thereby allow this demonstration to become violent. Our Nation is already polarized to an extent which may have no parallel since the days of the Civil War; and further polarization will only detract from the purpose of your presence in Washington.

You have a message—a most vivid and important message. Allow it to be heard unprejudiced by violence!

But for me to suggest that a peaceful demonstration will advance your purposes more than a violent one requires me to express my belief that you can be heard—that you must be heard—on the merits of your convictions. My views can be interpreted as "establishment-oriented." After all, I am part of "the establishment," but, in being a part of that system, I see the opportunity for you to effect change in that system. Frustration may be appropriate at the moment—we are all frustrated—but frustration must be turned into a positive force. Some continuing effort is needed; for if you settle for frustration as being the end product of the feelings on your compuses, then the efforts of those of you who have unrelentlessly prodded our Nation to take a better road have been wasted.

My message, then, is that you do have the ability and opportunity to help bring change. The change may not be as quick as some of you would like, and the change certainly will not be brought about by those who choose violence, but a vast opportunity is present for those of you who truly wish to work for a more responsible and responsive societal order.

Your numbers, in fact, are so great that the course of this Nation is more yours to direct—and in shorter time—than you may realize; and then our future will be wholly yours to cherish and protect.

HOWARD W. ROBISON,
Member of Congress.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN HOWARD W. ROBISON DELIVERED IN ELMIRA, N.Y., MAY 21, 1970

These past two weeks have been very difficult ones—for the Nation, for its citizens, and for those as well who have sought to serve that nation and its citizens, either in the uniform of its armed services, in positions of high executive responsibility, or in its national legislature, the Congress of the United States.

There has, during these past two weeks, been an unprecedented outpouring of rhetoric—both verbal and written—a great public outcry of almost totally-unrestrained passion of all sides, appeals to emotion, demonstrations and counter-demonstrations, accusations and counter-accusations, demands for the impeachment of the President and Vice President, and counter-demands for their full support in the name of patriotism, and, all in all, such scenes of tumult and human tragedy as to bring into serious question the ability of the Republic to survive such a strain.

Curiously enough, all of the invective of recent days has been directed by American against American—and none of it against the enemy in this war that so occupies our attentions; a war over which our Country has become more intensely divided than at any other time, except for the Civil War, in its entire history.

It is no longer possible for many of us to discuss the dilemma in Vietnam in a rational manner; but it is exceedingly important that we strive to do so, as I would like to try to do now.

I do not expect all—nor even perhaps a majority of you—to agree with what I have to say; this is an issue with regard to which no one any longer expects consensus—the last man who specifically yearned for that over Vietnam having long since been retired to his ranch in Texas.

In any event, for a number of years now I have personally thought—and said—that, for us, our deep involvement in an effort to solve the internal problems of the Vietnamese people was a foreign policy mistake of tragic proportions, the true costs of which—in terms other than those measureable in lives and treasure—are still being determined.

I do not say we should not have tried to help—in a limited way—the people of South Vietnam to preserve what we saw, if they did not, as their chance at "self-determination." Such an attempt, on our part, was surely not "immoral," as some have charged; indeed, it may even have been our duty so to try, given our then view of the world around us in those post-World War II and Korea years, and our groping for an understanding of the kind of role America should play therein until such time as there was some better international peacekeeping machinery than the United Nations could yet promise.

Nor, in the sense of the currently-developing Constitutional debate over the war-making powers of the President vis-a-vis Congress, was there anything "illegal" in that effort up, at least, to the time when Lyndon Johnson, through a series of seemingly logical decisions, began to take over the feeble efforts the South Vietnamese were making in their own behalf and turned the conflict into a war by Americans against a confusing variety of other Vietnamese.

This, as I now see it, was our basic mistake—for what we took over was a war we could not possibly "win" in any valid military sense, unless one chose to totally ignore the limited purposes that led to the first establishment of an American presence in Vietnam.

For, if there is one lesson we should have learned above all others out of all this, it is that one nation simply cannot win a war for the people of another nation; at best, it can only ever help *them* to do so.

Oh, this is not to say that we could not, and at almost any time we wished, have totally flattened the "enemy" in Vietnam—and possibly gotten away with it without any intervention by Russia or Red China.

But what would we have had left?

At best, an American "colony" of sorts—that we would have had to rebuild, and whose probably unhappy and sullen citizens we would have had to nurture and protect for years during a time when all the forces of a new wave of "nationalism" in that part of the world would, along with our own misgivings, have been pushing us in the opposite direction?

It seems to me that this would about have been it.

And so, checking my speech files, I found myself saying, back in May of 1968—and there were advance echoes of the now so-called "Nixon Doctrine" in my remarks—that, while we may ". . . have a responsibility—because of our strength—to do what we can to help 'organize a durable peace' in this troubled world (to borrow the phrase from Dean Rusk, who uses it often) . . . we, alone, cannot and should not try to ensure and maintain peace anywhere and everywhere in such a world."

In those same remarks, I questioned whether Vietnam was, therefore, the proper place to take a stand for "freedom" in the abstract sense, or the wisest choice of strategic spots, if such were our true purpose, to have drawn an indelible line of containment against Communist aggression, of either the North Vietnamese or the Red Chinese variety.

Finally, on that same occasion, in commenting upon the then-developing public attitude toward Vietnam's mounting costs, I said: "People have an instinctive feeling, the correctness of which is hard to deny, that even worthwhile objectives can have a price beyond which it is foolhardy to pay . . . (and that) as, in battle, not every hill is of equal value in lives so, in a long struggle, not every battlefield is worth the same cost to a nation's resources."

For it has been increasingly hard for me—and, I assume, for many of you—to justify the length and the cost to us of trying to

fight a war for the South Vietnamese in terms of our *own* national interests.

Southeast Asia is an important part of the world for us—but not as important as other areas, the Middle East, for one.

I know about the "domino" theory—and there is certainly some validity in it—but one can play "dominos" in more than one part of this troubled world at one and the same time, as the Russians may very well be doing while keeping us bogged down as we are in our Southeast Asian morass, and dangerously divided and uncertain of purpose at home.

Thus, I think it quite properly has become necessary for us to ask ourselves whether our government's first order of business should be to preserve South Vietnam—or to preserve the United States of America, itself, so that it could not only once again look more effectively to its more-clear, and perhaps more-compelling, responsibilities abroad, as well as to its own manifold and manifest internal problems.

Now, it clearly is not easy for a great and proud nation such as ours to change course in mid-stream, so to speak.

None of us like to think we could have made a mistake—none of us like the thought of defeat; though, if our purpose was to keep South Vietnam from being taken over by aggression from without, we clearly have not been "defeated" in that regard.

And all of us are familiar with patriot Stephen Decatur's toast—as offered in 1816: "Our Country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our Country, right or wrong!"

But there is yet another verison of that slogan—with its appeal to all patriotic Americans; the one as offered by Carl Schurz, in his speech to Congress in 1872: "Our Country, right or wrong. When right to be kept right, when wrong to be put right!"

And so I would think it was the force of public opinion, re-directing itself as I have suggested towards the true nature of our problem in Vietnam, that—in at least an indirect manner—brought about, first, the retirement of Lyndon Johnson to private life and, then, the election of Richard Nixon as his successor.

Whether or not actually possessed of a "plan" to bring the war, insofar as we were concerned, to some recognizably successful conclusion—an exceeding complex and difficult task under the circumstances—most of us thereupon took heart from Mr. Nixon's subsequently announced policy of "de-Americanizing" the conflict by withdrawing so gradually therefrom as to leave behind a South Vietnam with a chance of surviving on its own. Admittedly, such a policy was a risky one, offering no guarantee of success. While, in many ways, not constituting a good solution—and perhaps there was none such—I have supported this policy as seemingly the only "solution" available to us, and I have done so against the urging of those who, seeing no better or worse way out, have tried to tell me we should just quit without trying to make the best out of the worst.

I have also said repeatedly—the most-recent occasion for doing so following the President's announcement of his plan to bring still another 150,000 of our combat troops out of South Vietnam during the next twelve months—that I believe this policy of withdrawal to be an "irreversible" one, paced to but not dependent upon the success of the collateral effort as also directed by the President to "Vietnamize" what might remain of the conflict.

I would, however, be less than honest, both with myself and those of you, my constituents, who may depend, in a limited way, upon my judgment in matters such as this, if I did not now admit that the President's surprising move—in force—into Cambodia has caused me to re-examine this latter question.

On the one hand, I listened intently that Thursday night as Mr. Nixon declared, "The action I have taken tonight is indispensable for the continuing success of the withdrawal program" and as he then added, "A majority of the American people want to end this war rather than to have it drag on interminably, (and) the action I have taken tonight will serve that purpose."

While I hope and pray such will prove to be the case, there are, on the other hand, so many ambiguities about our new situation, and so many parallels between this most-recent decision and certain other military decisions as made by former President Johnson respecting Vietnam, as to lead me to share, evidently, with many of you, my constituents, that sinking feeling of ". . . here we go again!"

On the basis of immediate military considerations alone, a fairly compelling case can, I suppose, be made for the President's difficult—and, in some ways, courageous—decision; though I would have preferred to see the incursion into Cambodia, if there was to be one, made by South Vietnamese forces alone. That would have been one further way of testing whatever progress has actually been made under the "Vietnamization" program—and a dramatic test, as well, of what most of us have understood to be the thrust of the so-called "Nixon Doctrine" in such a situation.

However, the die has already been cast for us in the other direction.

Perhaps our troops in Vietnam can be brought home faster through Cambodia; I have my reservations about that, but time, alone, will tell.

President Nixon has gambled much on such a hope.

He has also apparently gambled much on the hope that this show of strength—of new resolution—in Indochina will be noted by other powers, and in those other parts of the world, where it is altogether possible that the credibility of these United States in a crisis situation has come under some question.

I am well aware of the necessity for concern in this connection.

And I am equally well aware of the fact—as George Kennan, an out-spoken critic of the whole Vietnam operation has warned us—that ". . . withdrawal from Vietnam is a delicate operation . . . (and) the only person who can arrange and direct it is the President."

But, the events both of the past several days and the shadows cast by events yet to come out of all this, demand that we, in Congress, be equally aware of our collateral responsibility with the President for the direction of foreign policy.

A penetrating editorial in a recent issue of "The Wall Street Journal" has reminded us that, though ". . . doubts and ambiguities are the price of a free society—the purpose of any foreign policy strategy is to preserve our free society, not to destroy it."

The editorialist then goes on to declare that, ". . . the Vietnam war has taken such a cruel toll in destruction of the bonds of consensus and authority that allow a society to operate both at home and abroad . . . (that) by now, the danger of disintegration here is far more serious than any military threat in Indochina."

It has been with a heavy heart that I conclude such to, indeed, be the case; and that any further escalation of our involvement in the conflict in Indochina—or any further widening thereof—can only hasten that process of disintegration.

On that Thursday night, the President rightly said, "It is not our power, but our will and character that is being tested . . ."

But not even the greatest power on earth can fight with troubled conscience, in a war without seeming end, for purposes so largely undefined—obtainable at only an unreasonable price, however desirable they may be in coldblooded terms.

Let me now sum up for you then, as clearly as I can, my position:

I want to see the earliest possible and practicable end of our involvement in the war in Vietnam—and now in Indochina, if you prefer—for the following reasons: Our national security is *not* involved in Vietnam, except in the most-indirect sense possible; our national interest in the area does *not* warrant our continued presence there at anything like the level it has attained; we have met, many times over, any commitment we might have had to the people of South Vietnam, and it is *time*—if not past time—for them to take over the conflict from here on out; we *cannot* win a military "victory" worthy of the name in Indochina and should stop flirting with the idea of doing so—either in Vietnam, Cambodia, or in Laos; the latter two governments, by their very weakness, having the capacity once our aid is extended to them of moving us, step by step, into engagements in their behalf far deeper than anything we originally contemplated; and, finally, our gradual withdrawal from the whole area is *essential* unless we are willing to go on doing irreparable harm to our own Nation—to its economy, to its basic unity, and to its underlying sense-of-purpose.

As I said earlier, I do not expect all, or even probably a majority, of you to agree with the foregoing statement of opinion.

It is *not* a statement of "political" opinion, arrived at through a process of counting noses, reading mail both pro and con, considering public-opinion polls, or anything of that sort, and surely *not* a statement of opinion based on my judgment of how much support I can attract by offering it, as opposed to how many people I might offend or alienate in the same fashion.

It is, instead, my own, personal judgment as to why we need to get *"out"* of Vietnam as soon, and as best, as we can; something I do *not* see—despite the suggestions of some to the contrary—in terms of anything remotely resembling a "surrender."

I invite your objective consideration of this opinion—even as I now invite your similar consideration of my further opinion as to how best Congress can help end this war:

First, foreign policy cannot—and should not—be determined in the streets; much less on college campuses, alone.

There can be no doubt that, inadvertently throughout all this, we have come perilously close to alienating an entire generation of young people who—sooner than they or we realize—will be in charge of this Nation and, by virtue of its influence and strengths, capable of directing substantially the destiny of this world.

I know how some of you feel about our young people; for you have written me in no uncertain terms about the predilection of some of them to long hair and beards, to "free-sex" and "pot," and of others of them to violence, to shouting obscenities at anything remotely resembling some part of what they consider "the Establishment" (which means most of you and, surely, *me!*), and to something too closely akin to anarchy—off-campus, now, as well as on.

And I understand why you feeel as you do about all that, for I feel that way, too; but these are *our* children, yours and mine, and I have opened my office door to them these past two weeks—as I shall continue to do so long as I have an office door to open—because, and I say this to you with all the urgency I can muster, before there are more rocks, more bullets, more dead, more tears of anger and remorse, this Nation, young *and* old alike, *must come to grips with itself!*

We must *listen* to one another, lest we become further polarized, and we must truly *hear* one another so that the angry extremes can be rejected—doing so with the under-

standing that the violent left and right are the enemies of all the *rest* of us.

What, then—and finally, now—can, or should, Congress, and this particular Congressman, attempt to do?

Well, again without expecting to enjoy your full support for my answer, I believe Congress—and this Congressman—must do what we can, at this late date, to broaden the base of public discussion and understanding of our painful few alternatives in Indochina.

In such an effort *you*, of course, have a part to play and, if you have not yet written me to give me the benefit of your views about Vietnam, and now Cambodia and Laos—though, looking at my backlog of mail, I tend to think I have by now heard from *every* person in this 33rd Congressional District!—you are still invited to do so. Participatory democracy, as we have known it, demands no less of you in any event, for it is now undergoing in this Nation its severest test ever.

And I shall listen to you as, all day Thursday—as a member of a six-man, ad-hoc committee I helped form in the House for such purpose—I listened to student representatives from some 25 of our college campuses; this continuing effort having been designed by us to encourage persons in this age group to believe that they can, and *must*, work within and through our system of government—and *only* through it—to bring about, if they can by the forces of reason and logic, the changes in policy they demand.

But, you may well ask, what at this time is the purpose of all this?

What good will it do for you—or for some student—to give me or any Congressman, or even the President, the benefit of your views?

Won't the President—with or without the concurrence of Congress—still do what he wants, or what he thinks best, anyway?

And, to tell the truth, some of you—for you have written me along such lines—seem to feel that the President, whoever he is, *ought* to be left alone to do what he wants; a sort of "father-knows-best" attitude based apparently, on the theory that only the President has all the "facts."

Well, when it comes to the straight-out defense of these United States, that's about the way it has to be—given the realities of the nuclear age in which we live; and I see no way around those realities

However, when it comes to un-declared wars or "Presidential" wars—or "political" wars, if you will, like the one in Vietnam, where the *defense* of this Nation in the way the framers of our Constitution evidently thought about it is involved in only the most-obscure way—I don't think any such open-ended grant of authority to any President is wise. Besides which, one of the weightier lessons we should have learned from Vietnam is that *no* President can, for long, carry the people with him in pursuit of the purposes of such a war without eventually emperiling the future of representative government, itself.

I therefore believe—as I trust you believe—that some way must be found for restoring the war-making power for such purposes under our Constitution to the representatives of the people; meaning the Congress of the United States.

The central problem in trying to do so now is complicated by the fact the we are already up to our ears in such a war; a war—need we be reminded—that Mr. Nixon inherited, but one we have had every reason to believe Mr. Nixon wants to see ended just as soon as possible and, generally, for about the same reasons I have already stated in my own regard.

Now, I want—by my votes and such influence as I may have—to *keep* him moving in the direction of withdrawal. I cannot support—nor do I think a majority of the American people would support—any widening of the war, or any lasting escalation of our participation in the conflict.

This is why I have expressed my reservations about the incursion into Cambodia—the public reaction to which the President seems to have misjudged. This is also why I have already voted—week before last in the House—for language to be added by way of amendment to a defense-procurement bill which, though not the best vehicle for such purpose, would have expressed the sense of Congress that the President should have, as he has promised, all of our troops out of Cambodia before July 1st, as well as a suggestion to Mr. Nixon that, before repeating any such move, he should first seek Congressional concurrence.

That vote—which I would repeat again today—has been applauded by some and vigorously condemned by others as, somehow, showing my "disloyalty" to the President. As one who has strongly supported the President in other ways, I don't see it at all in that latter light. I don't doubt the President's sincerity or his motives—but I do doubt, even as I did in Lyndon Johnson's case, the wisdom of some of the military advice that has been offered and apparently accepted by him. Though I hope and pray, like you, for the full success of this new effort—so much so that, after it is over, it may enable the President to announce a speed-up in the withdrawal of the 150,000 men to be brought home this year—I have tended, up to now, to view this effort as just one more (and this one a massive one) "search-and-destroy" mission of the type we tried at such great cost and such little, lasting success for far too long in years past in Vietnam.

At this point, I don't know whether Congress will yet adopt any such precautionary limitation on the President's powers as Commander-in-Chief or not. Perhaps it doesn't matter, for it is probable that the force of public opinion—by itself—would from now on prevent him from repeating such an exercise without, at least, first obtaining Congressional consent.

But what other actions may Congress also be called upon to consider along comparable lines?

There are numerous possibilities, ranking from an unlikely vote on an actual declaration of war on North Vietnam (which a Senatorial aspirant in this State is pushing to make Congress "face up to the issue"), consideration of which I think would be madness under the existing circumstances, to an even-unlikelier vote on a resolution to impeach both the President and Vice President for having committed (as stated in the Constitution) "Treason . . . (and) other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." Despite the fact that I have recently received from Harpur College students and faculty a petition bearing a purported 2,372 signatures demanding my support for such a move, this, I must say, is utter nonsense. At worst, the President—with the Vice President as onlooker—has been guilty of bad judgment, which is yet to be proved; at best, he deserves in this difficult time all our understanding and support, as well as our *guidance* insofar as God gives any of us wisdom to guide him. To all of which one might add that, should such a move somehow succeed, the Nation would for now be left with Speaker John McCormack, of Massachusetts, as its President—an event I am confident even Mr. Nixon's most-violent critics do not really wish to promote.

However, what I undoubtedly *shall* have to consider—and this in the near future—is language by way of amendment to be added to the forthcoming Defense Appropriation Bill for Federal fiscal year 1971 (beginning on July 1st), which would require the President to have *all* our forces out of Vietnam, and the Indochina area, before July 1st of 1971. This is the so-called "McGovern-Hatfield-Goodell-Hughes" proposal in the Senate—its companion piece in the House being H. Res. 1000, which some local groups are vigorously supporting.

Though Congress has never, in its 181 years, so used its ultimate "power-over-the-purse" to end a shooting war, there is no doubt of the Congressional *right* to do so.

However, I have grave reservations about the *wisdom* of doing so.

I am for withdrawal, paced to "Vietnamization"—and I woud like to see us make, now, a new effort at negotiations again—but setting an inflexible deadline for withdrawal, in a "hang-the-consequences" mood, would seem to finally end whatever slim chance there still is for obtaining a political settlement; unless, of course—and this needs to be said in fairness—such a deadline might move the Saigon government to do some needed negotiating on its own, at least with the large *non-Communist* groups within South Vietnam, itself. We have made only painfully slow progress—even as with promoting land-reform—in getting Thieu-and-Ky to broaden the base of their government, but until they try the latter as they now are the former there is little chance of our leaving behind a government in Saigon that can survive.

Be all this as it may—and I have taken far too much of your time—I do *not* think this Congress will mandate a "forced" withdrawal on the President. But it ought alternatively consider, I suggest, action somewhat along the lines offered in a Concurrent Resolution I have submitted with, now, some thirty House colleagues. This resolution calls firmly for a *national* policy of withdrawal from Vietnam—of *all* our forces—but leaves the mechanics of doing so free of any deadline and flexible enough so that our remaining forces face a minimum of danger, and no military or political vacuum is created overnight.

This resolution also states that it is in our national interest to work to achieve a political settlement and, in the meantime, to avoid enlarging the present conflict, and finally declares that Congress—as it should—from now on ". . . expects to exercise its Constitutional responsibility of consultation with the President on all matters, now and henceforth, affecting grave national decisions of war and peace."

The precise language of all this could obviously be improved, but I see it as at least a proper beginning, as well as an effort to *unite* Congress—and, behind them, the people—with the President in the all-important task of extricating this Nation from Indochina.

Perhaps what I have offered you is no answer. Surely some of you have already rejected it as such. But, as these are not easy days, so is it also true that there are no "easy" answers—and equally true that silence of the sort that, on the part of too many of us these past seven years, led us down the wrong pathway, would be the worst sin of all.

So, I have tried tonight to tell you "like it is"—so far as I am concerned—over Vietnam; urging you, at the same time, to share the burden of decision with me for, in the end, after those decisions are made, it is "we the people" who must live with them, as well as with ourselves, our children and our fellow human beings throughout this so fragile world.

Robison Supports Presidential Commission To Investigate Tragedies at Kent State and Jackson State

Rep. Howard W. Robison has announced that he has sponsored a Resolution in the House of Representatives expressing the sense of Congress that the President should establish a commission to examine the recent events at Kent State, Jackson State, and other college campuses. A similar resolution has been co-sponsored by well over forty other members of the House. In sub-

mitting this resolution, the Congressman made the following statement:

"Anyone who watches television or reads a newspaper knows that our campuses have become battlegrounds for the conflicting factions in our increasingly polarized society. The situation is becoming ever more serious and tense. We are not now dealing with a mere handful of students throwing rocks, but with large crowds of youth—and with policemen and National Guard troops with bayonets and live ammunition. The armed confrontation resulted in the senseless deaths earlier this month of four students at Kent State and of two students at Jackson State. It is justified to ask, where will it all end if we do not develop better ways of dealing with the dissatisfaction and frustrations of our people?

"I am as disturbed as anyone else about the small minority of college youth who practice violence on our campuses—who, in the process, seriously impair the freedom and rights of their fellow students. But it is equally disturbing that authorities have found it necessary to respond to random rock throwing with random rifle fire. There is no logic in either act; only horror and irrationality.

"The value of a Presidential commission at this point is that it could study the events at Kent State, Jackson State, and other campuses and present to the American people an objective analysis of the shootings. Hopefully, it would also make specific recommendations and set forth reasonable guidelines for the handling of future campus disturbances.

"It should be obvious that stringent guidelines are long overdue. Even if one accepts the explanation offered by both the National Guard at Kent State and the police at Jackson State that a sniper's fire precipitated the outbreak of shooting, there is little justification for the bloody response.

"Are we really to believe that the best way to deal with a rooftop sniper is to fire into an unarmed crowd on the ground? That is what the official explanation at Kent State seems to imply. Are we ready to accept the fact that the way to react to an unseen sniper at night is to pump over a hundred rounds into a women's dormitory occupied by hundreds of students? The police in Jackson, Mississippi seem to be suggesting that.

"I do not accept that, and I believe that the vast majority of the American people—after proper reflection—will not accept that either. I hope, therefore, that we will have a good deal of public support for establishing the commission I have recommended. The commission could perform a valuable public service by carefully evaluating the events on our campuses over the past few weeks; and also by suggesting viable regulations to insure that such tragedies do not re-occur."

SAIGON REGIME TORTURES THOSE WHO SEEK PEACE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on May 30, the New York Times noted the occupation of the Veteran's Ministry in Saigon by 200 disabled South Vietnamese veterans. On the same day, thousands of students and Buddhist monks demonstrated at the state funeral for Phan Khac Suu, former South Vietnamese Chief of State. The Thieu-Ky government responded to the veterans' sit-in and the student demonstration with tear gas and clubs.

It has been brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that students, disabled war veterans, Buddhist monks and laymen have been holding demonstrations in Saigon almost every day since mid-April. In addition to tear gas and clubs, many demonstrators have also been subjected to torture and imprisonment.

These demonstrations against the Thieu-Ky government and the continuation of the Indochina war have not been adequately reported in the American press.

The following statement from the Fellowship of Reconciliation and an article by Don Luce, former head of International Voluntary Services in Vietnam and coauthor of "Vietnam: The Unheard Voices," describe the brutal and repressive response of the South Vietnamese Government to these sincere demands for reform and peace.

I believe every Member of Congress should be aware of the repressive nature of the Thieu-Ky regime which claims to be our ally in the search for peace.

The statement and article follow:

STUDENT PROTESTS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

While the attention of the American public has been riveted on the protests and demonstrations of American students and other anti-war forces, a sequence of equally significant and far more hazardous actions in South Vietnam has gone almost entirely unreported and unnoticed.

For more than two months, protests against the war and the government of Generals Thieu, Ky and Khiem have occurred almost daily under the leadership of students, disabled war veterans, Buddhist monks and laymen, and Catholic priests, and have led to the beating, imprisonment and torture of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of their participants.

The Thieu government is facing a crisis comparable to that preceding the fall of President Ngo Dinh in 1963, and has reacted with predictably ferocious repression. Yet the demonstrations continue. When police surrounded the Cambodian embassy in Saigon that had been occupied by 400 students in protest against the Cambodian adventures, and refused to allow other students to pass through to bring them food, members of the House of Representatives carried the food to the students.

Important Saigon newspapers, including *tin sanq, Dong nai* and *Duoc Nha Nam* have challenged the omnipresent censorship by carrying stories of these actions, with photographs, on their front pages. It is reported that, as a consequence, 40 of the last 48 issues of *tin sang* alone have been confiscated by the police.

All universities and high schools have been closed; arrests have multiplied, and the most brutal forms of torture inflicted on the protesting students. Repression has been characteristic of the Thieu government since its formation, but according to eyewitnesses, is worse now than ever.

Yet almost none of this has been reported in the American press. The U.S. embassy in Saigon refused even to see a delegation of American relief workers protesting American collusion in the repression.

We align ourselves with these students, and will seek every way possible to identify with them more directly. We call on the peace movement in the United States, and particularly the students, to find means to publicize and reinforce these actions by their Vietnamese counterparts.

We remonstrate with the American press for its failure to report and interpret these events to their American readers. Nothing so clearly reveals the nature of this war as the fact that the Thieu government is so strenuously opposed by these non-NLF, non-Communist people in their own country.

We plead with the officials of our own government, at every level, to withdraw support from this tyrannical puppet we have created, and take the burden of the war off the backs of the Vietnamese people.

TORTURE IN SAIGON

(By Don Luce)

It is now known beyond any doubt that the Saigon police are subjecting Vietnamese students to brutal torture in an attempt to stifle student dissent against the war and the government. On April 21, ten of these young people were released. Their condition was pitiable but not nearly as grave as that of some whom they left behind in prison.

Do Huu But lies in semi-shock in a laboratory at the College of Agriculture which has been converted into a dispensary for the ten released prisoners. His fingernails are blackened from having pins pushed underneath. He is nearly deaf from having had soapy water forced into his ears, after which they were beaten. Miss Que Huong, a philosophy teacher at Doan Thi Diem high school in Can Tho, forces a small smile when visitors come. Her knees are swollen three times their normal size, and black and blue welts cover her thin arms. She was completely undressed in front of several policemen who watched and drank whisky while she was beaten. Her fiance, Nguyen Ngoc Phong, was brought into the room to watch in an attempt to get him to sign confession papers.

After five weeks in jail, Luu Hoang Thao, deputy chairman of the Van Hanh University student association, is one of the few students in good enough physical condition to give an extended interview:

"For the first three days, the police beat me continuously," he said. "They didn't ask me any questions or to sign anything. They just beat my knee caps and neck with billy clubs, then hit me with chair legs until I was unconscious. When I regained consciousness, they beat me again. Finally, after three days, they asked me to sign a paper that they had already written. I wouldn't sign it, so they beat me some more." Thao said he doesn't know why he was arrested or why he was released. Some observers believe that the government released the tortured students to frighten other students who have been demonstrating against government repression in large numbers in recent weeks. In any event, the torture of Luu Hoang Thao continued day after day, increasing in ferocity and variety. The details of what they did to him are sickening.

"Finally," he said, "they injected medicine into me and took my hand and signed a paper. It said that I had had liaison with the Communists."

Dr. Nguyen Dinh Mai, who is attending the ten students, said he did not yet know the full extent of their injuries.

"When they regain their strength, we will take them to one of the large hospitals for x-rays and thorough medical examinations," he said.

But the students are concerned about the many others who are still in jail. The condition of three of them, who were reported "too ill" to appear with other students for trial in Saigon April 20, was described by the newspaper *Tin Sang* (Morning News) on April 11. One lay near death from torture suffered for refusing to sign a statement that police had found weapons and explosives in his house. Two others were in grave condition with paralyzed legs in both cases and other serious injuries. While refusing to comment on its accuracy, a government spokesman, Nguyen Ngoc Huyen, called the article "objectionable" and had the paper confiscated—for the ninth time in less than a month.

Article 7 of the Constitution of South Vietnam specifically prohibits the use of torture

or of confessions obtained by torture, threat or force. Yet signed statements obtained in this way are used extensively in the trials of political prisoners. In the case of the students, the government denies that it has tortured or manhandled them but will not comment on their obvious disfigurement when they appear in court.

The gravity of the situation has led several leading Vietnamese to come to the aid of the students. Father Nguyen Huy Lich, a respected Dominican priest, has investigated reports of torture and obtained substantiation from nurses and doctors who have the job of treating prisoners during the day in preparation for another night of torture. On March 31, Father Lich and seven other priests called upon the Saigon government to provide humane treatment of its prisoners. Others, like former Minister Vu Van Man, Vietnam's foremost legal authority, have joined the struggle against torture in the prisons.

On April 21, Leo Dorsey, a volunteer social worker with the Unitarian Universalist Committee in Vietnam, went to the U.S. Embassy to request a private interview with Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker for himself and a small group of American volunteers concerned with the fact that U.S. equipment is supporting the Saigon government's repression of its people. The tear gas grenades the police use, for example, are made by Federal Laboratories Inc. in Saltsburg, Pa., and are part of the U.S. assistance program to Vietnam. Mr. Dorsey's group was unable to meet with the ambassador or his deputy.

THE ENVIRONMENT—HERE IS WHAT TO DO

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, high school students of San Francisco were recently asked to write their suggestions of what best advice could be given the President as to how best protect our environment and preserve our natural resources.

As high school and college students across the Nation have deep concern for the protection of the environment, the response to this contest conducted by the San Francisco Electrical Industry Trust was heavy.

The winner was Miss Diane Lynn Calden of Presentation High School.

Miss Calden's suggestions and comments are excellent and I think my colleagues in the Congress would benefit by what she says:

NOW, HERE'S WHAT TO DO . . .

Mr. President, as you yourself stated in your State of the Union address, our goal in the '70s should be "restoring nature to its natural state." This takes money. It has been estimated that it will take 4 percent of the GNP, nearly $40 billion annually, for the United States to even hold its own against pollution.

The existence of a suitable environment is necessary for our very existence and while you agree with this you are still holding back money that Congress appropriated last year to fight pollution. According to you, fighting inflation has more urgent priority for the moment.

Since you are of this mind, my first suggestion to you is that the least you could do is get started on environmental remedies which don't require heavy Federal spending.

NEW COUNCIL

For example, your new Council on Environmental Quality could be put to work looking over the operations of the Federal government. The Council might start by asking the Corps of Engineers to justify their depredations of the landscape; the Transportion Department, to establish a better allotment of funds between their lavish highway construction grants and their less than adequate aid to public transport; the Agriculture Department, to cut back subsidies that encourage farmers to misuse land and to keep on using harmful pesticides.

Another point of investigation should be Robert Finch and his Department of Health, Education and Welfare. HEW is, or will shortly become, the custodian of $45 million in public funds to be spent on cleaning the air we breathe.

I have serious doubts about how effectively and efficiently the money is being used. I have made a rather extensive study of how the funds have been allotted to various projects and after considering them, I think you might also be convinced that they merit some looking into.

HEW AND ENGINES

HEW has stated that it doubts the internal combustion engine can be "cleaned up" enough to meet their standards and claims "there is a lack of motivation within the (automotive) industry for it to mount a significant effort to develop serious competition to the ICE."

On that basis, HEW has cancelled their meeting with the automotive industries representatives, which might have proved very informative. The industry itself is well aware of the need to eliminate pollutants and according to one representative of The Big Three it will be done to everyone's satisfaction "within five years," with a minimum of cost to the car buyer and the taxpayer.

It is unfortunate, however, that HEW cannot accept Detroit's plan and would rather have their own "Big Project."

HEW proposes spending $21.7 million on the development of "Rankine-cycle" engines, over a five-year period. It might prove profitable if they consulted Bill Lear, who already has spent $4.5 million on steam and concluded that "the most can be said about the Rankine-cycle engine is that it is rank."

EXOTIC BATTERIES

Another $12.2 million will be fed into the development of electric propulsion systems; not for the development of a decent fuel cell as you might expect, but on exotic batteries. Even if they do develop them, what are they going to do with them?

New York has already had one massive power failure. What would happen if everyone plugged in their cars for recharging at night? Even by eliminating the pollution produced by cars with the electric car, you would increase the pollution caused by the electric power generating plants. Little is accomplished when you move the source of pollution from lots of cars to a couple of power plants.

Only $7 million was proposed for the gas turbine investigation, but of course there are a lot of people around who already know about building efficient gas turbines. HEW even plans to pay someone a few million for the development of things like flywheel buses which the Swiss have already been using and I'm sure that they would impart their acquired knowledge for a lot less than a million dollars.

NATURAL GAS

Strangely enough, HEW has tossed in only $700,000 for the Sterling engine, the most probable replacement of the present automobile engine.

Another non-inflationary measure would be for Washington to set up standards and, if necessary, penalties for industries who contribute to the destruction of our country's resources. The government should encourage large-scale service companies to switch from gasoline to natural gas as a fuel for their fleets of trucks, as PG&E did this last month without government pressure.

PG&E reports that this switch eliminated as much as 90 percent of the pollutants contained in their regular truck emissions. PG&E also stated that natural gas itself is safer than regular fuels and in the long run it should be cheaper also.

With some encouragement, business could make pollution elimination a profitable enterprise. "How to make America smoother, cleaner, quieter longer?" I'm sure with some strong prodding, the packing industries could come up with "bio-degradable" packing, meaning containers which would rot away naturally, to replace the mountains of indestructable no-deposit, no-return trash which is staring us in the face.

GREEN BELTS

Another type of land pollution is the result of exploitation of the land for the sake of progress. Farmlands are being eaten up with taxes, housing and freeways. According to Irwin Luckman, the only way to prevent this urban sprawl is to maintain green belts between large urban areas.

To implement this plan, when the nation's inflationary status goes down, the government should buy land between great metropolitan areas. The land should then be leased to others for the sole purpose of creating recreational areas. Even if you don't agree this is the way to stop urban sprawl, people need large green belts to furnish sufficient oxygen in order to breathe and recreational areas to free themselves from the confining city.

AIR POLLUTION

When you, Mr. President, think the economy can afford it, I would encourage Federal spending first in the area of air pollution. In California, one million trees are dying and $200 million worth of crops were lost last year because of a lack of clean air.

Industries should be encouraged by Federal subsidies to create more byproducts from their waste products and, if possible, a system could be achieved where numerous enterprises could pool their wastes and jointly make use of a nuclear reactor which would eliminate the waste material and produce at the same time, enough power to operate all of the plants involved.

The other large areas of pollution, water, also requires substantial federal aid to be overcome. The prime source of water pollution is industry and this is where my suggestion of standards and penalties would come in. What would be far more effective than penalties, however, would be giving industry something to do with their liquid wastes.

My suggestion is to help communities, especially highly industrialized ones, to build sewage treatment plants like the one at Indian Creek Reservoir in California. This operation produces reclaimed water which is above the U.S. drinking water standards. Operations such as this could also be used to help farmers in places like California's Imperial Valley, where millions of dollars in crops were lost last year because the salt content of the irrigation water is too high.

AND NOISE

A third area of pollution which requires Federal aid before any notable progress can be made is noise pollution. In the downtown areas of large cities the noise is trapped by tall city buildings and amplified to the point that it can cause damage to the human ear. San Francisco's new buses operate at about 105 decibels; that is 10 decibels above the safety level.

Quiet mass transit seems to be the only

solution. Constant exposure to noises at the levels which now exist in most modern cities result in physical and psychological harm to the human body. The Transportation Department has made an excellent first step in trying to help cities such as San Francisco find a solution to their noise problems.

Many people seem to think that "no-growth" is the solution to all of our environmental problems. This theory is faulty by the very fact that it will take even more technology and wealth to undo what our technology and wealth have done to the environment.

But more important than numerous projects is that a new awareness must be born which realizes that it is not a right of affluency to squander and spoil our resources, but it is a threat to it. "A country which has long taken pride in 'conquering' nature is now learning to live with it."

TWO COMMENCEMENT ADDRESSES

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most enjoyable duties that I have as a Congressman is to deliver the commencement addresses at several high schools in my district each year. It is a pleasure to see our young people ending their high school education and going either on to college or into the business world.

This year, I was invited to speak at the Pell City High School's commencement exercises. I was particularly impressed by the valedictory and salutatory addresses delivered by members of the graduating class. Because of the timeliness of these addresses and the views expressed by these young people, I would like to insert them in the RECORD at this point:

GET INVOLVED

When Nathan Hale said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," he became involved. When George Washington consented to serve as President of a newborn nation, he became involved. When Franklin D. Roosevelt began to jerk the American economy out of a severe depression, he became involved. When Ralph Nader acted as self-appointed overseer of consumer interests, he became involved. When Richard Nixon decided to send United States troops into Cambodia to stamp out the kindling fires of Communist takeover there, he became involved. Can we, as United States citizens, do any less?

It is so easy to become uninvolved. It is possible to lie on one's living room couch, exclaim over the horrors of war as reflected on the newsreels, push a button on the automatic channel changer, and watch reruns of the "I Love Lucy" show. Or, one could listen to reports of highway fatalities on the radio, and then research for another station that is playing the latest "Three Dog Night" record. Or, perhaps upon scanning the front page of one's newspaper and reading of a violent demonstration, one quickly flips through to find the funnies. And, upon arriving at one's favorite swimming spot at a lake or stream and finding the stench of pollution unbearable, it is possible to merely begin swimming at a public pool. But, these and other problems confront people every day, and I contend that it is not right to assume a passive attitude toward them. In order for these or any other problems to be solved, someone must be interested in solving them. Someone must be involved.

To be involved does not necessarily mean to picket the city hall daily or to take part in a demonstration at the local university, but it does mean to be concerned with things which happen in one's own community and in the world also. We, who are almost high school graduates, have a responsibility to learn what we can about world, national, state, and local affairs because in approximately three years, we will have a voice in them. A citizen who does not bother to care about the problems surrounding him is not a very effective voice in choosing the right officials and in making the right decisions. An informed citizenry is the key to an effective government, and an informed citizenry is one which is concerned, knowledgeable, and, above all, involved.

I've mentioned the word "involved" many times, but perhaps some are asking the question "What is she talking about? How can I become involved in anything?" I submit to you that "involved" covers a wide range of meaning. For the past twelve years, all of us have been involved in the task of obtaining a high school education. But, after this night, the paths of our lives will divert in many different directions, and we will no longer be known as a senior class but as 138 separate individuals. Some of us are going to college or trade school; others are beginning to pave their own way in life by holding a job; still others have chosen to be married. But, no matter what path we choose, each of us has the responsibility of recognizing problems which are around us and doing our best to correct them. However, before deciding whether or not to be involved in a certain problem, it is imperative that one think about every aspect of that problem, weigh the pros and cons in one's mind, and act upon his decision only when he feels very deeply in his heart that his decision is right. After deciding to become involved, his actions *must* be constructive; the actions of the men fighting in southeastern Asia is constructive; lying down in the streets is not. Forking out a few extra tax dollars to fight the pollution of our environment is constructive; protest rallies are not.

In conclusion, I would like to say that each of us has a responsibility to ourselves, our community, and our country. This responsibility is to be aware of the problems around us, to be concerned enough to search for a solution to these problems, and to be involved enough to be willing to work toward the correction of these problems. In other words, Get Involved!

SALUTATORY ADDRESS BY CHARLES DENNIS ABBOTT

Faculty and friends, I wish to extend to each of you the warmest of welcomes and to express our appreciation for the support and assistance that you have given us for so many years. Through our years of public education you have guided us with patience mingled with hope. Now, as we await the final steps of graduation, there are no words capable of expressing our gratitude.

We are venturing into a new world—a frightening world—a world we have had no part in creating. But we possess one great advantage over any human being in our country. That advantage is being an American citizen. We will journey along life's path with the same basic rights granted to each and every individual. How we use these rights determines our destiny.

With each right, however, there is a responsibility; and it is this burden that weighs heavily upon our shoulders—responsibility which some of us have never known. The very word frightens us. After tonight, however, we must meet the challenge, we must grow up, we must face responsibilities, and we must make our own decisions.

We will make our own decisions and we will live with the results of our choices for the rest of our lives. But we, at least, have the right to make the decisions. We are American citizens living in a free society under a democratic government—a government which cannot exist without rights, responsibilities, and decisions. Human sense is still the lifeline of this great country even though we do live in an age of mechanized brains and computers. Indeed, this country is run on "the will of man."

And in the same sense our society thrives on "the will of man." Our country can only be as great as we want it to be. Our rights and responsibilities can be fulfilled only if we want to fulfill them. And, more importantly, our future lives can only be as good as we wish them to be. We, as Americans, possess the rights and abilities, and it is our duty to our country and to our personal lives to use them.

Through our basic training in high school we have learned to forgive, to share, and to possess. But most importantly, we have learned to become involved—involved in pep rallies, sports events, school elections, and many other extra-curricular activities. This involvement has helped us to realize the democratic way of life: this life of "better to give of yourself than receive." This admonition of being an American with rights and responsibilities, this thought of being a *part* of a country, a state, a city, and even a school. We are ready to meet the challenge, and I think we will succeed. And so it is tonight that I, as do the other Seniors, welcome you "on the first day of the rest of our lives." Thank you.

NATURAL GAS SHORTAGES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the shortage in natural gas remains unsolved—it approaches crisis.

Unless we exert some leadership to encourage the FPC bureaucracy to act I fear we can expect a mounting wave of dissatisfaction from our people at home when services, homes, and a lot of jobs start being interrupted because of a lack of natural gas.

Nor will the people at home be satisfied to learn that we are awaiting international agreements to obtain even emergency supplies from foreign countries.

A most interesting and timely article by Mrs. Shirley Scheibla appeared in Barron's magazine for June 1, 1970, entitled "Simmering Crisis." I include her article, as follows:

SIMMERING CRISIS: THE FPC HAS PRODUCED NO SOLUTION TO THE SHORTAGE OF NATURAL GAS

(By Shirley Scheibla)

"When I talked with you three years ago, I said our pricing of natural gas was a big fat mess. Now it has become a big fat crisis." (Carl E. Bagge, FPC Commissioner.)

WASHINGTON.—Members of any regulatory body, notably the Federal Power Commission, tend to avoid being quoted by name regarding their views on matters pending before them. However, FPC Commissioner Carl E. Bagge feels that "someone has to stick his neck out to make the public aware of the impending very serious national shortage of natural gas due to the Commission's control of producer prices."

What he is referring to is the failure of FPC price control to elicit adequate supplies of the only major source of energy that is largely pollution-free. "By keeping prices down, we stimulated demand and discouraged production, he declared the other day. "Thus we got the worst of both possible worlds." Moreover, because expansion of output requires exploration, drilling and the installation of new pipelines, processes which take years, virtually nothing can forestall a serious national wide shortage long before the end of the decade. It is apt to be years before imports of liquefied natural gas (LNG) or the "gasification" of coal can furnish any substantial increment to the domestic gas supply. Indeed, the imminence of expensive LNG imports, including some from unfriendly Algeria, merely underscores the gravity of the looming shortage.

SHOULD ADMIT FAILURE

Commissioner Bagge thinks the government should admit the failure of price control and end it, a view shared by Hendrik S. Houthakker, a member of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers. Mr. Houthakker told Barron's: "It is my feeling that regulation of producer prices should end. It was a mistake to put natural gas under price control. Some method must be found to get rid of controls. We would like to study it, and if we get letters on the subject, we might do something on it. We have a very small staff and must be guided, at least to some extent, by expressions of public interest."

According to David Freeman, director of energy policy for President Nixon's Office of Science & Technology (OST), "the ending of price control on future gas is an option that we are seriously considering." He declares that he opposes ending price control on gas already committed because it would result in windfalls for producers. Formerly first assistant to the FPC Chairman when the post was held by Joseph Swidler, Mr. Freeman said he hopes to be able to make recommendations to President Nixon by the end of 1970. By then he expects to have in hand a study of the "very serious gas supply problem" to be made for OST by Resources for the Future, Inc.

Meanwhile the first signs of scarcity have appeared. In the face of what several Senators labeled a supply crisis, the Senate Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials & Fuels held hearings last November.

The New York Public Commission testified that many local gas distributors, including those in the state of New York, have run into trouble contracting for fuel to meet anticipated growth.

CONSOLIDATED EDISON

In particular, Hollis M. Dole, assistant Secretary of the Interior, said that Consolidated Edison of New York will not be able to meet the demands of large new industrial customers. He added: "Rochester Gas & Electric Co. said it recently turned down a request from Eastman Kodak Co. Northern Natural Gas Co., of Omaha, Neb., said it was trying to withdraw a pipeline application to initiate services to 60 new communities in the Midwest because it did not have enough gas reserves for the project."

The FPC staff has found that pipelines won't be able to meet their customers' needs for the winter of 1970–71, while Commissioner John A. Carver, Jr., recently warned of localized shortages "if next winter's weather is even normally bad."

According to figures published in a study by the FPC staff, between 1955 (when the agency first started tinkering with prices) and 1968, the number of successful exploratory gas wells droped from 874 a year to 429; exploratory wells drilled, from 14,942 to 8,861; total wells drilled, from 55,922 to 30,495.

For 1968 the American Gas Association has reported the first decline in the nation's proved recoverable reserves since it started publishing figures 23 years ago. It said that 19.4 trillion cubic feet were produced, while only 13.8 trillion feet of reserves were added; hence reserves dropped from 292.9 trillion to 287.3 trillion cubic feet.

BEST BET

Some FPC members think federal reserves off the coast of Louisiana are the best bet to reverse this trend. Because of spillage difficulties, however, the Department of the Interior has sold no such leases for more than a year. Earlier this month Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel invited public comment on a proposal to resume such sales on July 21. Wide-scale sale of the leases is not expected, however, until spillage problems are solved. Moreover, all production resulting from such reserves could go to intrastate sales if price controls continue, thus further weakening FPC regulation.

Chances look dim for fast, effective action by either the Commission or Congress. Thus matters are likely to get much worse before they get better. Commissioner Carver publicly castigated the agency on May 15; in the face of a supply crisis, he charges, "recent months have been almost devoid of Commission action." At FPC there is a lot of talk of further studies, new regulatory experiments to rejiggle prices to higher levels and even rationing.

Lawmakers generally view the matter as a political can of worms which they prefer to shun as long as possible. Joseph Dawson, public affairs director for Virginia Knauer, President Nixon's special assistant for consumer affairs, told Barron's that Mrs. Knauer does not consider the subject important enough to warrant her attention. Be that as it may, signs are emerging that the crisis may lead to the collapse of the bureaucratic machinery through which FPC regulates the gas industry. The Commission already has lost control in Texas, where all production is going into intrastate sales not subject to federal price ceilings. Commissioner O'Connor predicts that the same could happen to offshore Louisiana reserves.

PHILLIPS CASE

FPC price control dates back to 1954, when the U.S. Supreme Court, in the Phillips cases, ruled that the Commission must control producer prices. After trying to carry out the task on a company-by-company basis for years, the agency finally decided that it was administratively impossible. In 1960 it began to set prices by areas, based on average costs within each one.

After eight years of FPC proceedings, with a record of 35,000 pages and litigation all the way to the Supreme Court, prices finally were set for the first area, the Permian Basin of Texas. These are meaningless, however; as noted, all Texas gas is being sold intrastate, free of FPC dictate.

After a full decade, Permian remains the only area where FPC pricing action, even pro forma, is complete. The agency's decision on South Louisiana is now before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans, which affirmed it once and is considering a petition for rehearing. Last Thursday FPC asked the court to remand the case to the Commission for reconsideration. The court had expressed concern over "evidence of a serious deficiency" and had asked all parties for opinions on whether the Commission has authority to modify or rescind an order after it has been sustained by the court. Commissioner Bagge said, "To me this means we are saying 'We made a mistake, and let us reconsider.'" Decisions by FPC examiners in three other area cases, Texas Gulf Coast, Hugoton-Anadarko (northern Texas and parts of Kansas and Oklahoma) and the Southwest Area, are pending on appeal to the Commission.

For the Appalachian area, FPC is trying a new approach. It has issued a proposed rulemaking. After receiving comments from interested parties, the full Commission will hand down a decision, thus avoiding a full evidentiary hearing and decision by a trial examiner. So far, according to William L. Webb, FPC information director, FPC has taken no action for the Rocky Mountain area, the last one it has designated, which, with the others, accounts for 96% to 97% of domestic natural gas production.

OUT-OF-DATE PRICES

The prices the Commission has set so far already are out-of-date. Since they are based on 1966 costs, FPC Chairman John N. Nassikas calls it ridiculous to continue prices on that basis after a decade of inflation. At the Senate gas supply hearings last November, he testified that FPC is re-evaluating area prices but will make no official move until a formal public record has been made.

Meantime, although FPC literally has truckloads of information on hand, Mr. Nassikas admits: "With the data and techniques available to us, we cannot reliably forecast the rate at which these resources will be used and the economic conditions that will elicit the required supply. We have not yet developed a supply curve that will show us the relationship between the price level and discovery of reserves." Hence, he wants a Natural Gas Survey, "so that in the course of the next three to four years we can acquire the necessary information capability to make more reliable and sophisticated supply and demand forecasts than our present information will permit."

The chairman also has called for creation of a National Energy Resources Council, "with the primary purpose of examining the nation's energy resources in relation to long-term requirements, under a 'total energy' concept, recognizing the need to balance economic and environmental concerns." However, since such a council would encroach upon the prerogatives of the aforementioned OST, White House backing is dubious.

LACKS ESSENTIAL DATA

What Mr. Nassikas' remarks boil down to is that the Commission lacks the data essential for intelligent price-fixing, and that obtaining it, if feasible, will take too long to contribute to solution of the present crisis.

If, as the chairman has indicated, FPC authorizes price hikes, Mr. Freeman says that a few cents per thousand cubic feet won't help much as long as it continues basing prices on average area costs, since cost data will be obsolete by the time the new levels are set. Commissioner Bagge has proposed periodic price adjustments based on supply and demand data incorporated in a special new index, similar to the Consumer Price Index. But Thomas J. Joyce, chief of FPC's Bureau of Natural Gas, maintains, "It is almost impossible to construct a reliable index, and it would take an awful lot of time—years—to develop."

Mr. Bagge says that his proposal "was intended to initiate a public dialogue regarding the need for the Commission to extricate itself from the strictures of the existing cost case area rate methodology." Mr. Joyce agrees on the need. He adds: "Ultimately there will have to be more recognition of market forces in pricing. The country will have to face up to the fact that no more bargains in energy are available."

Commissioner Carver says that cost-based pricing works only when supplies are adequate, and that FPC should eventually consider accepting settlements on prices by various segments of the industry. The parties are not as much at odds as they used to be, and the distributors are primarily interested in obtaining supplies, he declares.

SETTLEMENT IDEA

Commissioner Lawrence J. O'Connor spelled out the settlement idea at the Senate hearings last November, as follows: "The most effective progress we will make will be by hearings . . . in which all of the three different elements of the industry will present their viewpoints and maybe in the process . . . will come closer together whereby they can come in and present us with settlements which will have the approval of a large enough percentage of each element of the industry which we may find acceptable and would be accepted by the court." Lately, however, Mr. O'Connor told Barron's, the parties can't get together.

Going further, Commissioner Bagge wants Congress to end FPC's obligation to maintain any form of producer price control, thus recognizing that "the realities of the market have taken over." But here is what Commissioner Carver says on this point: "Congress was persuaded not once but twice to 'correct' a Supreme Court decision and earlier Commission precedent which said that the FPC had jurisdiction over natural gas producer sales. One veto was on normal policy grounds by a President who asserted that he disagreed with the policy the Congress had expressed; the other veto was by a President who had supported the bill, but disapproved it nonetheless because a Senator charged he had been approached by a bribe to support it. The point of the story is not that a President can veto acts of Congress, but rather to suggest that now, 15 years later, it would be infinitely more difficult to get the Congress to overrule the Supreme Court than it was within a year or two of when it occurred."

If Congress fails to act soon, LNG imports may cause collapse of the whole regulatory house of cards. First regular LNG imports, from Algeria, are expected to arrive next year on the East Coast at 68 cents per thousand cubic feet, nearly twice as high as gas delivered by pipeline to metropolitan New York. Still undecided is whether LNG is covered by the Natural Gas Act, upon which the Commission relies for its regulatory authority. Daniel Goldstein, FPC assistant general counsel, says that Phillips Petroleum and other suppliers have challenged the Commission's jurisdiction.

Mr. Freeman of OST observes, "There is a serious question whether the Commission should be passing on LNG imports. This should be an executive function, but, on the other hand, I can see that FPC needs to fit it in with its domestic policy on natural gas."

Commissioner O'Connor points out a further difficulty: "The President's Oil Task Force said to reduce the domestic oil price to the world market level, and you can't reduce oil to the world price and keep gas below it."

With large-scale imports of Algerian gas by El Paso scheduled to begin in 1973, and imports proposed from Venezuela and elsewhere, Commissioner Bagge says they are likely to cost more than domestic gas and "effectively and irrevocably sweep away the dike of producer regulation." Other commissioners and staff members admit privately that they expect vitally needed imports to be priced at realistic market levels, and that this undoubtedly will cause headaches in holding the price line on domestic gas.

By a curious turn of events, domestic LNG produced from huge Alaskan reserves is going to Japan, while the U.S. prepares for imports from sources of dubious reliability. The Jones Act requires cargo between American ports to be carried on American bottoms, but there are no U.S. cryogenic tankers. Moreover, Senator Frank E. Moss (D., Utah) says building them in this country would be 75% more expensive, thus pricing Alaskan LNG out of the U.S. market.

Senator Ted Stevens (R., Alaska) says, "Our gas supply is practically unlimited if you have the incentive to go and look for it." Potential Alaskan supplies are estimated at over 400 trillion cubic feet, and proven reserves in southern Alaska alone were put at approximately 5¼ trillion cubic feet at the end of 1968. Senator Stevens told Barron's there has been some talk of reshipping the LNG from Japan to Hawaii to get around the Jones Act, but that Japan needs the gas itself and is reluctant to part with it.

According to Honolulu Gas Co.: "Hawaii is really the ideal market for Alaska's liquefied natural gas. Thus, it is ironic that the movement of LNG from the 49th to the 50th state is not economically feasible, when . . . the tankers serving Japan have adequate capacity to serve Hawaii also."

TANKER SUBSIDIES

Among solutions proposed but not yet acted upon are special exemptions from the Jones Act for Alaskan LNG and construction subsidies for cryogenic tankers. Both would require legislation.

Canada appears to be the country's next safest source of natural gas. Chairman Nassikas calls it "a promising supplementary source." However, on May 13, J. J. Greene, Canadian Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, told the Independent Petroleum Association of America: "Viewed against the scale of U.S. needs, Canadian gas resources likely to be available for export presently appear relatively small. . . . I feel it would be wrong for your industry and your policy makers, if they were so tempted, to look to Canadian supplies as a panacea for the ills of the American natural gas industry."

The minister also said his government deeply regrets American quantitative restrictions on imports of crude and unfinished oils from Canada. He warned: "Canadian gas will be available to supplement U.S. supplies only if our petroleum industry as a whole receives the incentives of progressive growth and assured stability of access to export markets for oil and natural gas liquids."

Thus, current developments appear to be bearing out the prediction of an FTC staff study last September that five to 10 years will be needed to restore the supply deficit. Here is how Commissioner Albert B. Brooke, Jr., summed up matters last month in Toledo: "The nation may face a severe shortage in three to five years unless there is a significant upturn in exploration and development. Within the next several years, coal gasification and LNG won't be able to supply the magnitude required. Several interstate pipelines have told FPC they will find it extremely difficult to meet normal growth demands of their present customers next winter, much less the needs of new customers. The allocation of gas among pipelines . . . is not completely beyond the realm of possibility."

Adds Senator Clifford P. Hansen (R., Wyo.): "If we want to disrupt a lot of people and a lot of homes and have them wonder about the ability of this kind of government to serve the national interest, just run short of gas. . . ."

THIRD-CLASS MAIL, ANOTHER VIEW

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently inserted information in the RECORD regarding a project undertaken by a high school class in Iowa City, Iowa. Their project involved efforts to point out the problems relating to third class mail as viewed from the recipient's standpoint. Obviously, those who send the third-class mail have a different view. In order to present both sides of the story, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point, parts of a letter I have received from the President of a large direct mail company located in my district.

MOUNT PLEASANT, IOWA,
May 27, 1970.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: In reviewing the Congressional Record of May 18, 1970, I was surprised—even shocked—to read your account and endorsement of the Iowa City High School class project "to collect a ton of junk mail."

I feel sure that these students were acting on good faith and were attempting to make a good and significant contribution to our society. Unfortunately however, their project was obviously based on an emotional reaction to some grossly distorted and completely erroneous information. . . .

In regard to the specific subject of postal economics, the real crux of the problem is attempted perpetuation of invalid figures generated by the Post Office Department's previous "Cost Ascertainment System." This outmoded accounting system has been publicly criticized by numerous CPA's, the General Accounting Office, the Sub-Committee on Postal Rates of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and the Post Office Department itself. Prior to fiscal 1969, all Postal Costs (including institutional or non-variable costs) were allocated to each class of mail on a ratio based on the volume of a particular class relative to the total volume. That approach obviously ignored the dramatic difference in handling costs between the different classes of mail plus the financial and other operating advantages of having a deferable classification of work available to the Department. It might be compared to assuming that the *actual cost* of moving a bookcase from your home in Davenport to Washington would be exactly the same whether it was crated or uncrated; whether you did the crating or the carrier did it; whether he picked it up from your home or you delivered it to his terminal; whether it went by itself or whether it went with many other identical pieces; whether it had to be rehandled and repacked at several different terminals enroute or if it could go directly to a terminal in the area of its destination; whether the carrier was obligated to handle it on a priority basis or defer it until his other obligations were satisfied; plus a host of other considerations. The factors involved in the Post Office handling of Third Class bulk mail are every bit as significant as those in this not so far fetched example of moving the bookcase.

A classic case in point can be found right here in Mt. Pleasant. In fiscal 1969 our local Post Office had gross receipts of about $5.2 million. More than 96% of these total receipts were generated by Third Class bulk mail. Although Mt. Pleasant's total revenues and total expenses were combined with the rest of the country, the net effect in the old accounting system would have assigned 96% of the total local expenses as a "cost" of handling Third Class bulk mail. When you consider that hardly a single piece of this mail ever even enters the Mt. Pleasant Post Office, that all transactions connected with this operation are handled by only one person, that not a single square foot of local floor space is devoted to the bulk mail operation, and that not a single vehicle or route carrier has been added because of it, then you can recognize the tremendous distortion that has existed. If the total cost of operating our local Post Office amounts to $200,-

000 per year (which is probably conservative), then the old Accounting System would have claimed that $192,000 was attributable to Third Class bulk mail. If we are generous, we might be able to find a maximum of $15,000 of truly related expenses. This means that Third Class bulk costs would have been inflated by at least $177,000 in just this one local office. Although the percentage figures in this particular case are admittedly well above the norm, these dollar figures are very real. Recognizing that these same principles were applied on a national scale for many years, we can see the fantastic distortion that was created and that provided the ammunition for the unwarranted attacks on this classification of mail.

In April of this year the Post Office Department issued a "Revenue and Cost Analysis" report for fiscal year 1969 which publicly discredits the previous accounting system and introduces a dramatically improved method of cost determination. Basically, this new method reflects the specific cost directly or indirectly associated with the various classes of mail and categories of service. The Post Office refers to such expenses as "Demonstrably Related Costs." This report clearly establishes Third Class bulk as being the *most profitable* major classification of mail handled by the Post Office! These facts, prepared and issued by the government completely refute any suggestion of an adverse economic effect on postal operations because of Third Class bulk mail. In fact, Assistant Postmaster General James W. Hargrove stated on April 13 that without the $296,000,000 of "gross profit" contributed to the Post Office by Third Class bulk, First Class rates would have to be increased one cent per ounce or else the resulting deficit would have to be made up by additional subsidies from Congress. The Postmaster General himself has publicly stated on numerous occasions that Third Class bulk mail is not only highly profitable to the postal system but is also an extremely desirable category of work from an operation efficiency and workload balance standpoint.

The occasionally heard implication of general public opposition and objection to this media of advertising is also a colossal myth that has absolutely no basis in fact. Numerous in-depth studies and major surveys have been conducted on this very subject and not one of these investigations even uncovered more than a small minority of Direct Mail Advertising opponents. One of these studies, conducted by the market research firm of A. C. Nielsen determined that only 15% of the population dislike receiving this form of advertising. The negative respondents included 5% of the population who stated that they do not like to receive *any* type of mail! Although I do not have the specific figure, another similar and completely impartial survey was conducted by the University of Kentucky about three years ago which produced the same general conclusion. On a somewhat smaller scale, Metromail included a postage paid (First Class), preaddressed, post card questionnaire of consumer attitudes in a recent cooperative mailing of cents-off coupons and other mail-order offers. Although 86.8% of the respondents stated that they "liked to receive the mailings", it is more significant to note that only 0.4% of the respondents asked to have their names removed from the mailing list. How could any consumer be provided with an easier "out" if he truly wanted to be relieved of this media?

On the "invasion of privacy" issue, I would like to ask how the nature of Direct Mail Advertising differs from that of other "imposed" media? What is the rationalization for the display ads or even the complete advertising supplements contained in newspapers which are delivered by U.S. Mail—or the ads contained in magazines delivered by mail? What about billboards? Television? Radio? Signs and pictures in front of theaters? Ads on trucks that are traveling on tax supported highways? Sales solicitation phone calls? If we support this type of privacy theory on the basis of 'protecting' the public, why don't we condone the parent who 'protects' his child by keeping him locked in a bedroom all the time?

My concern is three fold: The application of certain basic principles such as honesty, fairness, and equitable legislation are apparently being challenged in this area; The right of continued existence of an industry that accounts for more than 30 billion dollars in annual sales of goods and services is being questioned solely on the basis of misleading figures and emotional reactions; The jobs and future security of many thousands of Americans are being threatened as a result of these emotional and subjective attacks. I would conservatively estimate that there are well over one thousand families in the Direct Mail Advertising Industry right here in the First District of Iowa. Approximately half this number are employed in Henry County alone!

I apologize for my rather lengthy letter on this subject, especially at a time when you are unusually busy. However, I am sure that you can appreciate the vital concern of myself and many other residents of your District. At your convenience, I would be most interested in receiving a clarification of your stand on the subject. Enclosed is some further information on Third Class bulk mail which you may find of interest. If you would like any additional data or if I can be of assistance in any regard please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely,

MIKE MCSWEENEY.

THE FACTS ABOUT THIRD-CLASS BULK MAIL

Official U.S. Government cost and revenue accounting system (using for the first time the cost and revenue accounting principles generally accepted by private business and public utilities) reports bulk *third class* regular mail at today's postage rates is the *most profitable* major class of mail handled by the U.S. Post Office.

Sincere men, charged with the responsibility of making decisions affecting the lives of millions know full well what a burden of anguish falls upon their intellects and their consciences when they must make decisions without the necessary facts.

Deciding what rates to charge the now more than 200,000,000 users of the U.S. Post Office for the various classes of mail they send through the postal system has long been a troubling experience for the Congress. But more than this, it has also provided a classic example of sincere men "flying blind", and Congress has long known and often deplored the fact that the postal rates it finally set each year were often no more than optimistic shots in the dark.

It is to the credit of the Nixon Administration that it recognized very early in its administration the fact that there were few facts available for Congressional ratemakers and promptly did something about it. One of the administration's first firm steps toward equitable postal reform was to install in the U.S. Post Office Department a reliable postal accounting system employing generally accepted business accounting principles.

The benefits of that step have just been highlighted in the Department's recently issued "Revenue and Cost Analysis, Fiscal Year 1969." And in his preface to the first cost analysis by the Post Office made under the new and more reliable cost accounting system, J. W. Hargrove, Assistant Postmaster General, explains why the Department switched to a more modern cost accounting system:

"In previous years, the allocation of all costs (including institutional or nonvariable costs) has been made to each of the classes of mail. That allocation has involved *uncertainties, subjective decisions and argumentative conclusions* as has been demonstrated by the numerous criticisms of the system from various parties including the General Accounting Office and the Sub-Committee on Postal Rates of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee . . . Recognizing the difficulties of the total allocation process, we have radically altered our cost accounting techniques . . . *Costs in post offices have been determined for the first time by a probability sampling system which we believe results in an accuracy significantly improved over the former method.*" (Italic added)

Historically, the archaic, error-ridden "Cost Ascertainment system" of the Post Office has been in disrepute with knowledgeable accountants throughout the U.S. How ridiculous this Cost Accounting System actually *was* became completely self-revealing when a recent Cost Ascertainment Report showed that a first class letter, which normally requires 39 separate and expensive steps and labor handlings, cost only $0.00257 more to handle than a piece of zip coded and presorted bulk third class mail which normally requires only six handlings for local mail delivery and 16 steps for nationwide delivery.

The true culprit in the confusion about the so-called "postal deficit" was not the management of the Post Office. It was not the workers. And it was not most of the bulk mail users. *It has been the faulty accounting system.*

The Kappel Commission was also critical of this outmoded and misleading "Cost Ascertainment System". The system which the Post Office Department used last year for the first time to compile its Revenue and Cost Analysis borrowed some of the basic procedures recommended by the Johnson Administration's study by Touche Ross Bailey & Smart, a nationally recognized and leading certified public accounting firm, and from the Kappel Commission's brilliant and landmark study of the U.S. Postal System. The adoption of this new system by the Post Office Department means that the men who have the complex and crucial responsibility for fixing rates for the various classes of postal service no longer need to "fly blind". They can now know more about where they have been, where they are, and where they are going in the matter of postal rates. They can "fly" with more confidence—with less danger of losing passengers and business—because they can now base their acts on more reliable facts so far as costs and revenues are concerned.

FACTS ARE NEWS—THESE FACTS ARE BIG NEWS

What navigational aids for Congressional rate makers does this new and modern Post Office cost accounting system, used for 1969 for the first time, reveal through the burnoff in the fog?

The report turns up such startling facts as these:

1. The postage paid today by Bulk Third Class Advertising mail users is nearly twice as much as the variable costs of direct labor, transportation and overhead incurred by the Post Office in handling such mail.

2. For each mailing of Third Class Advertising mail (not including books and catalogs), the Post Office *spends* the total sum of $19.00 per thousand pieces for its variable costs of direct labor, transportation and overhead. But it collects an average of $39.00 per thousand pieces from third class mailers—leaving a balance of $20.00 per thousand pieces to pay for the institutional costs of the Post Office Department

3. The direct labor involved in the 39 steps in handling of first class mail costs 3.14¢ per letter. The Post Office pays only 1.61¢ per letter for direct labor in the 6 to 16 handlings for third class mail.

4. The "deluge" of advertising "junk" mail about which certain detractors of the medium have been protesting turns out to

be a *delusion* instead. For this kind of mail (not including books and catalogs—which most persons don't consider mail advertising, altho they are in the third class category) constitutes only 8.1% of the weight of all U.S. mail volume.

5. If bulk third class mail were to disappear tomorrow, the so-called "postal deficit" would nearly double. For instead of contributing to this "deficit", advertising mail actually brings in enough clear direct profit margin to the Post Office Department to *reduce* that deficit by nearly $300 million. "Without third class mail," declares Postmaster General Blount, "first class mail would cost mailers more."

6. Moreover, third class bulk mail is finally proved to be the most profitable major class of mail handled by the U.S. Post Office Department today. (A few minor volume subclasses of mail show a higher percent of profitability than third class but their contribution to the payment of institutional costs is minimal.) Third class bulk mail is the real money maker in the mail family. Rather than being a burden on the taxpayer and on other classes of mail, it helps to relieve their financial burdens with its extra income.

WHY DOES BULK THIRD CLASS ADVERTISING MAIL MAKE SUCH A SIZABLE PROFIT FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT?

Now that the facts show that bulk third class mail is the most profitable major class of mail handled by the Post Office, another question is sure to be asked by all to whom this fact comes as such a stunning surprise.

Why? Why does the Post Office Department's latest and more accurate report reveal this profitability when much of what we have read in the newspapers or hear on the radio or seen and heard on TV has been to the contrary?

This revelation springs from no single reason but from several favorable factors operating concurrently:

1. Third class postage rates have increased 300% in recent years.

In the last 16 years, the rates for third class bulk mail fixed by Congress and collected by the Post Office have quadrupled—have gone from $10.00 per thousand to $40.00 per thousand pieces. By way of contrast, the rates charged for first class mail have only doubled in 26 years, going from 3c a letter in 1944 to today's 6c letter.

2. Mandatory zip coding requirements speed up post office sorting and lower post office costs.

Third class bulk mailers have invested an estimated $200,000,000 in the last 3 years in converting their lists and their mailing systems to accommodate and comply with the mandatory zip coding requirements for third class mail.

3. Third class bulk mail must now be presorted by mailers by zip code, thus saving more sorting time and money for the Post Office Department.

Third class mailers still pay huge additional sums annually to maintain their lists in zip code order or to apply the zip to mailing pieces. In addition, third class mailers are required to pre-sort their mail by zip code prior to delivery to the post office leaving the post office with very little remaining operations to perform on the mail.

(The annual cost to mailers of maintaining their lists in zip code order and pre-sorting third class mail is reliably estimated to be $5–$8 per thousand pieces mailed.)

These, then, are the facts which stand out after careful study of the Post Office Department's "Revenue and Cost Analysis", and the facts speak for themselves.

And now that the Congress has the facts, let us hope it will also have the wisdom to call a halt to the continuous and crippling annual blows it has been delivering to the breadwinner of the postal family.

KEY EXCERPTS RELATING TO NEW THIRD-CLASS RATE-MAKING PHILOSOPHY

(Taken from 30-page testimony by Assistant Postmaster General James W. Hargrove)

"Now to deal briefly with costs as they relate to third-class bulk mail: For 1971, after full pay adjustments, we are anticipating demonstrably related costs averaging 2.5¢ per piece. At present rates postage would average 4.3¢ per piece. In these terms we are extending no incremental subsidy to such mail and there is a significant contribution to institutional costs.

"To avoid any misunderstanding, I must emphasize that coverage of demonstrably related cost is not the ultimate objective. If that were the objective for all classes of mail the postal service would operate in the red in perpetuity with the taxpayer picking up the tab for about half of all costs—that half which comprises institutional costs.

Third-class mail, by definition, is accorded deferred service. It is subject to delays in processing, handling and transportation in order to concentrate on first-class mail and make maximum efficient use of manpower and facilities. . . . (He then delineated inherent benefits of first-class over third.) . . . These factors would work to reduce the contribution to institutional costs expected of third-class bulk, as the result of the application of the "value of service" factor.

Working in the opposite direction, however, is the factor which we call "value to the recipient." This factor, caused us to distinguish between second-class and controlled circulation publications. In third-class mail it is even more significant.

"Mr. Chairman, it would be useless to pretend there is not a genuine resentment in this country to advertising mail, which outspoken and not exactly disinterested critics have labeled "junk mail," to its everlasting detriment. I avoid the use of the term, just as I avoid terms of ethnic opprobrium, because it is applied with obvious discrimination against a legitimate advertising medium. We might as well refer to "junk TV" or "junk magazines" because they bring into our homes unwanted advertisements which, as to newspapers and magazines at any rate, we have to throw away even as we do advertising mail.

"Despite my feeling that advertising mail has received discriminatory criticism and my feeling that direct mailers are good customers of the postal system whose business I would like to keep and encourage to grow, as I have said, it is perfectly apparent that many of the public do not want it and regard its unsolicited entrance into their homes as an intrusion. We must in practical assessment, therefore, charge it with a substantial premium because of its lack of social acceptance—if it is going to exist, it must pay an extra price of admission. And that is, to some extent, what we have done in proposing a 33% increase in minimum piece rates and somewhat smaller increase in pound rates. It is not accident that the percentage increase is the same as for first-class mail—we conclude that this was a practical necessity under the conditions as they now exist. If in the future direct mailers are unable to improve their products and their image so that their acceptance is better, that fact should be reflected in their responsibility to share in future cost increases. I think perhaps the facts developed in our new cost analysis may help them improve their image, since they demonstrate that their product does indeed pay its out-of-pocket costs plus a substantial contribution to institutional costs.

"We are aware that we face competitive pressures in third-class bulk mail and that a significant loss of third-class business would put an additional burden on first-class mail. For this reason we have staged the increase into three increments and intend to work with our customers to avoid loss of volume to the greatest extent possible. I expect we shall nevertheless lose some, although I think the total contribution to institutional costs will hold up because of the higher unit prices."

A MINI RESEARCH PROJECT

The questionnaire below was sent to 88,723 housewives in the Omaha, Nebraska market in our September Red Letter.

Significantly, in reply to question one, 86.8% of the respondents like to receive the Red Letter; only 13.2% answered no.

All those who replied that they like to receive Red Letter also indicated their intention to redeem the coupons ranging from a high of 50.4% of the respondents who indicated their intention to make a partial redemption to a low of 7.8% who intended to redeem half of the coupons.

Forty-five percent of those who like to receive Red Letter indicated that they take advantage of the special offers.

Finally and particularly important is that of the 88,723 mailed *only* 0.4% asked to be removed from our list and not receive additional Red Letters.

WILL YOU DO US A FAVOR

Please take a few minutes to answer the following brief questions about the Metromail Red Letter.

1. Do you like to receive your Red Letter?
2. Will you redeem the coupons?
3. Do you take advantage of special offers for magazines, records, film, books, etc.?
4. If for any reason you do not wish to receive Red Letter, just fill in your name and address below.

Name.
Address.
City, State, Zip code.
Many thanks for your help.
Metromail, a Metromedia Company.

MOUNT PLEASANT, IOWA,
May 1, 1970.

MR. DAVID M. STANLEY,
Muscatine, Iowa

DEAR DAVE: I was both surprised and disappointed to read about the remarks concerning Third Class mail advertising which you delivered to the Republic Women's Convention at Fairfield this past Saturday.

My surprise stems from your complete reversal of your recent stand on this subject. You will recall that shortly after announcing your congressional candidacy you visited my home for the expressed purpose of clarifying your position and attitude on direct mail advertising. At that time you acknowledged your awareness that this industry creates tens of thousands of jobs, accounts for more than 30 billion dollars in annual sales of goods and services; is a positive contributor to our postal system; and, in fact, does pay its own way in the system. Your April 25 statements obviously refute this previous position.

My disappointment arises from your apparent lack of awareness of some rather basic facts connected with a vital national issue. Your statement that "Most families don't want all the advertising—that fill our mailboxes" is simply not true. Rather it is an emotional ploy occasionally voiced by vested interest opponents of the industry. To the contrary, several survey studies conducted on this very question all concluded that only a small minority of individual Americans are opposed to this form of advertising. Specifically, an extensive national study conducted by the well-known market research firm of A. C. Nielsen showed that only 15% of the population dislike receiving direct mail advertising. It is interesting to note that this figure includes 5% of the people who do not like to receive *any* mail.

Your further statement that "A Post Office study shows . . . third class . . . mail

loses money" is a subjective interpretation of some old, over-generalized figures that the Post Office Department has publicly declared to be obsolete and invalid. Postmaster General Blount has stated on numerous occasions that Third Class Bulk mail is a desirable, positive contributor to the economic efficiency of the postal operation. This statement is supported by the Department's Revenue and Cost Analysis report issued on April 6 of this year. The report shows that revenue from Third Class Bulk mail exceeds its handling cost by 98% whereas the revenue from First Class mail exceeds its respective handling cost by only 85%. The same report also shows that Third Class Bulk is the *most profitable* major class of mail handled by the Post Office.

To go a step further, Assistant Postmaster General James W. Hargrove stated on April 13 of this year that, if Third Class Bulk mail did not exist, then the 296 million dollars in gross profit which it produced in fiscal 1969 would have had to come from some other source. He added that there are only two alternatives for 'that other source'—either a congressional subsidy or an increase in First Class postage rates.

With these thoughts in mind, I certainly hope that you will reconsider your present position on this subject. When I served as one of your county chairman in the 1968 Senatorial Campaign, I had complete conviction of your unquestioned integrity, objectivity, and tireless effort to seek out and weigh all of the facts before acting on any issue. I'm sure that this personal involvement with your past efforts tends to heighten my awareness and concern in regard to some of your more recent activities. However, I certainly hope (and must assume) that these inconsistencies do not represent your considered personal position but are simply over-zealous campaign efforts which were produced by well intentioned supporters.

The voters of Iowa's First District rightfully look to both you and your opponents for information and interpretation on vital issues. I am sure that you constantly strive to fulfill this obligation in the most straight forward and unbiased manner possible and hope that the information which I have offered will be of assistance to you in this effort. Enclosed you will find some further details which may be of interest in exploring the subject of Third Class postal economics.

Sincerely,

MIKE MCSWEENEY.

U.S. POLICY IN LAOS STRENGTHENS THE COMMUNISTS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of public concern over President Nixon's invasion of Cambodia, we must not forget the quiet war of escalation the administration has been conducting in Laos throughout 1969 and 1970.

I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress excerpts from four articles from the Far Eastern Economic Review which describe how Vietnamization, a reduction in U.S. ground troops in Vietnam, has resulted in an escalatory use of weapons of mass destruction in Laos.

As these articles point out, massive devastation of civilian life and property has drastically altered the fragile politics of neutrality in Laos. The Pathet Lao has become the only viable indigenous political force capable of providing leadership for thousands of dislocated and poverty stricken peasants.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, is this the course the President will now take in Cambodia after the withdrawal of U.S. troops on June 30? If so, he must be warned that indiscriminate bombing, use of chemicals, and other forms of massive civilian destruction create the social conditions which invite resistance and the growth of communism.

The excerpts from the four articles follow:

WASHINGTON'S DILEMMA

(By Arnold Abrams)

Ironically, those most in the dark about Laos are the American people. More than simply being unaware of the scope of U.S. operations here, they have yet to be told by their government that their nation is militarily involved in Laos. American officials still seek to officially conceal U.S. violations of the 1962 Geneva Accord, which bars all forms of foreign military intervention in Laos. They contend that Hanoi's refusal to concede the presence of North Vietnamese troops here makes it diplomatically unfeasible for Washington to act otherwise.

Consequently, everyone in Vientiane, from the Russian ambassador to the *mamasan* of the legendary White Rose, knows what the Americans are doing here. But the American public remains ignorant of the fact that their government is arming, training, supplying, transporting and directing approximately 70,000 Laotian troops in a war which threatens to get out of hand.

Instead of setting the record at least partially straight, U.S. officials here do things like allowing Vang Pao to declare recently, before a sizable contingent of visiting journalists, that his Meo forces fight with antiquated weapons, inadequate communications and inconsequential American support. As he was speaking, American F-4 Phantom jets roared overhead, several American observation planes were parked nearby and three cargo-laden American transport planes landed in quick succession at his official Sam Thong base. After denying he even received indirect U.S. military support, Vang Pao calmly climbed into an unmarked American helicopter, guarded by Laotians carrying American-made M-16 automatic rifles, and was flown back to his secret Long Cheng headquarters by a three-man American crew.

Vang Pao and official verbiage notwithstanding, American involvement in the Laotian conflict takes the following principal forms: In addition to 75 military advisers listed as embassy "attaches," about 300 men are employed in a variety of clandestine military activities supervised by the CIA. Although technically civilians, many CIA agents in Laos are former Special Forces soldiers recruited because of military expertise and Vietnam experience.

These ex-Green Berets train government troops, assist wide-ranging reconnaissance teams and plan guerrilla and psychological warfare operations. They wear combat fatigues and work out of three main camps, where they administer rigorous training in jungle warfare, guerrilla tactics, communications handling and weaponry.

The CIA also maintains and largely controls Vang Pao's army of approximately 15,000 fulltime troops. Official instructions to the contrary, CIA personnel occasionally accompany these forces on combat forays. More than 20 agents have been killed in Laos. Among the most recent CIA casualties was Phil Werbisky, a former Special Forces captain widely known for his exploits during the early days of Vietnam. He was killed in the government's late-summer offensive.

"These guys are tigers," says an American personally acquainted with many CIA agents in Laos. "They're tough, intelligent guys who know how to handle themselves. They're not afraid to mix it up out in the jungle." The American is a civilian engineer who befriended many agents while helping to build airstrips on several of their remote outposts. "They came to Laos because they were fed up with having their hands tied in Vietnam," he says. "Here they're doing things the way they want to, and getting better pay for it as well."

An important CIA adjunct in Laos has the innocuous title of "Requirements Office". It is staffed by about 90 men, most of whom also are ex-military types. Their function may be inconspicuous, but it is not innocuous. Stationed at field level, requirements officers—called ROs—handle the distribution of arms and ammunition, as well as general logistics. They are vital to any military operation mounted by the government.

Learning about these activities prompted Senator Fulbright to raise a key question about the CIA's role here: since its function ostensibly is to gather information, why is this agency running a war in Laos? "I don't approve of this kind of activity at all," Fulbright said. "But if it is in the national security interest to do this, it seems to me it ought to be done by regular US army forces and not by an intelligence-gathering agency." He added that the National Security Act, which created the CIA, "never contemplated this function" for the agency.

The CIA mission chief in Laos is Lawrence Devlin, listed as a "political officer" in the US Embassy. Unlike most political officers, however, Devlin flatly refuses to see reporters. For all anybody knows, he might agree on that last point with Senator Fulbright, who stressed that he was not criticising the CIA. "The agency is just following orders," Fulbright said.

Cargo and military supplies—as well as personnel—are ferried throughout Laos by Air America and Continental Air Services, private charter firms under contract to the US government. They are better known as the "CIA Airlines", and most of their pilots are ex-air force officers. Reporters are allowed to accompany flights involving rice drops to refugee camps, but are banned when military cargoes are carried.

"Why do you guys always ask about weapons and ammo shipments?" pilot Jim Walsh asked me. Walsh, 38, is an ex-air force officer who has worked in Laos for Air America since 1962. "You know we're not allowed to talk about such things," he said.

Another form of American air service in Laos constitutes the most direct US involvement in the fighting. Under the euphemism of "armed reconnaissance flights", Thailand-based American jets and bombers have mounted aerial bombardments equal to the pounding taken by North Vietnam prior to the bombing halt in 1968. The Ho Chi Minh trail in southeast Laos has been the prime target of American air attacks, but enemy encampments and troops on the Plain of Jars came under heavy fire during the recent government offensive.

Money for many US operations in Laos is cloaked in the budget of the mammoth Agency for International Development, or channelled through other unobtrusive conduits. The scope of American financial support of the neutralist Royal Lao government testifies to the effectiveness of such cover. Total American assistance here is reliably estimated at between US $250 million and $300 million per year. Of that, only the technical aid budget—about $60 million—is made public. The rest, undisclosed, goes almost entirely for military purposes.

ONE YEAR WORSE

(By T. D. Allman)

The situation in Laos is not particularly encouraging for either side—for the Americans who have dropped hundreds of thousands of tons of bombs to prop up the Vientiane government, or for the North Vietnamese, who have invested tens of thousands of troops in a so-far futile effort to force Prince Souvanna Phouma's government to follow more acquiescent policies.

Almost paradoxically, both sides have begun the present dry season, which marks the annual upswing in fighting, in weaker positions than they held six months or a year ago. Both sides seem as far away as ever from achieving their goals in Laos. And the country is victim of an escalating level of violence that so far has maintained the rough balance of territorial power only at an ever higher cost in Laotian lives, property and hope of finding some way out of the Vietnam war.

Indeed, as Laos enters its sixth full year of war since the break-up of the coalition government and escalation of the war in South Vietnam, nothing seems to have turned out the way anyone wanted it. The North Vietnamese hoped to use Laos as an unimpeded funnel to victory in South Vietnam. When the Vientiane government permitted the Americans to start the bombing, the North Vietnamese committed increasing amounts of troops in an effort to discredit that government. This they have succeeded in doing, at least militarily, time after time, but the U.S. bombing has only increased.

The Americans began the bombing with some hope of keeping the war from spreading deep into the territory of an increasingly dependent Vientiane government. But jet bombers cannot stop ambushes; they are of relatively little use even in medium-sized engagements. As a result, American bombs have been able to drive the communists off the Plain of Jars and have constantly harassed traffic along the Ho Chi Minh trail. But nothing the Americans can do, short of moving their own ground troops into Laos, can prevent the communists from disrupting normal commerce and government in the Mekong valley. Similarly, communist raids and larger attacks can discredit the Vientiane government's pretensions to effective authority but they cannot stop the American bombing.

Thus neither North Vietnam nor the United States have found the short-cut to victory in South Vietnam that they sought in violations of Laotian neutrality. The Laotians, on both sides, have suffered heavily. Probably neither the Americans nor the North Vietnamese originally anticipated that the Laotian war would involve them so deeply, and turn out to be so inconclusive.

There now is some debate in Vientiane on when the communists will finally be able to get their Plain of Jars counter-offensive going, and when they do, whether it will force the United States into another escalation, such as the use of B-52 bombers for the first time in large numbers outside the Ho Chi Minh trail.

But in contrast to a year ago, there is now absolute unanimity among all observers, of all persuasions, that an end to the Laos war is impossible until after the end of the Vietnam war, whenever that may come, and that the prognosis for Laos in 1970, and indeed for a long time after that, is for more—perhaps much more—of the same.

LAOS: SHADES OF LBJ

(By T. D. Allman)

VIENTIANE.—Two expressions—"escalation" and "credibility gap"—may well be on the way to having the same dark significance for President Nixon that they had for his predecessor. Lyndon Johnson's fruitless upings of the ante in South Vietnam in pursuit of an illusory military victory, and his compulsive lack of candour on the effects and motives of that policy carried him from the greatest plurality in the history of presidential elections to political oblivion four years later.

This time the president appears less egoinvolved; the country is Laos, not Vietnam; and Richard Nixon still has many, many mistakes to make before he turns into the Lear-like figure that Johnson has become.

But mistakes are being made in Laos, and they became more obvious after Nixon's recent nationwide address on Laos. It was supposed to tell all, but it wound up being undeniably—and probably deliberately—cavalier with the facts about the disguised war the US is fighting in Laos.

The major fact Nixon apparently wished to conceal was that the US war effort in Laos had increased greatly since November 1968 when the bombing halt in North Vietnam resulted in an almost automatic escalation of bombing in Laos. He said reports that the increase in "our air activity has had the effect of escalating the conflict" were "grossly inaccurate."

The fact remains that US bombing sorties over Laos have risen from an average 4–5,000 a month to 15–18,000 today. The fact remains that the US now is bombing whole areas of Laos it did not touch before, including the Plain of Jars. The fact remains that the US has expanded its policy of systematically denuding the Communist-held areas of Laos by moving in, taking out the civilian population, destroying all stocks of food and defoliating productive land. It is also a fact that US personnel—including advisers, planners, transport pilots and American gunship crews—are more deeply involved in fighting the Laotians' war for them than ever before.

Nixon, of course, went on television to defend his policy, not to pick it apart. The speech, obviously aimed squarely at Middle America, was an attempt to win political approval for what is going on in Laos. With increasing disquiet expressed in the US Congress and the press about the US war effort in Laos, the President could be excused for emphasizing the logic behind his own Laos policy—even if it meant trying to lay all the blame for the unhappy state of affairs in Laos on Hanoi's doorstep. But the President can hardly be excused for saying things that even US officials here have had to concede, just aren't right. Among the Nixonian departures from reality:

The President said there were 67,000 North Vietnamese troops in Laos, up from 55,000 in mid-1969. The US embassy here, despite its enthusiasm for the task, can find only 50,000 North Vietnamese troops, an increase from the 47,000 figure estimated in the middle of last year.

He said a total of 1,040 Americans work for the US government in Laos, directly or indirectly, of which 643 are involved in some military or logistics capacity. A paragraph later, he said: "US personnel in Laos during the past year has not increased . . ." But only last September, in another administration statement supposed to tell all about Laos, the US State Department said that only 833 Americans were working in Laos. Had the total number of Americans in Laos actually increased from 833 to 1,040—a rise of almost 25%? Or was the State Department wrong? Or the president?

Most disturbing, reliable sources here say the total of US personnel directly supporting the Vietnamese government's war effort is really much higher than 643, more like 1,000, if one includes "temporary duty personnel", and military and logistics personnel who spend the day in Laos but sleep at night at US bases in Thailand and Vietnam. None of the figures—the State Department's, the president's or those knowledgeable sources in Laos—include the tens of thousands of Americans who support the mammoth US bombing operation in Laos from bases in Thailand, Vietnam and Guam.

Nixon said: "No American stationed in Laos has ever been killed in ground combat operations." Although the phrasing is highly restrictive—most of the Laos war is fought from outside Laos by US personnel not stationed there—it is well known in Vientiane that many Americans have been killed in combat situations in Laos, and that their deaths, in South Vietnam, would be counted as combat casualties. Informed sources here—recalling that Americans killed in Laos are often shipped out on special planes without legal formalities in order to avoid publicity—estimate that about 150 Americans are killed each year in the Laos war, the vast majority of them pilots shot down on bombing missions. The president's contention that no American lives are being spent in Laos, of all his experiments with the truth, may be the one that comes back to haunt him the most as more and more Americans—mostly the families of civilian Air America pilots and US Air Force officers—receive death telegrams from Washington.

Perhaps most importantly, the president sought to camouflage the major changes that have occurred in the US policy in Laos over the last year by averring that American expansion of its war role in Laos has occurred "only when requested by the Laotian government". He also said: "The level of our air operations has been increased only as the number of North Vietnamese in Laos and the level of their aggression has increased."

In fact, observers here point out, the initial US air escalation in Laos, which occurred during late 1968 and early 1969, happened when there was no communist threat of noticeably increased proportions. Indeed, the aerial escalation did not occur because of special events in Laos, but because the US bombing halt in North Vietnam for the first time permitted the focus of the US air arsenal to shift to Laos. And perhaps, the crucial point, long-time observers here say, is that until a year ago Laotian requests for an escalation of the US bombing and logistics effort were rejected as a matter of a long-established policy of keeping the US involvement in Laos as low profile as possible.

That policy has changed, and the Nixon administration clearly is no longer interested in keeping a particularly low profile in Laos, despite the overall thrust of the Nixon Doctrine. The underlying reasons for the change in Laos policy are not hard to discern: "The US is deescalating downstream in South Vietnam," a Vientiane diplomat recently observed. "It is only natural that it should escalate upstream in Laos, especially on the Ho Chi Minh Trail."

The American bombing of communist infiltration routes in Laos, in fact, will be one of the few controls the US will retain over events in South Vietnam as Vietnamisation proceeds. The effectiveness of the bombing is debatable. But the President clearly does not wish to relinquish it while he is surrendering so many other options in South Vietnam.

Indeed, from all appearances, U.S. policymakers see the U.S. bombing in Laos as one of the keys to escape from the whole Indochina labyrinth. If the bombing can control the flow of North Vietnamese soldiers and supplies into South Vietnam, Vietnamisation will have a better chance of success, and the U.S. will be well on its way out of the war.

Of course, the train of cause and effect in international affairs is seldom so simple, and the North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao have expressed their displeasure at the increase of bombing by continuing their attacks against government positions in Laos. They are using more men than ever before in the current dry season offensive—though the rise in number of North Vietnamese troops in Laos does not constitute the escalation Presi-

dent Nixon charged so much as a need to protect the Plain of Jars flank which the U.S. and Laotians for the first time attacked last year.

If the communists continue, as they have in the past, to win more and more ground in Laos, the government of Prince Souvanna Phouma could fall, or be forced to make concession to the communists, such as calling for a U.S. bombing halt. This, of course, would undermine the whole American effort to get out of South Vietnam gracefully, and so the Nixon administration has gone to escalated lengths to preserve the Vientiane government from a string of communist defeats.

THE LABYRINTHINE WAR

In 1953 the Vietminh launched an offensive into Laos. This forced the French to make an unpalatable choice; either attempt to hold on to Laos or, as military sense dictated, withdraw and concentrate forces on the Vietnamese coastal plans. The French chose the former—and Dienbienphu and disaster soon followed.

Now, in 1970, a white foreign power fighting to maintain its position in Laos and Vietnam may soon be faced with a similar decision. If current communist military activities continue, the U.S. will have to decide whether to become more involved in Laos or make political and military concessions it has not yet been willing to consider.

It is still too early to say where the pendulum will swing. But one thing is clear: the U.S. and the Royal Lao Government are on the defensive. If the communists decide to continue their offensive—however large and whoever is leading—it is not likely to be contained without substantial military escalation or significant concessions on the part of the Americans.

For the past two years the U.S. has carried out one of the most sustained bombing campaigns in history against essentially civilian targets in northeastern Laos. The area is a carpet of forest dotted by villages and a few towns. Refugees report that the bombing was primarily directed against their villages. Operating from Thai bases and from aircraft carriers, American jets have destroyed the great majority of villages and towns in the northeast. Severe casualties have been inflicted upon the inhabitants of the region, rice fields have been burned, and roads torn up. Refugees from the Plain of Jars report they were bombed almost daily by American jets last year. They say they spent most of the past two years living in caves or holes.

The basic aim of this bombing has been to hurt communist forces in every possible way: to deprive them of villages which could provide them with shelter, of manpower which could be used as porters or rice growers, to limit food supplies and road travel and to demoralise.

It seems probable, however, that this attempt to "raise the ante" has worked only too well. Militarily the Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese seem to be as strong as ever.

The ineffectiveness of American airpower is highlighted in a comparison of the communist offensives against the Plain of Jars in 1964 and 1970. It took them three days to take it six years ago. This year, despite the massive American air support for government forces, it took five days.

Perched on the prain, communist forces could move in any or all of three directions. They could push west to Route 13, then move south toward Vang Vieng. Pathet Lao forces include a number of former neutralist battalions, currently commanded by General Deuane. The Pathet Lao claim that these represent the real neutralists. By taking Vang Vieng they would be recapturing territory belonging to the Kong Le neutralists in 1962 and could then claim it in the name of their own "patriotic neutralist" forces.

They might move southwest in an attempt to take Long Cheng and Sam Thong. Long Cheng is the major US military base in northeast Laos. Recently visited by journalists for the first time, they reported seeing the longest runway in northern Laos, big helicopters used for rescuing downed American pilots in northern Laos, and American planes landing and taking off every minute. Sam Thong, seven miles away by air, is a centre for airlifting arms, food and medical supplies to Meo villages organised into paramilitary outposts. These are located on mountaintops and can be supplied only from the air. Long Cheng and Sam Thong constitute the logistics and air support centre for military activities throughout the northeast. Both are relatively easy to defend, being surrounded by hills on all sides. If the communists are willing to pay the price, however, there seems little doubt that they could capture both; this would mean a major military defeat for government forces.

A third though less likely possibility is that the communists may move southeast and attempt to take Paksane, a Mekong river town. Militarily this would be relatively easy but it might risk Thai involvement and conceivably, American ground intervention. It also seems unlikely that communist forces could hold Paksane for very long.

Whatever direction they choose to move, a communist offensive from the plain could place the US in a most difficult position. Airpower would be unlikely to halt their advance. Neither would the Royal Lao Army or the CIA-directed Clandestine Army.

The 60,000-man Royal Lao Army is made up primarily of village youths conscripted to fight in a war they neither understand nor desire. A private's salary is about US$5 a month. Government soldiers have shown a marked—and one suspects rather astute—disposition for retreat during major battles. Corruption and indifference is rife in the officers corps. American military attaches complain constantly that the only advice Lao army officers seek from them is in preparing escape plans. During the last battle for the plain government soldiers complained that they had been fenced in by barbed wire to prevent their retreat.

The Meo soldiers—and Thai, Burmese and Cambodian mercenaries of the Clandestine Army—tend to be more aggressive than regular troops. A private is paid more than US$30 a month and is better equipped and trained. Their strength is about 6,000 in northeastern Laos and 6,000 in the rest of the country. However, as an American official delicately put it, the Meos are "better at attacking than defending". The fact is that they are basically a group of guerillas, effective at harassing and small actions but simply not designed to function as a regular army. The most serious problem with Vang Pao's Meo soldiers is their lack of discipline. Laotian refugees complain bitterly of mistreatment by Meo soldiers during their capture of the plain last September. Refugees say the Meos slaughtered hundreds of cows and buffaloes, destroyed many of their shelters and looted their belongings.

The only real military options left to the US should a major communist thrust develop are the introduction of American ground troops or support of a Thai invasion into Laos.

At present, neither seems very likely. Laos is simply not a vital enough interest for the US to introduce ground troops, particularly after nine years of Vietnam. And support of Thai troops in Laos might in the end prove more complicated and costly than sending in American troops. Despite periodic breast-beatings at SEATO conferences and other occasions, the Thais are not very anxious to confront the North Vietnamese army face to face. And few Americans here believe that if they did they would make a particularly good showing.

A successful communist push in Laos would probably result in major political and military concessions on the part of the US.

This would seem to be the communist goal. Few informed observers here believe that the communists plan to take over Laos in the near future. American military attaches, the first to ascribe aggressive motives to the North Vietnamese, have stated publicly that they do not believe that the North Vietnamese are intent on "colonising" Laos.

The first priority for the communists would probably be to force the US to stop its bombing of both the Ho Chi Minh trail and northern Laos. A second would be to give greatly increased strength to the Pathet Lao within the framework of a coalition government.

A third, and intriguing, possibility is that a communist offensive in Laos may be designed to force a faster rate of American troop withdrawal from South Vietnam. A major thrust which seemed on the point of taking over all of Laos would place the US in an untenable position. It might well be that in such a case the Americans would be prepared to swap a faster withdrawal of American forces from South Vietnam in return for some firm communist guarantees of neutral status for Laos.

Such speculations point up the basic weakness of the American position in Laos. Over the past five years Royal Lao Government control has gradually been eroded. Most of Laos is either a no-man's land or is controlled by the Pathet Lao. A successful communist offensive would shrink government control even further. This weakness was implicit in President Richard Nixon's March 8 statement on Laos. By appealing to the Russians—who are unlikely to have either the inclination or capability to slow a Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese advance into Laos—the president seemed to imply that American ability to contain communist forces in Laos is limited.

Perhaps most significantly, American military priorities have prevented any strengthening of the Royal Laos Government. Its corruption, lethargy and indifference is as great if not greater than it ever was. Few people living under its rule actively support it. American officials have been unable to push for basic reforms due to the political necessity of getting on with the Lao civilian and military elite so that continued American bombing will be permitted.

Laos is not Vietnam: U.S. deaths here are counted in the hundreds—mostly downed pilots and crew—not tens of thousands. And expenses are measured in hundreds of millions of dollars, not billions. But if Vietnam is America's quagmire, Laos is its labyrinth.

It seems clear at this point that the only path out leads through agreement on some sort of political settlement. The Americans simply do not have enough usable military power to force a favourable military situation. The U.S. will not find the concessions necessary to bring peace to Laos very pleasant. At the least, it will involve a suspension of all bombing in Laos and acceptance of a truly non-aligned Vientiane government. And it may involve trading complete and relatively rapid withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam for a guarantee of Laotian neutrality.

STATUS REPORT ON THE BRITISH-FRENCH CONCORDE

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the London Economist for May 30, 1970, contained an interesting article on the British-French Concorde supersonic transport.

There is "increasing airline dissatis-

faction" with the Concorde, the article says. The airlines say the plane is too small, the article goes on, and "they expect to make a loss on Concorde however they fly it."

Furthermore, the crucial trials of the Concorde at cruising speed have been delayed. These trials will test two points where the Concorde is most vulnerable—fuel consumption and the aerodynamics of its wing. According to the Economist:

It either behaves fractionally less well than it should, so that it takes more power to push the aircraft, or more fuel to keep the engines up to the mark, then crossing the North Atlantic could be impossible for the Concorde.

I include the Economist article in the RECORD at this point:

WHAT TO DO WITH CONCORDE: SHOULD THE NEXT GOVERNMENT IN BRITAIN CONSIDER A MAJOR REDESIGN OF THE CONCORDE AIRLINER?

The formal announcement in a white paper* on Wednesday that all supersonic flying will be banned over Britain is important because it put on the record what everyone has assumed was bound to happen. It is a decision all reasonably developed countries are expected sooner or later to take. In the United States, already acutely pollution-conscious, the British lead will stiffen the political opposition to the American supersonic programme. That opposition has gained momentum this year. Support for America's proposed supersonic airliner (SST) had never been cordial. But this year the amount of money required has jumped sharply, to $290 million. This has coincided with growing reports that the Boeing design is altering for the worse—with its weight going up and its performance going down, just as on the first prototype abandoned early last year. It has also coincided with reports of increasing airline dissatisfaction with Concorde, which has made Americans less afraid of the possibility that Concorde would sweep the American market and make huge inroads into the balance of payments, although the Department of Transportation still says it will.

The result is that the American SST's budget has been scraping through its various congressional stages by increasingly and uncomfortably narrow votes. On Wednesday, the House of Representatives finally passed it without cuts but it might have been rougher had the Russians not helpfully flown their supersonic transport at its designed speed of twice the speed of sound for the first time on Tuesday. But the SST's budget still has to go through the Senate, where the opposition is tougher and better organised, and where some pessimists in the aviation press are even beginning to suspect that it could be voted down altogether.

If the American programme is visibly in trouble, is this the time for the next British government to get together with the French and talk seriously about whether they should concede some airlines' request to redesign Concorde—since there could now be less urgency about putting it into the market before an American competitor and more to be gained from offering an aircraft with improved performance? The present complaint is that Concorde is too small. The two manufacturers are currently proposing that airlines should reduce the seats in it to 110; and fly it as an all-first class service, charging first class or marginally less than first class fares (which on the North Atlantic are high: £213 return). On the manufacturers' figures, this would show a profit; on the airlines' calculations, it would not. They expect to make a loss on Concorde however they fly it.

The proposal that has been put by some airlines is that Concorde's fuselage should be widened so that an extra row of seats can be run down its length. This would increase the seating from four to five abreast and get numbers up closer to 200. Technically, this would be easy to do, and it also looks as if it might even improve flying performance by giving the aircraft a bigger surface area. It is not thought, at this preliminary stage, that it would involve any of those costly changes to the wing that lengthening the fuselage would. Lengthening Concorde's fuselage, without also changing the wings, would make the fuselage stick out at the back and wag dangerously. It is a ploy to be avoided in a narrow, delta-shaped aircraft.

The Government appeared to set its face against late major changes 12 months ago. It said that if Concorde costs were to rise more than 15 per cent above the estimated £730 million it was then taking to develop—a figure which still holds, thanks to the effects of French devaluation—this would be tantamount to a major redesign. The unspoken implication was that Mr. Wilson was unwilling to agree to go back to the drawing board. But 15 per cent of £730 million is over 100 million. And engineers believe that the proposed modification of the fuselage could be kept within £100 million.

There are two catches. The most obvious is that only the naive are still prepared to accept estimates by the aircraft industry, here or in the United States. But the more important one is that Concorde has not, unlike the Soviet SST, yet flown at twice the speed of sound. It should have been doing so any time now. Instead it has been grounded for a variety of reasons; most obviously strikes at Bristol (see page 61). These trials at cruising speed are crucial. No amount of work in wind tunnels and on computers can substitute for them. They will test the two points where Concorde is most vulnerable: the fuel consumption of its engines at normal cruising, and the aerodynamics of its wing. If either behaves fractionally less well than it should, so that it takes more power to push the aircraft, or more fuel to keep the engines up to the mark, then crossing the North Atlantic could be impossible for the Concorde. That is, unless the airlines and the government regulatory bodies behind them are prepared to compromise on the size of the fuel reserve that any aircraft is required to carry for possible diversion to another airport. In lay language, this would be translated as cutting safety margins, and may therefore be politically unacceptable.

The two governments need the result of these trials before they can know what sort of Concorde they have on their hands, or whether it is even worth discussing a modification. The airlines would cordially support them if they did think of changes. It would save the airlines from having to decide how to pay for so expensive an aircraft during that period of the mid-1970s when most of them will be staggering from the losses they are going to make on jumbos until the traffic catches up with the new capacity. Some airlines will simply not be able to, a fact that must cut sales of Concorde. What airlines would most like is that the present Concorde design be treated as a prototype for a bigger 200-seater; the latter would then not be ready until, at a guess, 1976, as against a probable 1974 for the aircraft in its present form. To make the decision easy for the two governments, the airlines might, with arm-twisting, take perhaps 40 of the present Concordes: just as they took a small version of the original 707 from Boeing 13 years ago, in order to ease the introduction to jets. This is a let-out that should be seriously considered after June 18th.

* The Protection of the Environment. Cmd 4373.

SENATE—*Tuesday, June 9, 1970*

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of all our days, grant that we may live this one day, free from fear and frustration, in command of all our powers, with compassion and charity toward all men. So rule over us that we may be channels of Thy mind and spirit, serving this Nation's welfare and advancing Thy kingdom, to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. EAGLETON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 7, 1969, as amended, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably, with amendments, on June 8, 1970, the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 91-917) thereon, which was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. EAGLETON) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.