

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEBRASKA RURAL ELECTRIFICATION
ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the late Senator George Norris, one of Nebraska's most distinguished citizens, was noted for many contributions to my State and our Nation. But perhaps one of his greatest achievements was leading the fight in the U.S. Congress 36 years ago for a nationwide rural electrification program.

Those of us from rural States know full well what a substantial role this program played in revitalizing rural areas, making them much more appealing and livable.

In Nebraska alone, since the program was inaugurated, REA loans to rural electric systems have provided service to an estimated 117,935 rural consumers. Loans which have been made to the 37 REA electric borrowers, including 33 public power districts and four cooperatives, total \$205,338,879.

When the first REA-financed line in the State was energized in December of 1936, only 7.1 percent of Nebraska farms were receiving electric service. Today, thanks to the REA program, 98 percent of the State's 74,000 farms are receiving electric service.

It is perhaps difficult for Senators from largely urban States to realize the importance of such a program as REA to States which are largely rural in nature. The advantages of rural living are many and have been amply documented throughout our Nation's history. There unfortunately have been many disadvantages as well, and it is in the Nation's interest to remedy these disadvantages as rapidly and effectively as our resources will permit.

The REA program has been one of the classic programs which have brought comfort, convenience, and pleasure to rural living. As our urban problems fail to abate, there appears to be a great interest in rural living, a longing of many of our people to get back to a simplified existence in smaller communities and rural areas.

It may not be generally realized, Mr. President, but continued development of our rural areas will soon help solve the problems of our cities and soon help reestablish the balance in our population density which was once one of our Nation's great sources of political and economic strength.

REA continues to play a very prominent role in this very beneficial discovery of rural living. As of January 1, 1970, REA had advanced \$194,449,544 to Nebraska borrowers. These funds have been invested in local facilities which include 63,251 miles of line serving 111,232 farm and other rural consumers.

Consumers served by REA borrowers in the State are using increasing amounts

of electricity on their farms, in their homes, and businesses. As an example of the increase, the average monthly consumption per consumer in 1958 was 431 kilowatt-hours. By 1968, this average had risen to 1,083 kilowatt-hours. That is an increase of nearly 250 percent in a 10-year period, and it shows you the tremendous impact which this program has made upon the rural community in Nebraska.

By January 1, 1970, REA borrowers in Nebraska had made a total of \$126,149,765 in payments on their Government loans. These payments included \$73,118,789 repaid on principal as due, \$11,871,743 of principal paid ahead of schedule, and interest payments of \$41,159,233.

Not a single borrower was overdue in its payments.

That is a record we are very proud of in Nebraska.

As a means of emphasizing Nebraska's dependence upon and pleasure with the REA program, it has become an annual practice for the Nebraska Rural Electrification Association to sponsor an essay writing contest on the subject of REA.

The subject this year was "The Value of Rural Electrification in My Home and Community." Hundreds of essays were submitted by high school students, and the 22 participants whose work was judged the best have been given a trip to Washington by the NREA.

A highlight of that trip will be the students' attendance at the Nebraska congressional breakfast next week. The young people will be presented with copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing their essays.

Mr. President, I have some of the winning entries from this year's competition and I ask unanimous consent to have printed essays from the following students:

Dennis Andrews, 16, a sophomore at Holbrook Public Schools, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald H. Andrews of Holbrook; sponsored by the Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge.

Karen Steel, 16, a junior at North Platte High School, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Wesley Steel of North Platte; sponsored by the Dawson Public Power District of Lexington.

Phil Maseberg, 17, a junior at Thedford High School, son of Mr. and Mrs. Millard Maseberg of Thedford; sponsored by the Custer Public Power District of Broken Bow.

Margaret Gunther, 16, a sophomore at Broken Bow High School, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Vincent Gunther of Broken Bow; sponsored by the Custer Public Power District of Broken Bow.

Marci Wemhoff, 15, a sophomore at St. Francis High School in Humphrey, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ray Wemhoff of Humphrey; sponsored by the Cornhusker Public Power District of Columbus.

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

INFORMATION

My Name: Dennis Andrews.

Age: 16.

Grade: Sophomore.

School: Holbrook Public Schools.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Donald H. Andrews, Holbrook, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME
AND MY COMMUNITY

Electricity. What is electricity? Many people know electricity by what it does for them, but not by what it is. Scientists have found that an electric current is composed of tiny particles called electrons. An electron is a negatively charged particle of an atom. These electrons are conducted through conductors, such as wire, to the many homes of our country.

One may wonder how these tiny moving electrons may be of any use to man. There are two results of electric current that are used by man. As the electric current flows through a wire, resistance of "drag" produces heat. This heat is used to heat toast or warm one's house in the winter. The other force is a magnetic field produced from flowing electricity. This magnetic field is put to work in the electric motors, transformers, or AC welders. The invention of the electric light bulb by Thomas Edison was an important event that affected many lives. This invention allowed people to stay up after dark and not worry about a kerosene lamp or the effects of poor lighting.

Many people in rural areas were overjoyed with the coming of electricity; the farmers were able to enjoy many conveniences unthought of before that time. Lights were enjoyed by many, but radios enthralled the people about as much as anything, for they were able to hear the news as it happened. Little did they realize that they would witness the first step on the moon by man through the efforts of electricity.

Electricity has been put to work in endless ways in rural towns. On farms electricity has become increasingly more important. Grain can now be moved by electric augers instead of scooped by hand. Grains may also be harvested earlier because of the use of electric dryers. This would help prevent loss from lodging, hail, or other weather elements later in harvesting season. There were also many improvements and additions in the house. Lights, radios, refrigerators, and electric heating are just a few of the many pleasures of electricity.

Electrical power is needed in my community by every family. The only way electricity could be fully appreciated by everyone would be to have a power failure. The families could then see how dependent they really are on electricity. Due to the hard work of REA and the many linemen, however, a power failure seems very unlikely. These men have erected lines skillfully and accurately to minimize power failure possibilities.

REA represents many hopes for the future. The dreams of a farm in the future may wander from electric computerized farms to environmental controls of enclosed areas.

The letters, REA, might serve a dual purpose: first, Rural Electric Association; second, Reserve Energy Available for me and my community, now, and whatever our needs may be in the future.

INFORMATION

My Name: Karen Steel.

Age: 16.

Grade: Junior.
School: North Platte High School.
Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Wesley Steel, R. R. #3, North Platte, Nebr.
 Contestant sponsored by the Dawson Public Power District, Lexington, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

Electrification as it is today is a very important segment of our lives, for it is what keeps the wheels of progress turning. Each new invention leads to something better and more exciting than the last, and all this happened because men such as Ben Franklin and Thomas Edison were curious about the world around them. We are greatly indebted to these men, for their findings have served as the basis of many, many other remarkable inventions.

It is astonishing how much we take electricity for granted; we never realize how much we rely on it until we're without it. A few years ago when our power went out during a blizzard, we had to use kerosene lanterns for light and had to carry our water from a windmill not any too close to the house. For my brothers and sisters it was fun living like they had to in the olden days, but after a few days of going without power I realized just how much we depend on electricity to do things for us. Now I see why just about everything had to stop at nightfall; there just wasn't enough light to see.

Not too many years ago people were not able to enjoy the many wonderful electrically operated devices that we consider common today. In Grandma's day housework was tedious and time consuming—she would literally spend weeks in preparation of a special occasion. She didn't have the convenience of a freezer to keep her food from spoiling, or that of an automatic washer to keep clothing clean, or a vacuum cleaner to whisk over her floors. Now we can experience the pleasure of owning and using many appliances like electric ranges, toasters, steam irons, and the answer to any housewife's dream—dishwashers.

The home is not the only place greatly aided by electricity—outside, on our farms and ranches, electricity is very important, too, for it increases the farmer's efficiency and, in turn, his income. Electricity provides us with irrigation for our growing crops; and each year with the help of heating in barns and sheds, newborn animals are saved from the harshness of winter. With the help of devices such as electric fences, welders, power tools, and tank heaters the farmer can increase his efficiency, since formerly all this work had to be accomplished by manual or animal labor.

In addition to public power and irrigation benefits, Nebraska storage reservoirs provide many good recreation areas with some of the most beautiful scenery in the state. A prime example is Lake Maloney near North Platte. A popular place for many activities, it provides a variety of camping, fishing, golfing, boating, picnicking, and even rodeoing.

Rural Electrification still needs the "grass-roots support" of Nebraskans if it is to continue to be a state-wide blessing. We as future leaders of Nebraska are responsible for the betterment of our community, our state, our nation, and our world. Let's meet this challenge with the key to progress—Electricity!

INFORMATION

My Name: Phil Maseberg.
Age: 17.
Grade: Junior.
School: Thedford High School.
Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Millard Maseberg, Thedford, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Custer Public Power District, Broken Bow, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN MY HOME AND COMMUNITY

Do you remember the old story of Aladdin and his lamp? As the story goes Aladdin had but to rub the lamp and a genie appeared who granted his every wish. But all of us have learned that in today's world it is by working, not wishing, that we attain our goals. Yet, it is nice to know that a modern-day Aladdin's lamp is represented by the vast power that electricity has for us, if we are willing to make the effort to learn to use it. And we are doing just that in my rural community.

The early day settlers spent lots of time feudin' and fightin' for the land and water closest to town and modern conveniences. Sometimes it got excitin' but it was a wrong that needed rightin'. Rural electricity has deleted this problem. Electricity is now used in rural communities to power our irrigation wells, light and heat our homes, cook our meals, and make our chores quicker and easier.

A new "magic carpet" has been introduced that transmits signals for radio, TV, and telephones. It also carries the electricity to operate these appliances, making electrical outlets and messy cords unnecessary. You just insert a pronged probe into the carpet anywhere to connect appliances.

Electricity now spans many miles under country skies. We will never have to worry about running out of electricity as with oil, gas, and other natural resources. According to the predictions of nuclear experts, by 1980 atomic power plants will be generating 150,000 megawatts (150 million kilowatts) of electricity. Two of the ninety-two atomic plants that were ordered are being built in eastern Nebraska.

Rural electric and telephone systems helped to create at least 31,000 new jobs in rural America from July, 1967, through June, 1968.

Electricity flows through the wide open spaces where we live, and never leaves a trail of smog behind. Electricity can never be blamed for creating air pollution.

Electricity will work along in the evening breeze, and all through the night. It hums along, never complaining, and it takes no vacations. With farm and ranch labor so high and often hard to get, electricity does the work in half the time at a bare fraction of the cost of man-power.

With the many electric power tools in his shop, a farmer or rancher can save money on many costly repairs that he would have to take time off and travel to town and get.

Livestock is being sold by electric teletype machines. Office work is done faster by electric computers, typewriters, and many other electric machines.

Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Edison discovered and harnessed electricity. Rural electrification lines came to my sand-hills home in 1954, to give me all the conveniences, comforts, and entertainment that my city cousins have. The opportunities that the future "Aladdin Lamp" will create are limitless.

INFORMATION

My name: Margaret Gunther.
Age: 16.
Grade: Sophomore.
School: Broken Bow High School.
Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Vincent Gunther, R.R. No. 1, Broken Bow, Nebr.
 Contestant sponsored by the Custer Public Power District, Broken Bow, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN MY HOME AND COMMUNITY

A special day in the history of rural electrification will be May 11, 1970. On this day the Rural Electrification Administration will celebrate the 35th Anniversary of its creation. The REA was one of many government agencies created in the depression of the mid-1930's to combat unemployment. As a solution to unemployment, the REA was unsuccessful until in 1936 when the Rural Electrification Act was passed. This Act, sponsored by Senator George Norris of Nebraska, authorized loans to be made for rural electrification. When the Act was passed, only 10% of America's rural areas had central station electric power. Today, that figure is 98%. When rural electrification was first begun many people thought it unwise, but others foresaw the miracle that electricity would bring to rural America. Because of this "miracle," electricity has come to be important to me and my community. When the REA power lines reached my community in July 1951, they brought higher standards of health and nutrition, closer contact with the world, and revolutionized agriculture.

Rural electrification brought higher standards of health and nutrition to the farm home and community. Most farm homes now have refrigerators to provide a variety of foods for the family each day. Nearly all farm homes have running water to provide fresh water at any time. Every day may be a good wash day with the electric washer and dryer to make it easier. The family of today enjoys controlled heat, adequate lighting, and air conditioning. Because of these conveniences the farmer and his family are healthier and more nutritionally provided for.

Rural electrification brought the once isolated farm family in closer contact with the outside world. The radio and television brought the latest news of the day to the farm home. The rural family can now be warned of any inclement weather in their area. By television every family can view man's journey to the moon, from liftoff to splash down and recovery. Because of REA the rural family no longer is uninformed about the world around them.

Of most importance, rural electrification has brought about revolutionized agriculture. Many farmers no longer need to worry about summer drought because they have the convenience of electrical powered irrigation systems to provide water for their crops. Our farm now has an electric submersible well pump to supply the entire farm with fresh water, even on "windless" days. To make the chore of feeding cattle easier many farmers have automated feeding systems. Thus, the cattle can be fed by the flip of a switch. This revolutionization of agriculture has greatly benefited the farmer and made his work easier.

Because of REA my home and community has become a healthier place to live, better informed of the surrounding world, and more revolutionized in agriculture. The role of rural electrification is not finished, it is only beginning. Much yet remains to be done, for the increasing use of electric energy calls for enlarged facilities and heavier equipment to provide and carry the power which modern rural life demands today. We can now look to the next 35 years of rural electrification with the hope and courage of building even better farms, communities, and even a better country.

INFORMATION

My Name: Marci Wemhoff.
Age: 15.
Grade: Sophomore.
School: St. Francis High School, Humphrey, Nebr.

Name of Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Ray Wemhoff, Box 67, Humphrey, Nebr.

Contestant sponsored by the Cornhusker Public Power District, Columbus, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS
TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

Mankato is a small Kansas town that, until a few years ago, was typical of too many rural communities—empty stores, dying businesses, and dwindling populations.

Then, as the Jewell-Mitchell Electric Cooperative expanded and therefore benefited the farm areas around Mankato, Mankato itself profited. Its business revived, and soon a new hospital, a recreation center, and other fine developments revealed a fresh outlook for Mankato.

To me, this is what rural electrification is all about. It aids greatly in keeping our rural areas and towns alive. Just as a machine needs every working part in order to run, our nation needs its cities, suburbs, large towns, villages, and rural areas in order to exist. Our rural areas are the backbone of our country, and in order for our nation to live, and grow, our farms and villages must progress. This is being achieved through rural electrification.

Rural electricians provide high efficiency for low rates on farms. For instance, electric motors perform many of the almost 600 tasks which electricity has taken over. Irrigation well motors supply more water for more needs in less time with less expense. Feed augers speed up efficiency in livestock feeding, and allow the farmer to manage larger herds. Since farming success depends on efficiency and productivity, rural electricity aids greatly in raising farm profits.

Rural electricity also indirectly helps small communities prosper. Farm profits aid many small-town businesses, such as hardware stores, appliance stores, and repair shops, some of which may not even have existed before rural electricity became common.

These businesses must expand and hire more employees in order to handle increased business, for farmers are now able to spend more. In turn, they help the farmers by selling and repairing electrical appliances, thus easing the farmer's workload and shifting it to electricity.

Rural electricians have been successful in helping to launch a wide range of ventures to provide more home-grown jobs. More people are employed at new plants created through increased farm business. New residents are moving in to share in the fresh opportunities. Dying areas are being brought to life through rural electrification.

This is primarily what rural electrification means to me. It keeps my community, and farms around it alive and thriving. It gives my family, myself, and every family that is a part of a rural electrification program a chance for a better and more productive life.

RACIAL HIRING POLICY SPURS
HOUSE HEARINGS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to discuss a matter vital to our posture of national defense.

In an article which appeared in the June 7 issue of the Washington Post, William Chapman calls attention to the formation of a special investigating subcommittee of the House Armed Serv-

ices Committee presumably in opposition to stricter Labor Department insistence on the hiring of blacks and other minorities.

I have confidence in the fair-mindedness of the chairman of this subcommittee, Representative CHARLES H. WILSON. However, the ramifications of such an investigation appear dangerous and extremely volatile in view of an earlier press release by the chairman of the full committee, Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat of South Carolina.

The thrust of this investigation relies heavily on the rather vague declaration that the imposition of new programs under the equal employment opportunity program can have an effect upon the price, quality, and delivery of weapons vital to our national security.

Plainly this reasoning could lead to the nullification of Executive Order 12246 and title VII of our Civil Rights Act prohibiting racial discrimination in Federal contracts and assuring equal employment opportunities.

Already grave doubts have been raised when this past week the lucrative B-1 bomber contract was awarded to the North American Rockwell Corp., which at the time had not, at least publicly if at all, complied, with the Executive order even though it was doing business with the Federal Government and was already required to have an affirmative action plan on file. Thus, specifications for the contract are to be considered after the award has been made. This raises doubts as to how many other specifications were overlooked.

Parenthetically, it should be noted some of us from southern California sought to assist North American Rockwell win this award on merit by becoming a "fair employment employer" to back up its technical capability. It could have satisfied both legal requirements and the need for jobs in the area, as well as technical capability to perform on the contract.

Also alarming is the fact that Assistant Secretary of Labor Arthur A. Fletcher, closely identified with the "Philadelphia plan," has been requested to testify in an executive session closed to the public. Such procedures are often used to badger enforcement officials into cooperation with defense contractors who could not care less for complying with equal employment as part of their responsibility.

The issue is raised, should those who do business at taxpayers' expense be exempt from complying with Federal laws under the guise of national defense?

If any reasons at all exist, which is doubtful, at least the full facts should be disclosed and an open hearing held. What is so secretive about equal employment opportunities? In what way is our national defense jeopardized by having companies hire on the basis of merit and not race, religion, sex, or national origin?

Also, if a subcommittee of the House of Representatives can pressure officials into decisions contrary to laws which the Congress has passed and orders which have been issued by the President, then certainly the time has long passed when basic reform is needed.

I call immediately for an open and full hearing on this matter by the subcom-

mittee and wish to give notice at this time that this matter deserves the careful and continuing attention of the entire Congress.

The article from the Washington Post follows.

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1970]
RACIAL HIRING POLICY SPURS HOUSE HEARINGS
(By William Chapman)

A toughened federal policy on the racial hiring practices of government industrial contractors has aroused the suspicions and irritation of the House Armed Services Committee.

Stricter Labor Department insistence on the hiring of blacks and other minorities has prompted formation of a special investigating subcommittee, which includes congressmen from states where there are big defense manufacturers with large contracts at stake.

This week the subcommittee will call into executive session for questioning the man who engineered the new policy. He is Assistant Secretary of Labor Arthur A. Fletcher, the blunt-speaking official best known for developing the controversial "Philadelphia Plan" for assuring minority employment on federally contracted construction jobs.

Fletcher already has sounded a warning, accusing the Armed Services Committee chairman, Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.), of "trying to exempt \$80 million worth of jobs in the defense sector" from the equal opportunity rules.

Chairman of the subcommittee, appointed in May, is Rep. Charles H. Wilson (D-Calif.), whose district includes a plant of the North American Rockwell Corp. The company, which was awarded the lucrative prime contract last week for the new B-1 bomber, has submitted a fair-employment practices plan now under scrutiny by Fletcher's aides in the Labor Department. The B-1 contract could involve more than 40,000 jobs.

Another member is Rep. W. C. (Dan) Daniel (D-Va.). His state is the home of Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. The Labor Department has rejected as unsatisfactory that company's plan designed to end job discrimination.

Daniel declined to answer questions about the subcommittee's activities and referred all inquiries to Wilson, the chairman, who was in California and unavailable for comment. The third member, Rep. Donald D. Clancy (R-Ohio), also declined to discuss the subcommittee's plans. "It's still in its infancy," he said, "and I really know very little about it."

The general outlines, however, emerged in a press release Rivers issued in May and from interviews at the Pentagon and the Labor Department.

Rivers' press release said that, "While recognizing that our labor force must be treated upon an equal basis, the imposition of new programs under the equal employment opportunity program can have an effect upon the price, quality, and delivery of weapons vital to our national security."

The phrase "new programs" apparently refers to a set of guidelines, known as "Order Number Four," issued last February by the Labor Department. It set out new, tougher, and definitive rules for minority hiring.

A presidential executive order forbids discrimination by federal contractors. Each department is supposed to be sure that contractors comply. The Labor Department, however, has the power to review and if necessary overrule any contracts approved by the various department.

Fletcher said in an interview, that Order Number Four was intended to change the emphasis in contract compliance from one of "voluntarism" to one of "enforcement." "We at Labor have been accused of not providing enough guidance to the departments," he said. "Now they have it."

The new order in many ways is similar to the "Philadelphia Plan," which in effect established rough quotas for the number of blacks and minorities to be employed by a company performing construction under a federal contract.

The February order, applying to federal industrial contracts, spells out in detail the ways in which companies must prove they are assuring equality in hiring, promotion, and upgrading of employees. Most controversially, it would require hiring members of minorities in rough proportion to their number in the area.

It has had its biggest effect at the Pentagon, the Government's biggest contractor. Since February at least 27 "show-cause" orders have been issued, requiring companies to explain why they should not be debarred from bidding on contracts.

According to Defense Department sources the new order and accompanying confusion over what it means have riled a number of defense contractors.

Fletcher said the White House had been approached to have his office soften the new guidelines. "But the White House wouldn't draw back," he said, "so the attention has switched to Congress."

Fletcher has received an informal request to testify in closed session this week. According to other sources, he was specifically asked to comment on the procedures followed in disallowing the Newport News shipbuilding firm's equal employment program.

ROTARY IN ATLANTA

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the foremost journalists in the Atlanta area is Mr. Hubert F. Lee, who for 40 years, has been editor of the Dixie Business magazine.

Some years ago, Mr. Lee wrote an article on the history of Atlanta which was published on February 10, 1917 in the Lone Scout magazine. That was the year that the Rotary International held its first convention in Atlanta, Ga. That article now has significance because Rotary International held its convention again in Atlanta from May 31 to June 4. Particularly significant is the fact that most of the information used for the article on Atlanta by Mr. Lee in 1917 came from then Senator Ivan Allen, Sr., father of Ivan Allen, Jr., who recently completed an outstanding term as Mayor of Atlanta. Ivan Allen, Sr. founded the Atlanta Rotary Club in 1913 and was president of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce in 1917.

Because of their historical significance, I hereby insert into the RECORD the 1917 history of Atlanta and a recent report by Mr. Lee on the Rotary International Convention:

THE GATE CITY OF THE SOUTH: 1917

(By Hubert F. Lee)

ATLANTA, GA.—The Gate City of the South was not always known as Atlanta. Because some Lone Scouts are interested in how my city got its name I am going to write the history of Atlanta.

In 1836 Mr. Hardy Ivy built the first log

cabin on the site of what is now Atlanta. One year later the Western and Atlantic Railroad selected this place for its terminus and the place was called "Terminus."

The second house was built by John Thrasher in 1839, and the first business firm, Johnson & Thrasher, opened a little store. In 1842 the settlement had six dwellings, and a daughter was born to Mr. and Mrs. Carlisle. That same year the first train ran from Terminus to Marietta, and the first two story house was erected, and the first real estate auction took place.

In 1843 Terminus was incorporated under the name of Marthasville, in honor of the pretty daughter of the Governor of Georgia. At this time Marthasville had a railroad office, a sawmill and two stores.

In 1847 the legislature changed the name to Atlanta. The town had 500 inhabitants. Three years later the population was 3,000, and was 6,000 four years later.

About this time there were sixty stores, a courthouse, and a theater. The annual trade was \$1,500,000.

One year later the city was lighted with gas, and the Atlanta Medical College was established.

The "boom" period began in 1859. The population was 11,500. In that year twenty brick stores were built, four hotels, four machine shops, two planing mills, four tanneries, one large rolling mill, one clothing factory and fifteen churches. The panic in 1857 did not hurt Atlanta. The first directory, in 1859, showed that the city had three fire departments, seven masonic lodges, one Odd Fellows society, two temperance societies, seven newspapers, five hotels, fifteen manufacturing concerns.

Up to the Civil War period the mayors of the city were Moses Ferminait, Benjamin Borar, W. Buell, J. Norcross, G. O. Gibbs, John Mims, W. M. Butte, A. Nelson, John Glenn, William Eyzard and Luther J. Glenn.

The above is true and I hope to see it in "Our Dear Old Lone Scout."

ROTARY INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION

(By Hubert F. Lee)

The Atlanta Rotary Club will be host to Rotary International Convention May 31 through June 4 and Chairman Herb Norton anticipates 12,000 of the 650,000 members of 13,000 clubs in 146 countries to attend.

Here is a brief history of Atlanta Rotary Club as part of my "Man of the South" for 1961, the late Ivan Allen, as inserted in the Congressional Record by Senator Herman Talmadge.

ROTARY IN ATLANTA

Ivan Allen, with others, founded the Atlanta Rotary Club in 1913 and has been one of its loyal leaders since.

As members of the Atlanta Ad Club, he, along with Henry W. Grady, Jr., Joel Chandler Harris, and Howard Geldert, were delegates to a convention in Baltimore. There Ivan Allen attended Rotary and on the way back discussed the idea of a Rotary Club with his fellow delegates.

Back in Atlanta, Mr. Allen got busy and soon had plans formulated. He got together with his Ad Club delegates in his office—the room Woodrow Wilson used as a law office—and the three handpicked a list of 32 businessmen and sent out invitations to a meeting on July 2, 1913, in the chamber of commerce.

Mr. Allen wrote to Chas. R. Perry, secretary, and Glenn C. Mead, president, of Rotary International. These men named Ivan Allen as the organizer for Rotary in Atlanta. He received the charter on August 1, 1913—No. 79—which hung in Mr. Allen's office until a paid secretary was employed and an office established years later.

YOUTH, FULL PARTNERS IN A BETTER TOMORROW

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, a 17-year-old senior at Blair, Okla., High School in my district, made a valedictory speech at commencement ceremonies a few days ago that has brought a great deal of favorable comment.

Miss Del Ann Cargal, a lifelong resident of Blair, gave the address, "Youth, Full Partners in a Better Tomorrow." She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Junior Cargal of Blair. I believe her comments are constructive and timely. They were brought to my attention by Mr. V. H. Guy, publisher of the Blair Enterprise, who published them in full.

The address follows:

YOUTH, FULL PARTNERS IN A BETTER TOMORROW

(By Miss Del Ann Cargal)

"Ladies and gentlemen, faculty members, parents and classmates: We are gathered here tonight to bid farewell to Blair High School, for we are closing another chapter in our book of life. For 12 years we have prepared for this day, and now that it has arrived, it is with mixed feelings of sorrow and joy that we leave you.

"As the representative of the graduating seniors, I would like to use as my topic 'Youth, Full Partners in a Better Tomorrow.'

"As teenagers, we do not choose to be common young people. It is our privilege to be uncommon if we can. We must not look for security but opportunity. We must take the calculated risk—to dream, to build, to fail or to succeed. We must stand tall and proud—unafraid to speak out for youth as we build a better tomorrow.

"How are we going to build a better tomorrow? Well, it won't be done by drug-sick teenagers who think suicide is the only answer. It won't be done by loud-mouthed demonstrators wearing free-speech bands as they rebel to force a presidential candidate from a speaker's platform. It won't be done by a small group of students who selfishly close an entire college because the demands of the minority aren't being met.

"It can't be done by a bored group of kids who burn a bank in Santa Barbara in protest of something that is happening in Chicago. It won't be done by hippies whose motto is "Total Freedom—No Restraint". Even a 5-year-old child knows what's wrong with that theory.

"It won't be done by a hate campaign against our police force and armed services. If there is no law and order then there will be no freedom. It won't be done by those in our society who scream "freedom", but fail to see his neighbors as Americans who have rights also. It can't be done by kids who undermine our armed forces—yet refuse to admit that these same armed forces are the only thing keeping us from a communist takeover of the world today.

"It can't be done by these young people who are trying so hard to destroy America—the ones who are sucking in a lot of good kids, too. It won't be done by youth who have no convictions—who change sides more often than a windshield wiper in a rain storm. It can never be done by a godless society who think they are so intellectually superior that they don't need high moral standards

and keep screaming that morality and God are old-fashioned ideals.

"A better tomorrow won't be built by those who want to tear down our economic system of free enterprise, yet can propose nothing better to replace it. Just because teenagers spend 14 billion dollars a year—money which we haven't earned, but which has been given to us—spending this staggering figure does not make us authorities on economics, authorities who can say "The American system of free enterprise is corrupt".

"True, American youth do have fresh, young ideals, but we are not as yet qualified to take over the world.

"I've spent a lot of time telling you which youth will not build a better world. So how will it be done? What do we as graduates of Blair High School have going for us?

"Well, to begin with, most of us are A Number 1 OK. The 87 percent, the solid majority of American youth, are hard working, wholesome young men and women who are preparing themselves to take over the future America. We care what's happening in the world. We know we must be informed and are learning to utilize what you have taught us the past 12 years. Most of us are still highly idealistic. We believe in honesty, in decency, and in God.

"A better world will be built by those of us who believe in freedom and appreciate our heritage. We are the ones who will continue the search until we find a cure for cancer and the common cold—the ones who will lay out smog-free cities—who will work to improve the underdeveloped countries—who will strive to wipe out hunger and poverty in America.

"The majority of us are not protestors, but we do realize that the world needs improving. It always has, it always will. No society has ever reached perfection, but if perfection is our goal, then we are headed in the right direction . . . as we work for a better tomorrow.

"Thank you for the many contributions you have made to the Seniors of 1970. May God bless and keep each of us as we leave Blair High School to continue our journey through life."

BROWARD RESIDENTS SUPPORT CAMBODIAN DECISION

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Lauderdale News and the Sun-Sentinel, two sister newspapers, that have a wide circulation in Broward County which is in the 10th Congressional District which I represent, have presented their readers an opportunity to voice their views on President Nixon's Cambodian decision and methods of ending the war in Vietnam.

The results reveal an overwhelming majority support the President's decision to remove Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia, and most even support a military victory in South Vietnam to end the war.

I feel that everyone of my colleagues should take the time to read this most interesting editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News on June 2, 1970, and which explains the views of some of the people in Broward County, Fla.

The news report with the poll results, and the editorial by Mr. Jack Gore, editor of the Fort Lauderdale News, follows: [From the Fort Lauderdale News, June 2, 1970]

POLL SHOWS PRESIDENT HAS STRONG SUPPORT ON CAMBODIA ISSUE

While Broward County admittedly can be considered a strong conservative and pro-Nixon area at the present time, it still must rate as something of a surprise that his decision to invade Cambodia with U.S. troops has drawn the favorable reaction that it has among the residents of this county.

A little more than a week ago, it will be recalled, this newspaper and our sister publication, the Sun-Sentinel, started a poll to determine how Broward residents felt about Mr. Nixon's Cambodian decision and about the moves in Congress to challenge his constitutional authority to make that decision on his own.

Today, the results of that week-long poll are published on page one. While we felt from the beginning that a majority would back Mr. Nixon's policies, there were two things about this poll that surprised us no end.

Not only were we surprised that the poll revealed such a heavy margin in President Nixon's favor, but we were amazed at the number of people who took the time and trouble to participate in the poll.

In just a single week we received more than 7,500 signed ballots here at The News and the Sun-Sentinel tallied more than 2,000 returns.

As can be seen from the published results, the returns show the Broward Countians support Mr. Nixon's Cambodian decision by better than a 9-1 majority. The results also reveal that an almost equally heavy majority is not in favor of Congressional moves to cut off funds for any Cambodian activities after June 30 of this year, or for forcing the President to remove all of our troops from Vietnam by June 30 of next year.

Perhaps even more surprising was the vote on the question of whether or not the U.S. should hold out for a military victory in South Vietnam. While the tally here was much closer, the poll showed that a majority is still in favor of the U.S. staying in South Vietnam until victory is achieved.

Considering all the opinions that have been voiced in this country over the past several years to the effect that we have been fighting for a lost cause in Vietnam, and should take our losses and get out as fast as we can, this particular poll shows there are many Americans who haven't yet swallowed this "cut and run" defeatist philosophy.

As we said above, Broward County, with its conservative leanings, may not be in harmony with some other parts of the nation in this regard, yet this does cause one to wonder if perhaps the voices of the doves in this land of ours haven't been given an exaggerated play while other voices have been underplayed.

This poll also reveals that the so-called "silent majority" may well be a much more potent political force in the fall's congressional elections than many of the political experts seem to think these days.

Much of course will depend on President Nixon's ability to carry out his pledged withdrawal of U.S. forces from Cambodia by the end of this month, and his promised withdrawal of another 150,000 troops from Vietnam by the end of this year.

Apparently, as of now, most Broward Countians feel he will carry out these pledges, and until events prove him wrong, they are willing to give him a chance to pursue his program without having his wings clipped by Congress.

As we indicated when we announced the

start of this poll, the final results will now be sent to both Florida senators and to all members of the state's lower House delegation.

These men are in the thick of the debate now raging in the Congress over Mr. Nixon's conduct of the war, and we think it might be helpful to all of them to know how the majority of Broward Countians voted on the question asked in this poll.

We also think the poll showed that our people are more than casually interested in the major issues involved in the current conflict between some members of Congress and the President over his constitutional war powers. Not only are they interested, but they demonstrated to us they appreciate an opportunity to register their feelings on these issues in a manner that will be called to the attention of their representatives in Washington.

READERS' LANDSLIDE VOTE BACKS NIXON IN WAR

The opinions of Ft. Lauderdale News readers lean heavily toward support of the Nixon administration's conduct of the Vietnam War and the President's dispatch of troops into Cambodia.

Ballots published in the newspaper during the past week and tabulated today showed the voters overwhelmingly in favor of the Cambodian action.

To the question: "Do you support President Nixon's dispatch of troops into Cambodia to destroy enemy sanctuaries and protect American troops, a mission that is to be completed by June 30?", the "Yes" answers totaled 6,973. There were 787 "No" votes to that question.

Readers were asked to indicate if they supported the Cooper-Church resolution, which would prevent the President from spending any money for U.S. operations in Cambodia after the June 30 deadline. A total of 6,592 indicated they did not support the resolution, while 1,016 approved of it.

There were 6,004 ballots against support of a House version of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment which would require removal of all U.S. troops from South Vietnam by June 30, 1971. Another 1,342 readers said they supported the amendment.

The landslide figures narrowed somewhat on the question of whether the U.S. should hold out for a military victory in South Vietnam. In this case, 4,162 voted "Yes," 2,865 "No."

Results of the balloting are to be forwarded to members of the Florida congressional delegation in Washington, as a sampling of local sentiment regarding the present controversy between Congress and the President over the conduct of the war.

SENATOR SMITH PROVIDES SOME TIMELY ADVICE

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on the 20th anniversary of another memorable speech, the senior Senator from the State of Maine has drawn well-deserved attention for her views on the current climate of violence and disorder plaguing the Nation. In an alert editorial appropriate for this college commencement season, the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., on Thursday, June 4, 1970, stressed the importance of Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH's reflections and warnings

at this difficult time, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the State Journal, June 4, 1970]

SENATOR SMITH PROVIDES SOME TIMELY ADVICE

Veteran Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, R-Maine, made some timely remarks the other day in Washington which we hope will be heeded by all Americans.

She spoke of increasing fear and emotionalism across the nation resulting from the "anti-democratic arrogance and nihilism from the political extreme left." Mrs. Smith warned that we could be facing a new era of repression.

The Senator knows something about the tides of right and left wing extremism. She was among the first to stand up and fight back against the all powerful Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy 20 years ago with her famous "declaration of conscience" remarks. This came at a time when it was considered something close to political suicide to tangle with the Senate's free-swinging anti-communist crusader.

Not many of our young people today are old enough to remember those chilling days when guilt by association was riding high in Washington; when right-wing extremists terrified many of the most powerful men in Congress and government into silence as they hurled reckless charges of subversion against U.S. government agencies and the armed forces.

The national mood was such that in many cases an individual's career and reputation could be wrecked merely by an accusation of leftist leanings.

To be a liberal of any degree in those days was a mighty dangerous business. The McCarthy era finally faded after the senator was censured in 1954.

Mrs. Smith now warns that the pendulum has swung back to the opposite pole with excesses of dissent from the left which blur, confuse and undermine reason and sane debate. She said the forces of repression could come down again in reaction to nihilism and anarchy.

Two decades ago it was the anti-intellectuals who promoted the "know-nothing" attitudes on major political issues. Today, she said, it's many of the militant intellectuals who are taking a "hear-nothing attitude or refusing to listen while demanding better communication."

Citing the parallel of 20 years ago, Mrs. Smith said "too many Americans (today) are intimidated and made mute by the emotional violence of the extreme left."

She called upon the great mass of Americans in the middle to speak out against the extremists of both left and right and help the nation return to reasoned and non-violent solutions of our problems.

It is indeed a time for calmer voices, a time to debate and find compromise solutions, a time for those who classify themselves as either liberals or conservatives to reject extremists of any stripe.

Sen. Smith performed a great service to the nation 20 years ago when she helped lead the fight against the forces of fear and repression.

We hope her new appeal last Monday will again be heard by all concerned Americans.

MEMORIAL DAY EXERCISES AT THE NATIONAL CEMETERY IN GETTYSBURG, PA.

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, I have inserted

into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the highlights of the Memorial Day exercises conducted at the National Cemetery in Gettysburg, Pa.

This year marked the 103d annual Memorial Day exercises at Gettysburg National Cemetery. I was honored and privileged to present the address for this program. In accord with the precedent I have established, I am inserting in the RECORD the opening prayer by the Reverend James Melhorn, pastor of the United Methodist Church in Gettysburg and the closing prayer by the Reverend Fr. Alphonse T. Marcincavage, pastor of the St. Francis Xavier Catholic Church of Gettysburg, along with my remarks for these Memorial Day proceedings:

OPENING PRAYER

(By Rev. James Melhorn)

Oh living and loving God, we gather on this holy and hallowed ground to demonstrate our love for you and to praise you for this day of remembrance dedicated to those men and women who made the great sacrifice in the very midst of life and who do now rest from their labors. Oh God, make us worthy of their sacrifices by giving us the needed wisdom and strength to do your will. Fill us with the love of truth and righteousness. So rule our hearts and prosper our endeavors that law and order, justice and peace may everywhere prevail to your honor and glory. Through Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, we live. Amen

MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH, GETTYSBURG, 1970

(By Hon. George A. Goodling)

We pause today, a day dedicated to the memory of those who gave their lives for our country. It is a day becoming more solemn with each passing year. It is a day shrouded in clouds of a war which has now become the longest in our history and ranks number three among foreign wars in casualties. One need only look beyond the stone wall to my left to learn the realities of war.

In a more precise sense, Memorial Day is a sacred day, an occasion when we pay respects to those who died so that the living would inherit a country strong and free. In that sense of respect, it is fitting and proper that we, the living, measure the circumstances that surround our inheritance.

"These are the times that try men's souls." Those words were penned by Thomas Paine, noted journalist of America's colonial period, at a time when our revolutionary forces were being hard pressed by the brilliant British General Howe in areas of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York.

These same words are quite pertinent today, for we are confronted with grave complexities both at home and abroad.

During times of stress, it is easy to become somewhat pessimistic and to place emphasis on negative aspects. It is important to realize, however, that there are numerous positive features which we should not forget.

It should be noted, for instance, that troubles and complications are not something new for our country. America was born in agony of revolution and has existed through 194 years, years that have been punctuated by two world wars, a Korean war, a military action in Vietnam, and numerous emergency encounters. Our nation survived a civil war which tore at our national fabric, a war which had some of its most dramatic expressions right here where we are today. It was at this location here that Abraham Lincoln called all Americans "to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

In a like manner, throughout our history

there have been those who have honestly disagreed with some of our major national efforts:

In the war for American independence, Washington's men endured countless hardships, and the dramatic crossing of the Delaware was executed without proper footwear or adequate supplies. Still, there were those Americans who thought that America's lot would best be cast with Britain and that we should spend our time being friendly with rather than fighting England.

Up to the early part of the 19th century, in the undeclared war against the fierce Barbary pirates, many American sailors and civilians were kidnapped and tortured by those ruthless pirates, and our small and inadequately-equipped Navy fought valiantly. But against this background, there were American citizens who thought it was the best course of action for America to pay tribute to the pirates and to exercise restraint.

In the war of 1812, patriotic Americans defended this country and its institutions, but there were other Americans who felt we should come to terms with the British and not try to interfere with her interests in North America.

The Civil War saw great sacrifices made by many who wished to preserve the union. But there were those who honestly thought that this Nation could exist half slave and half free, and they deplored this war where brother fought against brother.

Likewise, in the Spanish American War of 1898, many Americans championed the cause of liberty by fighting to quell Spanish oppression in Cuba, but there were many in America who felt we should stay at home and mind our own business.

In World Wars I and II many thought we should wait until our shores were threatened by an enemy before we became involved in an international conflict. They felt we shouldn't go looking for trouble.

And so it is today. There are some American citizens who honestly question our involvement in Indo China, wondering whether the decision made back in the early 1960's to send American troops into this area was in the best national interests.

There are, of course, some evil forces operating in our country to create chaos and disorder, and we must guard against these evil forces. They are led by wild-eyed freaks who cry out to have the laws broken, to have our flag desecrated, to have our culture scorned, and to have our institutions destroyed. These promoters of panic and disorder are ever present whenever they see an opportunity to fan the flames of emotions in men, whether it be discontented students, workers out on strike, or those with a race consciousness. They would like to take over from down under, so to speak.

The brave Americans who died at Valley Forge during the Revolutionary war, at Gettysburg in the Civil War, in France during World War I, and in the Battle of the Bulge in World War II would turn in their graves if they could witness the apathy of millions of Americans when this small minority of extremists and radicals, in the name of freedom, rob the people of their freedom, destroy true Christianity, and substitute their own radical religion that can lead only to dictatorship and the loss of all freedoms we have ever known.

Just recently I was privileged to hear our only surviving General of the Army, Omar N. Bradley, give his version of freedom. Listen to his words:

"Freedom—no word was ever spoken that held out greater hope, demanded greater sacrifice, needed more to be nurtured, blessed more the giver, damned more its destroyer, or comes closer to being God's will on earth. May Americans ever be its protector."

It is encouraging to observe that the majority of Americans are quite level headed, and they are not influenced by rabble rousers. They realize that there can be no

effective government from the streets—that there can be no stability without self-discipline—that there can be no enlightened tomorrows if we destroy our institutions of learning today—and that there can be no progress unless ideas and privileges are given an opportunity to surface, remembering also that every privilege has a corresponding responsibility.

On this Memorial Day it is encouraging to realize that one aspect increasingly is becoming clear, and it is that Americans are becoming eager to communicate with each other.

Our elder statesmen, for instance, are showing an increasing awareness of the problems of the young in our society. They are taking the young into their confidence, inquiring into their hopes, their fears, seeking their opinion, counseling with them on a wide range of domestic and international problems.

The young, in turn, are gaining a better understanding of the complexity of the problems that confront those charged with the responsibility of managing government. Our young are discovering that it is not enough to oppose and that every opposition should, if there is to be no vacuum, be counterbalanced with constructive proposition.

Students are also finding out that if they are going to be equipped to solve the problems of the future, they must incline toward learning instead of burning. They are also gaining an understanding of the fact that education without discipline results in confusion, and that lack of respect for authority is a form of anarchy.

In a like manner, both whites and blacks in our society are realizing that their best interests reside not in attacking each other but in cooperating with each other. They are recognizing that true racial progress can be made only through proper emphasis on the dignity of the individual and through honoring the concept that there can be no second class citizens under our system of government.

Another thing we should be mindful of on this Memorial Day is that our honored dead saved for us a country that is not our master but our servant. In a day and age when the Federal Government is so greatly involved in everything, we might tend to lose sight of this fact.

This kind of arrangement in Government places the citizen in a command position, and he must not forget it. If he does not like the way his government is being run, he can change its management. He can do this through his voting power at the polls on election day. This kind of system is in marked contrast to governments like those of Russia and China, where the situation is the reverse of ours, where the people are the servants of the government.

It is well for us to remember that there are some domestic areas that need immediate attention. For instance, the increases in crime, drug abuse, and immorality among our people is a stain on our national character.

We must rearm ourselves morally and spiritually to prevent these acids from eating out the soul and life blood of America. We must do this in our homes, in our schools, and in our churches, providing the influences for ridding ourselves of these social sicknesses.

We must also remind ourselves of those things for which our flag stands. It stands for great cities and towering buildings, for seats of learning and for museums. It stands for places of worship and for a blend of people that represent nationalities from all over the world. It is a symbol of a courageous and resourceful people, and it boasts a form of government that has never been surpassed in its excellence. It represents an idea that is based on the dignity of the individual and the freedom of the human spirit, an idea that has burned like a torch and drawn

those lost in a darkness of other worlds to the bright shores of America.

Our pondering of these various matters that concern our country can make this a very meaningful Memorial Day. In so doing we will, in the highest tradition, be keeping faith with those honored dead who cried out to us in the words of John McCrae, from World War I, "If ye break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep, though poppies grow in Flanders Fields."

CLOSING PRAYER

(By Rev. Alphonse T. Marcincavage)

Let us pray.

O God, the Creator and Redeemer of all mankind, hallow these moments of solemn remembrance coming to a close. You know our many faults. Help us to purify ourselves of them, so that our lives will reflect more brightly and more honestly Your holiness, Your purity, Your wisdom and Your goodness.

You know our weaknesses. Help us to rely on Your grace and keep reminding us daily that of ourselves we can do nothing, but with You all things are possible to us, that unless You, our Lord and God, build our nation, in vain do they labor who build it. Lord, You don't want us to be strong in arms and bombs, because You have told us, 'He who lives by the sword, will perish by it.' You want us spiritually strong and morally strong, for then, like Sir Galahad, we will have the strength of ten, each one of us, for our hearts will be full of love, our hearts will be pure, our hearts will be generous and understanding, our hearts will be sympathetic and will reach out to all those in need.

Heavenly Father, you know our needs, too. And the greatest of them is 'to bring us together' as a nation, as a community, as a family—young and old, black and white, rich and poor. We need to be one in heart and one in mind, as You are one with the Son and Holy Spirit. We need peace, too. Peace in the world, in our land, in our communities and in our homes. You are the Prince of Peace. But we don't ask You to do it all by Yourself. We know You can. But then we would be unworthy servants, burying the wonderful talents You have given us. You have endowed us so richly in so many ways. Stir us up to act, to work, to use these talents, gifts and powers. Keep prodding us to use them not for our own selfish purposes and gain, but for the good of all with whom we live and work, for the well-being of our nation with freedom and justice for all and that these honored dead may not have died in vain.

We beg for this through Your Son who lives with You in the unity of the Holy Spirit forever and ever. Amen.

POPULATION GROWTH AS AN ECOLOGICAL FACTOR

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, what kind of life do we want for our children? Each of us, as we make decisions about having children, must ask ourselves whether the joy of parenthood will ultimately cause a deteriorated quality of life for that child and those of his generation.

Until we recognize that individual decisions are responsible for the destruction of our environment, there can be

little hope of arresting the continued erosion of environmental quality—and there is no decision more critical than that of parenthood. Since we cannot allow environmental erosion to continue, each of us has the responsibility to choose parenthood with full knowledge that our decision will directly affect our environment's quality.

In the Congress, I helped obtain the first funds made available through the foreign aid program for family planning in nations receiving our aid. Unfortunately, the American public has not been made sufficiently aware of the need for population planning to create a similar demand here at home.

Therefore, because of this immediate need to inform the American public, I am drafting a bill title the "Population Education Act of 1970." Under the provisions of this bill, Federal aid would be offered to local school districts to develop classroom programs that would focus attention on population growth as the major ecological factor. Such a program would be optional to school districts. States would also be offered Federal funds to provide massive public education programs designed to achieve effective voluntary action in population control.

Every citizen must know, for example, that population experts now predict that at its present growth rate, the United States will increase from its present 200,000,000 population to 300,000,000 in just 30 years. The impact of such a population explosion on our quality of life is staggering to imagine, although we seem to grasp what this means in underdeveloped nations such as those in Asia.

Every citizen must know—if he is to make the choice of parenthood knowledgeably—that we are becoming victims of a population growth that multiplies our urban problems as well as the problems of environmental pollution. Every day, waste sewage is added to our environment at a per capita rate of 120 gallons, polluted air at a rate of 1.9 pounds per person. Metal cans are thrown away each year at the rate of 250 per person, jars and bottles at the rate of 135 per person. Every citizen should know that as our population doubles, the demand for water triples. And as Dr. Jean Mayer, a leading expert on environmental problems, states:

Rich people occupy much more space, consume more of each natural resource, disturb ecology more, and create more land, air, water, chemical, thermal and radioactive pollution than do poor people.

Every citizen should know about birth control methods and devices. The Federal Government should provide devices for those citizens who cannot afford them but who voluntarily want them. The funds now being appropriated for this purpose are ridiculously low. This year, the Government is spending only about \$10 million for population planning purposes—about the cost of one fully equipped jet fighter plane. The Presidential veto of the HEW appropriations—and administration cutbacks in Government-sponsored research—have also stymied development of an effective contraceptive. This is why I am intro-

ducing into the House the Cranston-Tydings bill, S. 2108, that would establish a National Center for Population and Family Planning.

However, no government should tell its people how many children they may have. This is a matter of private concern and individual conscience. What the Government should tell its people is the facts of population growth in order to foster voluntary action on population control. If Americans choose to have large families, then they will do so with full knowledge of the adverse effect such a decision will have on the quality of our environment.

STATEMENT ON AMENDING TAX PROVISION RECOGNIZING GAIN WHEN A CORPORATION REDEEMS ITS STOCK WITH APPRECIATED PROPERTY

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the Tax Reform Act of 1969 amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that gain will be recognized—in most situations—when a corporation redeems its own stock with appreciated property. However, the effective date provisions relating to this amendment provide that the new law is not to apply to certain transactions in which the corporation redeeming, was, so to speak, caught in midstream by the change in law. In general, it did this by excepting those cases in which there was a binding contract, a public offer, or a written description of the proposed program filed with a public agency.

A case has come to my attention in which a corporation had, in fact, begun a plan of redemption and had completed 40 percent of this contemplated plan before the date of enactment of the 1969 act. Nevertheless, this case is not within the exceptions made because there was no binding contract, public offer, or description filed with a public agency. It seems to me that the existence of an authorization to redeem—taken together with the actual completion of 40 percent of the plan—makes the intention of the corporation clear. For this reason, I believe the relief now provided in the effective date clauses should be extended to cover this case.

The additional new exception I would add by my bill only applies if certain specific conditions are satisfied. In the first place, the specific property used must have been owned by the distributing corporation or by its wholly owned subsidiary on December 1, 1969. Second, the stock must be redeemed before December 31, 1970, and must be cancelled before that date—that is, it must not be held as Treasury stock. Third, the redemption must be pursuant to a resolution adopted before November 1, 1969, by the Board of Directors authorizing the redemption of a specific amount of stock constituting more than 10 percent of the

outstanding stock of the corporation at the time of the adoption of such resolution. Finally, the exception is restricted to those cases in which more than 40 percent of the stock which the directors authorized to be redeemed was, in fact, redeemed before December 30, 1969, and more than one-half of the stock so redeemed was redeemed with property other than money. The exception will apply, however, even though the authorization by the Board of Directors permitted the redemption to be made either in cash or other property, as long as the requirements of the statute are met.

A corporation which has actually carried out 40 percent of a redemption plan before a specified date is as truly caught in midstream as a corporation which has contracted to redeem, or made a public offer to redeem, before that date. The Treasury, after looking into the matter, advised me—in part—as follows:

We have reviewed the proposed amendment and have no objections to it. As it has been worked out, the amendment would fall within the framework of the transitional rules presently contained in section 905 and would be consistent with those rules.

Equity requires the enactment of this amendment because it merely perfects the fair policy already laid down in the transitional provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

TAX INCENTIVES AS A DEVICE FOR IMPLEMENTING GOVERNMENT POLICY—A COMPARISON WITH DIRECT GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said in recent months about the need to reorder our national priorities. The recent hearings held by the Committee on National Priorities of the Democratic Policy Council have served to focus attention on the need for recognizing that hard choices must be made in rationing our resources, and that we must allocate those resources in a reasoned and systematic manner.

Funding for priority programs is quite clearly related to tax revenues, but, unfortunately the many loopholes and special tax privileges in the Federal tax structure limit the effectiveness of tax policy in forwarding national priority objectives. As Prof. Stanley S. Surrey pointed out in a recent article in the Harvard Law Review, more than \$45 billion a year is being "spent" through utilization of a long list of tax dodges, special credits, deductions, and preferential rates which are supposed to serve as incentives to encourage an activity in the national interest. Professor Surrey, a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, indicated that the cost of these special privileges in terms of dollars, equity, inefficiency, and taxpayer confidence have far outweighed any benefits. Moreover, it is difficult to

maintain control over the management of priorities when billions of dollars are escaping due to open-ended tax incentive provisions that place no limit on how much tax benefit a taxpayer or corporation can "earn" by taking advantage of the provision. Our tax system is providing a "back door" through which dollars can flow free from careful planning and scrutiny.

I commend Professor Surrey's excellent article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Harvard Law Review, Feb. 1970]

TAX INCENTIVES AS A DEVICE FOR IMPLEMENTING GOVERNMENT POLICY: A COMPARISON WITH DIRECT GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

(By Stanley S. Surrey)

The tax code contains a great number of special provisions which provide credits, deductions, and other tax advantages intended to achieve non-tax goals considered desirable by Congress. In fiscal 1968, these provisions represented tax expenditures of over 45 billion dollars. Professor Surrey argues that the tax incentive is generally inferior to the direct subsidy as a means of achieving social goals: that incentives are usually less equitable, since they benefit persons in high tax brackets most, and more difficult to develop and administer, since they are handled by tax committees and administrative agencies which have little expertise in non-tax social policy. He suggests a strong presumption against their use.

Suggestions are constantly being made that many of our pressing social problems can be solved, or partially met, through the use of income tax incentives. Moreover, the present federal income tax is replete with tax incentive provisions. Some were adopted to assist particular industries, business activities, or financial transactions. Others were adopted to encourage non-business activities considered socially useful, such as contributions to charity. This article will deal with the question of whether tax incentives are as useful or efficient an implement of social policy as direct government expenditures, such as grants, loans, interest subsidies, and guarantees of loans. The discussion will be in terms of the federal income tax, but it is intended to be helpful for other jurisdictions and other forms of taxation as well.

I. THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF EXISTING TAX INCENTIVES

The term "tax expenditure" has been used to describe those special provisions of the federal income tax system which represent government expenditures made through that system to achieve various social and economic objectives. These special provisions provide deductions, credits, exclusions, exemptions, deferrals, and preferential rates, and serve ends similar in nature to those served by direct government expenditures or loan programs. In any specific functional area the Government may use direct expenditures, interest subsidies, direct federal loans, and federal insurance or guarantee of private loans as alternative methods to accomplish the purposes which the special tax provision seeks to achieve or encourage.

The use of the phrase "special provisions" clearly involves a major definitional question: which tax rules are special provisions and therefore tax expenditures, and which tax rules are just tax rules; simply part of the warp and woof of a tax structure? The description and analysis of tax expenditures contained in the fiscal 1968 report to the Secretary of the Treasury used these guidelines:

"(The analysis) lists the major respects in which the current income tax bases deviate

from widely accepted definitions of income and standards of business accounting and from the generally accepted structure of an income tax. . . .

"The study does not attempt a complete listing of all the tax provisions which vary from a strict definition of net income. Various items that could have been added have been excluded for one or more of several reasons:

"(a) Some items were excluded where there is no available indication of the precise magnitude of the implicit subsidy. This is the case, for example, with depreciation on machinery and equipment where the accelerated tax methods may provide an allowance beyond that appropriate to the measurement of net income but where it is difficult to measure that difference because the true economic deterioration or obsolescence factor cannot be readily determined.

"(b) Some items were excluded where the case for their inclusion in the income base stands on relatively technical or theoretical tax arguments. This is the case, for example, with the imputed rent on owner-occupied homes, which involves not only a conceptual problem but difficult practical problems such as those of measurement.

"(c) Some items were omitted because of their relatively small quantitative importance.

"Other features of our income tax system are considered not as variations from the generally accepted measure of net income or as tax preference but as part of the structure of an income tax system based on ability to pay. Such features include personal exemptions and the rate schedules under the individual income tax, including the income splitting allowed for married couples filing joint returns or for heads of households. A discussion of income splitting and the dependent's personal exemption is thus considered outside the scope of this study on tax expenditures.

"It must be recognized that these exclusions are to some extent arbitrary. . . . The immediate objective, however, of this study is to provide a list of items that would be generally recognized as more or less intended use of the tax system to achieve results commonly obtained by government expenditures. The design of the list seems best served by constructing what seemed a minimum list rather than including highly complicated or controversial items that would becloud the utility of this special analysis.

"The assumption inherent in current law, that corporations are separate entities and subject to income taxation independently from their shareholders, is adhered to in this analysis."

These guidelines readily identify a significant number of provisions in existing law which we can all agree are "special" and represent tax expenditures: tax benefits for the aged, natural resources provisions such as percentage depletion allowances, the investment credit, excessive real estate depreciation. These provisions are identifiable as tax expenditures for the additional reason that they have been defended, either by their beneficiaries or by Congress in adopting them, on the grounds that they achieve a particular purpose, claimed to be desirable, other than the measurement of net income under an income tax.

On the basis of these guidelines, the Treasury analysis identified a long list of tax expenditures, with estimates in terms of fiscal year 1968. The expenditures were classified according to the functional categories of government expenditures used in the budget, with the addition of two special categories: Aid to State and Local Governments, and Capital Gains:

The analysis also showed the relationship of tax expenditures to direct expenditures

for these budget categories. In some cases the tax expenditures exceeded or were close to budget expenditures (Community Development and Housing, 204%; Commerce and Transportation, 114%; Natural Resources, 90%; Health and Welfare, 37%) (fiscal 1969 figures). In none of the categories listed above except for National Defense and Veterans were the tax expenditures less than 10% of budget expenditures. The total of the estimated tax expenditures, in a round number, was \$45 billion.

If we take as our definition of tax incentive a tax expenditure which induces certain activities or behavior in response to the monetary benefit available, almost all of the tax expenditures included in the above analysis can be considered tax incentives. Many of the tax expenditures were expressly adopted to induce action which the Congress considered in the national interest. For example, the investment credit was intended to encourage the purchase of machinery and equipment; excessive bad debt reserves for some financial institutions were allowed to encourage the growth of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks; the charitable deduction was intended to foster philanthropy; the preferential tax treatment of qualified pension plans was intended to foster broad pension plan coverage; and the corporate surtax exemption was intended to foster small business. Other tax expenditures whose origins are cloudy are now defended as incentives to home ownership, as in the case of the deduction for mortgage interest and property taxes, or as aids to state and local governments' tax bases, as in the case of the deduction for state and local taxes. Other tax expenditure provisions were adopted as relief provisions to ease "tax hardships," or were adopted to simplify tax computations. Some of these provisions have come to be defended on the basis of their incentive effects: for example, the intangible drilling expenses deduction, the percentage depletion allowance, the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation preferential rate, and the research and development expense deduction. Moreover, to the extent that such tax relief—i.e., tax treatment that is special and not required by the concept and general standards of a net income tax—is granted for an activity that is voluntary, the relief is in effect an incentive to engage in that activity, even though the provisions may not be defended on incentive grounds. For example, if meals and lodging furnished an employee on the premises of an employer are not taxed, the effect is to make employees more likely to choose such employment. If coal and iron royalties receive capital gains treatment and other royalties do not, investment preferences will be affected.

The only tax expenditures that are not tax incentives, as we are using the expression, are expenditures related to involuntary activities of taxpayers. Most such provisions are designed to provide tax reduction in order to relieve misfortune or hardship—situations involving "personal hardships," as contrasted with the "tax hardships" that have brought about other special tax provisions, chiefly for business activities. The extra exemption for the blind is one example. The extra exemption for the aged is another—we can't grow old any faster because of the exemption. Special provisions of this character are relatively few in number. By and large, therefore, the classification guidelines in the Treasury analysis which separate tax expenditures from other tax provisions also serve to identify existing tax incentives.

The recently considered tax expenditures are all in the tax incentive category. They include pollution control machinery credits, manpower training credits, educational expense credits, tax benefits for investing in low income housing, and tax benefits for business investment in central cities or rural areas. In all these situations the direct pur-

pose of the proposed tax change is to provide monetary assistance or benefit through the tax laws so as to make the desired course of action financially more palatable to taxpayers involved, and thereby induce them to take that action. Whatever the purpose of the economic benefit involved—be it to make an expensive activity less costly, to reduce its risk, or to increase the rate of after-tax profit—the incentive effect is the desired effect.

II. COMPARISON OF TAX INCENTIVES WITH DIRECT EXPENDITURES

This section of the discussion is concerned with criteria for evaluating the use of tax incentives as compared to the use of direct government expenditures. This evaluation does not involve the issue whether we should seek to achieve the particular goals for which tax incentives are now used or suggested. We can assume it is understood that each incentive must serve purposes which the nation wants to achieve and is willing to finance, rather than let the marketplace determine the extent to which the result will obtain. This is not to say that every proposal for a tax incentive is presented or defended with a careful analysis along these lines. Far from it—many sponsors of tax incentives simply assume that if the benefit sought is helpful to them in reaching a desired result, the incentive is in the public interest. But this discussion assumes that these issues have been decided. Therefore, we are assessing the use of tax incentives as a technique to provide the government assistance. The discussion is applicable to those tax expenditures intended to alleviate personal hardships, although we have indicated that they might not be classified as tax incentives.

There are, of course, as stated earlier, a variety of ways to provide government financial assistance—direct grants, loans, interest subsidies, guarantees of loan repayment or interest payments, insurance on investments, and so on. These methods are here called budgetary or direct expenditures. Skilled tax technicians and budgetary experts can take any tax expenditure and devise a budgetary expenditure approach to serve the same goals as a direct expenditure. For example, the British for some years used an approach under their tax law somewhat similar to our 7% investment credit to encourage the acquisition of machinery and equipment. They subsequently dropped the tax technique and substituted direct cash payments. The existing tax incentive for charitable giving could also be structured as a direct expenditure program, under which the Government would match an individual's contribution to charity with a proportional contribution of its own to the same charity. Tax credits to an employer for manpower training could be structured as grants or contract payments to the employer. Tax benefits to the aged can be structured as cash to the aged. And so on.

It follows that a meaningful comparison between the tax incentive technique and the direct expenditure technique must involve similar substantive programs. There is no point to saying that in a particular situation a tax incentive is a more useful approach because it involves no government supervision over the details of the action to be induced, whereas a direct expenditure involves detailed supervision. To say so is not to compare a loosely controlled method of paying out government funds with a tightly controlled method. Direct expenditures can involve loose as well as tight supervision. Once we decide which substantive program we want them we can go on to decide which technique, tax incentive or direct expenditure, is preferable for that program.

The matter of what type of substantive program is best calculated to achieve the desired goal lies in the fields of cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analyses. These methods are being used more and more to devise

and test direct expenditures, and they should a priori be equally applicable to programs using a tax incentive technique. For present purposes I am assuming that the substantive analysis, as respects methodological approach, use of econometric techniques, and the like, should be of the same order whether a tax incentive or a direct expenditure is involved. This is not to say that this has been true with regard to tax incentives in the past. Far from it—and therein lie many of the problems with tax incentives. Nor can we say that it will be true as to future tax incentives, nor can we say that all direct expenditure programs are carefully thought through.

A meaningful comparison between the two techniques must also be realistic. Thus, it must recognize that a tax incentive does involve the expenditure of government funds. It is often said that a tax incentive is more useful than a direct expenditure because people do not like or will not respond to "subsidies." Such statements always assume that the direct expenditure is the "subsidy," whereas the tax benefit obtained in the tax incentive—the lower tax—is not so regarded. Perhaps we may find that this fiscal illusion has its usefulness, but we should at least be aware of what is the reality and what is the illusion.

A. Some asserted virtues of tax incentives— Falsely claimed

Against this general background we can now consider some of the virtues and defects generally claimed for tax incentives and, on the other side of the coin, for direct expenditures. The first level of consideration relates to virtues claimed for tax incentives, but, in light of the above background, falsely claimed.

1. *Tax Incentives Encourage the Private Sector to Participate in Social Programs.*—Frequently a tax incentive is urged on the ground that the particular problem to be met is great and that the Government must assist in its solution by enlisting the participation of the private sector—generally business. The need for Government to participate can be fulfilled by a tax incentive, and this is asserted as a virtue of tax incentives—they provide government assistance. Thus, a tax incentive for manpower training proposed in the Senate was defended in these terms:

"Tax incentives (are proposed) to encourage the fullest participation of the private sector in employment, upgrading, and training of less skilled people.

"A tax incentive program should (make) . . . it economically possible for American business to play an important role in our manpower program.

"I understand the objections that are at times put forward to the use of the tax system for social purposes. However, I think it is time we realized that in order to encourage business to participate in programs of this nature, Government must be willing to meet business halfway. The most convenient form for subsidizing a businessman is through his income tax.

"(This bill) enlists the job creating potential of private enterprise by realistically recognizing the high initial costs involved in hiring, training, and providing supportive services for low-skilled individuals."

But all this is a non-sequitur; it points not to the virtue of tax incentives but to the need for government assistance. The existence of that need has no relevance to the question whether the need should be met by an incentive or by a direct expenditure.

2. *Tax Incentives Are Simple and Involve Far Less Governmental Supervision and Detail.*—A whole swirl of virtues claimed for tax incentives is summed up in the general observation that they keep Government—that is, the government bureaucracy—out of the picture: that they involve less negotiation of the arrangements, less supervision,

less red tape, no new bureaucracy, and so on. The manpower proposal referred to above was supported by this argument:

"The advantages to a tax credit approach are numerous. The most important, however, is that the program can go into effect immediately upon enactment. Employment programs in the past have taken months and years to become operative. . . . Employers who participate in the program will receive a tax credit of 75 percent of the wages paid to the employee for the first 4 months of employment, 50 percent for the next 4 months, and 25 percent for the balance of the individual's first year of employment. This is an uncomplicated program with the minimum of red tape. Any employer who hires a certified employee is eligible for the tax credit—it is as simple as that."

But this merely comes down to saying: "Let's have a manpower program under which the Government pays an employer who hires a certified employee an amount calculated as a percentage of the employee's wage." There is nothing so far that indicates whether the payment should be by way of a tax credit or a direct expenditure. If the employer can obtain government funds (i.e., a reduction in tax through the tax credit) for his employment activities by filling out a schedule on a tax return, a manpower program could be devised instead under which he would receive the same monetary assistance by filling out the exact same schedule on a piece of paper that had "Department of Labor" at the top in place of "Internal Revenue Service."

A government that decides it is wise to pay out tax credit money via a simple tax schedule would be highly irrational if it also decided that it would be unwise to pay the same amount directly on the same basis. A dollar is a dollar—both for the person who receives it and the government that pays it, whether the dollar comes with a tax credit label or a direct expenditure label. Nor is a new bureaucracy needed to pay out these amounts as a direct expenditure—a check-writing process is all that would be needed in keeping with the parallel to the tax credit. Nor, similarly, must there be long negotiations, complex contracts, and the like. It is not the tax route that makes the program simple—it is a substantive decision to have a simple program. In many cases, it is true, direct expenditure programs are probably overstructured and the urging of tax incentives is a reaction to, and a valid criticism of, badly designed expenditure programs. The cure lies of course in better designed expenditure programs.

It should be added, parenthetically, that the alleged simplicity of tax incentives is likely to be illusory. Thus, the argument quoted above states that "(a)ny employer who hires a certified employee is eligible for the tax credit—it is as simple as that." But this is not really so, because the legislation actually proposed would have required the employer to be certified by the Secretary of Labor, and to be eligible for certification an employer would have had to prove that the employment program would not impair or depress the wages, working standards, or opportunities of present employees; that the business was not affected by strike, lockout, or similar conditions; that the employees in the program would be afforded an equal opportunity for full-time employment after the expiration of the credit period; that a formal on-the-job training program would be available; and that there would be no discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. Further complexities were involved in the proposed system for determining the creditable wage base, which was to be defined as the higher of the minimum wage or the wage customarily paid by the employer for such services. Similarly, the low income housing tax incentive legislation discussed in 1967 and 1968 was studded with

requirements of "approval by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."

The tape was thus present in the tax credit program and its color was red. This is not to criticize the particular programs, but rather to observe that those who design tax incentive programs, just as those who design direct expenditure programs, may find that complex requirements become desirable.

3. *Tax Incentives Promote Private Decisionmaking Rather Than Government-Centered Decisionmaking.*—It is said that better progress will be made towards the solution of many social problems if individual decisionmaking is promoted, and that since tax incentives promote this they should be preferred to approaches that underscore government-centered decisionmaking. Senator Ribicoff, for example, has expressed the view that "(r)ecognition that tax incentives can account for real Federal expenditures should not obscure the fact that such programs can eliminate the need for additional bureaucratic apparatus while promoting the use of private capital and initiative toward socially useful projects."

We need not discuss the merits of private enterprise as a device for solving social problems, except to note in passing that many business groups who in urging tax incentives stress the virtues of private enterprise overlook the fact that they are really stressing private enterprise plus government assistance. But wise or unwise, the contention that private enterprise should be allowed free play, without government interference, tells us nothing as to the choice between tax incentives and direct expenditures, given the same substantive program. This contention is really a variant of the previous "red tape" argument. Just as we could design a direct expenditure program that provides for reduction of red tape, so we could design one that provides more flexibility for private decisionmaking and less scope for government control. For example, the deduction for charitable contributions is sometimes cited as a method of government assistance that promotes private decisionmaking—the taxpayer, and not the Government, selects the charity and determines how much to give. But a direct expenditure program under which the Government matched with its grants, on a no-questions-asked and no-second-thoughts basis, the gifts of private individuals to the charities they selected, would equally preserve private decisionmaking. Similarly, the freedom of choice that states and local governments have as to how to use the funds they borrow with the assistance of the tax exemption for the interest on their bonds can be preserved by a direct expenditure program in which the federal government pays a part of the interest cost.

It is true that many of the existing tax incentives are less structured than direct expenditure programs. But in part this reflects lack of scrutiny and foresight when the tax incentives were being planned or considered. If after a careful consideration it is decided that a simple structure is wise, then it would assume considerable irrationality to say that the simple structure will necessarily be kept if a tax incentive is used but scrapped in favor of a more complicated structure if a direct expenditure is used.

B. Some asserted defects of tax incentives

1. *Tax Incentives Permit Windfalls by Paying Taxpayers for Doing What They Would Do Anyway.*—It is generally argued that tax incentives are wasteful because some of the tax benefits go to taxpayers for activities which they would have performed without the benefits. When this happens, the tax credit or other benefit is a pleasant windfall, and stimulates no additional activity. With respect to many existing and proposed incentives this criticism is well taken, and indeed it is often difficult to structure a tax credit system which avoids this problem

without increasing complexity and introducing arbitrariness. But this also is a problem not unique to the tax incentive technique. A direct expenditure program similarly structured would be equally open to the charge. For example, grants or contract payments made to employers who hire unskilled employees as part of a manpower program may go to employers who for one reason or another would have hired those employees anyway.

It may be desirable in particular programs to tolerate this inefficiency or windfall. Or it may be desirable to attempt to eliminate it, perhaps by constructing a program under which taxpayers bid for the government assistance needed and the assistance goes to the lowest bidders if otherwise qualified, just as in direct government purchasing. It may be that such a substantive program is difficult to operate through the tax technique, but other ways of reaching only the marginal decision could be built into a tax incentive. The significant question is what sort of substantive program is desired.

2. Tax Incentives Are Inequitable: They Are Worth More to the High Income Taxpayer than the Low Income Taxpayer; They Do Not Benefit Those Who Are Outside the Tax System Because Their Incomes Are Low, They Have Losses, or They Are Exempt from Tax.—This criticism of tax incentives in terms of their inequitable effects is properly levied against most of the existing tax incentives, and probably most of the proposed incentives. The existing incentives were never really carefully structured and in many instances just grew up, without serious thought ever having been given to the question whether they were fair in these terms. The entire process was molded by the fact that the positive tax structure was being affected, and within that structure tax benefits—deductions and exclusions—had these effects as a matter of course. The deductions and exclusions of the tax incentive provisions and their inequitable effects took on the protective coloration of the deductions and exclusions that were a part of the basic tax structure.

The fact that tax benefits for the aged and the sick provide no benefits for those aged or ill who are too poor to pay income taxes was not even thought of as a difficulty, since the focus was as in any positive tax system, on writing the rules for taxpayers. The problem was sometimes thought about in the context of an individual who fell outside the tax system because of current losses, and at times a carry-forward of incentive benefits was provided. Thought was occasionally given to the fact that the deduction of mortgage interest or charitable contributions is worth more to the top bracket taxpayer than the low bracket taxpayer, but the disparity was generally dismissed on the grounds that all deductions had that effect. Sometimes this matter was regarded as worrisome, and a tax credit was used instead of a deduction, as in the case of the retirement income credit for the aged.

This unfairness persists even in recently proposed tax incentives. The proposed tax credit for educational expenses would not have helped poor families with incomes below the taxable level. The proposed manpower training credit would not help a new business experiencing initial losses and struggling to stay alive, or it would help only by deferring into the future, through a carry-forward provision, benefits needed at once. No assistance is provided to a tax-exempt organization or local government incurring added expenses under its participation in manpower training activities.

Thus, the lesson is hard to learn. The recent tax reform legislation contained a tax incentive for the rehabilitation of low income housing, using the device of five-year amortization of capital expenditures which otherwise would be depreciated over a longer period. This device, which was proposed by

the Treasury Department, has these interesting effects for individual taxpayers: for a taxpayer in the 70% bracket, the benefit is the equivalent of a 19% investment credit (assuming an expenditure with a 20-year life and discount rate of 10%); for a taxpayer in the 20% bracket it is the equivalent of a 5% credit. In terms of interest costs on a loan made for rehabilitation purposes, the benefit of five-year amortization is equivalent for the 70% bracket taxpayer to reducing an 8% interest charge to 3%; for the 20% bracket taxpayer it is equivalent to reducing the 8% charge to 7%. The inequitable effect of this tax incentive device is not mentioned either in the proposal or in the committee reports explaining it.

It is thus clear that most tax incentives have decidedly adverse effects on equity as between taxpayers on the same income level, and also, with respect to the individual income tax, between taxpayers on different income levels. As a consequence of these inequitable effects, many tax incentives look, and are, highly irrational when phrased as direct expenditure programs structured the same way. Indeed, it is doubtful that most of our existing tax incentives would ever have been introduced, let alone accepted, if so structured, and many would be laughed out of Congress. What HEW Secretary would propose a medical assistance program for the aged that cost \$200 million, and under which \$90 million would go to persons with incomes over \$50,000, and only \$8 million to persons with incomes under \$5,000? The tax proposal to remove the 3% floor under the medical expense deductions of persons over 65 would have had just that effect. What HEW Secretary would introduce a program under which Social Security benefits would be unaffected if the recipient's total income including the benefit were under \$900, would he automatically increase by 14% if the recipient's income were between \$900 and \$1,400, by 15% if between \$1,400 and \$1,900, and so on up to 70% if over \$100,000? That is the effect of the present exclusion from income of Social Security benefits. What HUD Secretary would suggest a housing rehabilitation subsidized loan program under which a wealthy person could borrow the funds at 3% interest but a poor person would have to pay 7% or 8%? That is the effect of the five-year amortization of rehabilitation expenditures contained in the recent Tax Reform Act.

This criticism—that tax incentives produce inequitable effects and upside-down benefits—is valid as to the general run of tax incentives. It demonstrates why tax incentives make high-income individuals still better off and result in the paradox that we achieve our social goals by increasing the number of tax millionaires. The marketplace does not work this way—for the individual who earns his profit, even high profits, by meeting a need or desire of society, finds his rewards subject to the progressive income tax. The economic system is thus functioning as it is intended it should, and the tax system, which acts as a control, is also functioning as intended. But when rewards are in the form of tax incentives, the latter control is eliminated, and tax millionaires are produced.

The financial assistance afforded by the incentive, with the purpose of making profits high enough to induce the desired action by the taxpayer, is not itself included in income. The tax incentive thus provides both financial assistance and freedom from taxation. That freedom itself means much more to the well-to-do individual than to one in the lower brackets. The tax incentive is thus a method of reward and assistance that is just upside-down from the way the country decided—when it adopted a progressive income tax—that the rewards of the marketplace should operate in combination with the income tax. The use that has been made—and is being made—of tax incentives is thus

destructive of the equity of a tax system. This is illustrated by the Treasury Department's first proposing a housing rehabilitation tax incentive and then having to suggest that the incentive is a tax preference which must be guarded against by including it in a minimum tax structure designed to prevent the wealthy from escaping all tax burdens. The use of the direct expenditure route would have prevented this particular undermining of the tax system.

In some cases, however, the tax incentive could be fashioned to avoid this criticism, though the result would be a different program and one structured more closely along direct exclusion of Social Security benefits, that a uniform tax credit was used instead of the exclusion, the tax credit was included in taxable income, and any unused credit was paid to the taxpayer. This would be the equivalent of a direct expenditure program for all aged on a per capita basis, with positive taxpayers receiving a diminishing final share depending on their tax bracket, and those aged outside the tax system receiving their full share. The elements of inequity would be removed and the tax incentive technique would be on the same footing as a direct expenditure under which each aged person received the same per capita amount. Indeed, this is how tax incentive programs should be structured if they are to be equitable and not involve the unfairness described. But this approach may only rarely be feasible given its novelty and the difficulties involved in convincing the business community and others who are the beneficiaries of tax incentives, let alone the policymakers in Government, of the appropriateness of making such changes as including the tax incentive amount itself in taxable income.

As an aside, we can here see the importance of distinguishing tax expenditures and tax incentives—so-called special tax provisions—from those provisions considered a proper and necessary part of the structure of an income tax. If an item is properly deductible in the latter sense, it does come off at the taxpayer's top tax rate, and its benefits are confined to those who are taxpayers. Given the decision to have an income tax at all, the result is equitable, within the concept of an income tax. All income tax is a tax on net income and not a tax on gross receipts; therefore the deductions from gross income required to produce the net income base must be allowed. Those deductions, generally speaking, are the expenses and costs incurred in the process of producing or earning the gross income received by the taxpayer.

Thus, consider the deduction for moving expenses: it is a deduction and so benefits a taxpayer (reduces his tax) in accordance with his marginal tax rate. It also benefits only taxpayers; an employee who incurs moving expenses, but whose income is so low as not to leave him taxable, does not obtain any benefit or assistance. This is the correct result under a positive income tax system if the moving expense should properly be taken into account in the measurement of net income, as it should be if it is an expense in earning income rather than a personal expense. If it is the latter, the deduction is a subsidy or tax expenditure, inequitably cast, to induce labor mobility. Actually, the moving expense deduction is at the frontier of the positive income tax structure; a gradual shift is occurring, and such expenses are coming to be regarded as a factor proper and necessary to the measurement of net income.

3. Tax Incentives Distort the Choices of the Marketplace and Produce Unneutralities in the Allocation of Resources.—This criticism is in one sense always valid, because that is what the tax incentive is designed to do. Generally, the critic is also saying or implying that the distortion introduced by the particular incentive is undesirable for vari-

ous reasons. In large part this criticism is true of many existing incentives for reasons earlier described. The criticism has relevance because the distorting effects of tax incentives often pass unnoticed. But the criticism is of course equally applicable to direct expenditures, some of which certainly are unwise. Again, we are not here concerned with the overall role of government or the extent to which and under what circumstances financial assistance is desirable to induce private action different from what the marketplace would provide. This criticism thus does not per se tell us when one or the other technique should be used.

It is interesting to note that even within the area sought to be benefited by the tax incentive, the design of the incentive may push or pull in unneat directions, which may or may not be desirable. Thus, a tax credit for pollution control facilities focuses on expenditures for machinery as the method of control to the exclusion of other methods, such as a different choice of materials involved in the manufacturing processes. A tax credit for businesses located in urban slums may focus concentration on monetary assistance to the neglect of the provision of technical assistance.

4. *Tax Incentives Keep Tax Rates High by Constricting the Tax Base and Thereby Reducing Revenues.*—This criticism of tax incentives states a fact that many overlook in their advocacy of tax incentives. The lack of an explicit accounting in the federal budget for the tax expenditures involved in tax incentives and the lack in most cases of an accounting in the tax statistical data combine to cause many to forget that dollars are being spent. As a consequence, the criticism that is made against direct expenditures—that they keep our tax rates high—is often lost sight of when tax incentives are involved. This criticism of tax incentives is thus a useful reminder that government funds are being spent, and that therefore whatever degree of scrutiny and care should be applied to direct expenditures should also be applied to tax incentives. Tax incentives are usually open-ended: they place no limit on how much tax benefit a taxpayer can earn. Hence it is difficult to foretell how much will be spent by the Government through a particular incentive. It is difficult in the nature of things to structure most tax incentives in order to provide a limit on their use. Thus, tax incentives are much like the uncontrollable direct expenditures in the budget.

In the end, the issue is whether, as to any particular area, we want direct government provision of services or goods, government financial assistance (subsidies) to encourage and assist private action to provide the services or goods, or reliance on private action unaided by the Government. If we choose government provision or assistance, then dollars must be spent, and whether they are dollars forgone through lost tax revenues or dollars spent directly through direct expenditures, the effect on tax rates will be the same. So also will the effect on the economy if the government program succeeds, and the resultant effect on the revenue base and tax rates of the increased economic activity that such success may mean.

C. Summary of asserted virtues and vices of tax incentives

This description of the virtues and vices of tax incentives yields these conclusions: the asserted disadvantages—waste, inefficiency, and inequity—are true of most tax incentives existing or proposed because of the way they are structured or grew up. The whole approach to tax incentives—one of rather careless or loose analysis, failure to recognize that dollars are being spent, or to recognize the defects inherent in working within the constraints of the positive tax system—has produced very poor programs. But if care were taken to design tax incentive

programs that one would be willing to defend in substantive terms were the programs cast as direct expenditure programs, then these disadvantages would not be involved, except to the extent that they are inherent in government assistance itself. These are large conditions, and in some cases would be hard to bring about. For example, it would not be easy to give tax benefit assistance to groups outside the tax system but performing desired activities, such as local governments or tax-exempt organizations hiring the disadvantaged—direct payments outside the tax system would be needed. And it would not be easy to design tax incentive programs which were not inequitable as between taxpayers in high and low brackets and between taxpayers and nontaxpayers. Indeed, there is not tax incentive in existence or proposed that meets the above standards. But for purposes of comparison we are here assuming that the standards could be met under some tax incentive programs.

Similarly, the asserted advantages of tax incentives—greater reliance on private decisionmaking and less detailed requirements—to the extent that they are true in fact (and they are often only illusory) are really criticism of the complications and supervision built into direct expenditure programs, or else a reflection of the structural weaknesses of the tax incentive program, depending on the amount of detail and supervision appropriate to the particular program. In a rational world, one should assume that if after careful study it is considered that certain complexities and details are not needed and can be left out of a tax incentive program, then they should and can simply be dropped from the direct expenditure program. Again, this may be a more difficult condition than appearance suggests, but it is probably less difficult to bring about than the conditions for repairing tax incentives, or at least no more difficult. Again, for purposes of comparison, we are also here assuming it can be done in direct expenditure programs.

D. What is lost by using a tax incentive rather than a direct expenditure

Given, under the assumptions just made, the same substantive program, under which government assistance in the same amount is being given in ways and to persons that would be equally acceptable whether tax incentives or direct expenditures were used, what factors should determine the choice of framework for a particular program? We can approach this question by asking: what is lost if the tax incentive technique is used? There are several answers.

1. *Tax Incentives, by Dividing the Consideration and Administration of Government Programs, Confuse and Complicate that Consideration in the Congress, in Administration, and in the Budget Process.*—Let us start with the congressional consideration of tax incentive programs. By definition, such programs are designed to induce action to meet a particular social goal—manpower training of the disadvantaged, education, housing, pollution control, or business location in desired areas, to use some recent examples—and would not be a part of the tax structure were they not deliberately cast as tax incentives. Such governmental programs would normally be considered by the appropriate congressional committee charged with the legislative area involved: the House Education and Labor and Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committees, the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees, the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Senate Commerce Committees, and so on. These committees are responsible for overseeing and developing legislation in their jurisdictional fields, and so are able to coordinate the Government's programs and policies. Tax legislation, however, goes to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Commit-

tee. These committees would normally not consider the substantive areas involved in tax incentive programs. Tax incentives suddenly charge them with acting on substantive matters outside their fields of responsibility simply because the program uses the tax system. Although tax committees are highly competent in tax matters, they do not have as much insight into these programs as the legislative committees normally handling the programs. A similar situation would prevail if the latter committees were suddenly to legislate on technical tax matters. Moreover, the tax incentive program considered by the tax committees would be isolated from the regular flow of legislation and activity in the field involved, and this isolation would make coordination and the consideration of priorities difficult. The purpose of the congressional committee system is to distribute expertise among the members of Congress. To cast solutions to social problems as tax measures and exchange expertise in those problems for unfamiliarity is, to say the least, both disruptive and unproductive. Moreover, the jumbling of a number of different incentive programs in the tax committees would inevitably set in motion a "log-rolling" process, in which careful consideration would be displaced by trading for support among members. Such a process is difficult to control once a committee is operating outside of its area of expertise and with no clear limits of subject matter to restrain it.

These difficulties could perhaps be overcome. Tax committees might refer incentive proposals to the appropriate legislative committees and accept their judgments, or both groups of committees could consider the matter jointly. Approaches like these are sometimes used in areas where a trust fund having earmarked taxes exists. But the system is awkward and leaves unanswered questions—for example, which committee would exert continuing oversight over the program? Given all the trouble and care that must be taken to patch up an arrangement basically at variance with the normal practice, what is gained by choosing that arrangement in the first instance and thereby dividing the governmental consideration of the program?

Much the same can be said about the parallel effect at the administrative level. Social programs are normally administered by executive departments such as Labor, HEW, HUD, and Interior. Taxes are administered by the Internal Revenue Service. A social program cast in tax terms must in the first instance be administered by the IRS, whose expertise does not extend to these other areas. Problems of lack of coordination with other substantive programs would also arise because of the isolation of tax incentive programs. Again, these difficulties could be patched up to some extent—and probably would have to be—by having the appropriate executive department provide some guidance to IRS. But why the divided arrangement in the first place?

At the budgetary level such a division of responsibility makes oversight and control more difficult. Budgetary problems exist even where several relevant executive departments have a hand in the same program or area. The difficulties are compounded when one of the agencies (IRS) really doesn't belong there in the first place, and when it distributes the funds by tax reduction rather than direct expenditure. Our present budgetary process badly compounds these difficulties by giving no recognition or accounting to what is being spent on existing tax expenditures. Until 1968, when the Treasury Department published its analysis of tax expenditure programs and a Tax Expenditure Budget, there was no accounting for the existing tax incentives. The necessary data were not available to the public and not comprehended within the Government. No

one really knew what was being spent through the tax system or for what purposes.

An additional problem is the difficulty of coordinating the treatment of tax incentives with the overall handling of direct expenditures. For example, when overall expenditures limits are directed by the Congress or when the President decides to cut expenditures it is essentially impossible to apply the restrictions to tax incentives. So far none of the various expenditure control devices, such as those voted in recent years by the Congress, have in any way affected tax expenditures. Yet had these tax programs been structured as direct expenditures, they would have had no such immunity. In substantive terms they do not merit that immunity any more than the direct expenditures, yet their tax clothing shields them. For similar reasons, tax incentives are not covered by the annual budgetary review process; the Bureau of the Budget doesn't even know about many of them, or how much they cost. We do have "uncontrollable" areas in the budget, such as interest on the public debt, and since they can play havoc with a budget, an effort is made to keep them to a minimum, and at least to identify them and try to estimate their effect. But in the budget process this is not done for tax incentives.

Overall, therefore, a resort to tax incentives greatly decreases the ability of the Government to maintain control over the management of its priorities. This is true both as to the substantive programs to be introduced, modified, or dropped and as to the amounts to be spent in particular programs and areas. These consequences run counter to the whole thrust of our concerns with the ordering of national priorities and with the wise allocation of our resources, which we have come to see as limited and therefore in need of careful management.

Some of these difficulties could be met. Tax incentives could be identified, amounts estimated, and the data incorporated in the budget. Unless this is done, comparisons of tax expenditures and direct expenditures must be comparisons of hidden programs with open ones. But even after such clarification, further difficulties would remain. Perhaps the President could be given authority to treat the tax incentive funds as direct expenditures for budgetary control purposes, and the incentives could be structured as far as possible to have them fall in the controllable rather than the uncontrollable expenditure pattern. Perhaps the tax incentive programs could be given yearly or biannual expiration dates, so that they could be reviewed in the same way as direct expenditures under the appropriation and budgetary procedures.

But these solutions, like those available for the problems of congressional consideration and administrative operation, raise the question, what is gained by turning what would normally be a direct expenditure program into a tax incentive program and then trying to structure the program so that it can nevertheless be handled as a direct expenditure program? Why the detour through the tax system? Why inject the tax system into the program, when the program can be effectively structured without it?

2. Tax Incentives Will Not Improve the Tax System and Are Likely To Damage It Significantly.—Certainly the tax system does not gain when expenditures are made through tax incentive programs. We have already seen that tax incentives are inimical to the equity of a tax system—indeed, in a sense that is necessary to their purpose and function. Moreover, the tax system is complex enough as it is, and to have a large number of tax incentives side by side with the provisions making up the structure of the tax itself can only cause confusion and a blurring of concepts and objectives. Tax incentives make it more and more difficult to distinguish between what is subsidy and what is proper

structure. This is especially so where the tax incentive is not identifiable as such but is merged into a provision that has a genuine relationship to the measurement of net income—as is, for example, the subsidy involved in accelerated depreciation for real estate, since some degree of depreciation is appropriate.

It is no answer to say, as do some cynics, that since the tax system today has so many special provisions there should be no objection, when worthwhile programs are involved, to adding still more to the heap. Rather, the effort should persist to contract those existing special provisions that are improper and wasteful. We know from long experience that provisions can be enshrined in tax laws far past their usefulness and long after their defects become clear. We should not, when alternatives are present, freeze in more special provisions, especially since programs in the complex areas of social policy to which many tax incentive proposals relate are essentially experimental in nature.

E. What is gained—allegedly—by using a tax incentive rather than a direct expenditure

Thus, a great deal is lost when tax incentives are used. What is to be gained by that approach compared with the direct expenditure approach? Some have advanced answers which are essentially political in nature, and, I think, rooted in illusions or irrationalities. Professor Aaron has observed that the popularity of the tax devices "derives from a peculiar alliance among conservatives, who find attractive the alleged reduction in the role of government that would follow from extensive use of tax credits, and liberals anxious to solve social and economic problems—by whatever means—before it is too late." We have already discussed the illusion that tax credits for social purposes are simple and removed from the bureaucratic hand. The second illusion in the above argument is that the Congress will vote dollars through tax incentives that it refuses to appropriate through expenditure programs. Just why a Congress that focuses on the matter should be so inconsistent is not explained. Certainly many members of tax committees, such as Chairman Mills, have recognized that tax incentives do involve expenditures—"back-door expenditures" in his words—and that a legislature concerned with expenditure levels and expenditure control should not, while holding the front door shut, let hidden expenditures in through the back door. But perhaps irrationality will govern; perhaps administrators and legislators will devise and accept programs structured as tax provisions which they would reject as direct expenditures, or will refuse to improve direct expenditure programs, or will spend money through tax incentives that they would not appropriate as direct expenditures. In that event, rational consideration will not change matters.

There is another answer, which also appears to be irrational or illusory. This is the claim that businessmen respond to tax credits but not to other forms of government assistance; that there is a glamour and magic possessed by dollars of tax reduction that will attract the businessman who would pass up dollars offered through direct expenditures. To the extent that this answer rests on the belief that tax incentives are really simpler, or that complexities can be sheared away only if tax incentives are used, it rests on beliefs already discussed and found either unrealistic or true only if the underlying government policies are themselves irrational. To the extent that the answer rests on the claim that business regards tax incentive dollars as "clean dollars"—just part of a tax computation—but sees direct expenditure dollars as somehow unclean because they are a subsidy, one can only answer that business probably does not respond

this way, or that if it does, it is behaving irrationally. Experience with direct subsidies—the SST program for example—suggests that business firms are willing to and do calculate profit prospects in the light of government subsidies. Similarly, the argument that business is familiar with tax credits—though until the investment credit there were no credits widely used in the corporate tax system—but not with other forms of government assistance is certainly not always true. Lack of business familiarity could be overcome by publicizing direct subsidies. The manpower training credit proposal quoted earlier suggested that "the Department of Labor . . . be required to make (the proposal's) provisions known to the unemployed and potential employers in the business community." Such a duty could equally well be placed on that Department if it were administering a direct expenditure program.

There may be an aspect of this asserted preference for tax incentive programs that is not illusion or irrationality, but more serious. It may be that legislators and the beneficiaries of tax incentive programs—businesses receiving accelerated depreciation or percentage depletion, state and local governments receiving tax exemption on their bonds—fear that once the public is fully aware of the amounts involved and can weigh expenditure costs against benefits received by the nation, the tax incentives will be found wanting in many respects. In this view, the deeper the incentive is buried in tax technicalities and tax terminology, the more it looks like any other technical tax provision, the more it partakes of the protective coloration of the tax law that can be obtained by such outward similarity to ordinary tax provisions, then the more desirable the tax incentive becomes. The public must dig hard and deep to find the subsidy and evaluate it. But such an approach to government expenditures—the preference for the hidden subsidy over the open subsidy—is contrary to all experience with budgets, and to efforts to achieve a rational use of resources. If this is the argument for tax incentives, it should not be accepted.

III. CONCLUSIONS

What, then, is the balance sheet regarding these two methods of government assistance, direct expenditures and tax incentives? I conclude from the above observations that, as a generalization, the burden of proof should rest heavily on those proposing the use of the tax incentive method. In any particular situation—certainly any new situation—the first approach should be to explore the various direct expenditure alternatives. Once the most desirable of these alternatives is determined, if one still wishes to consider the tax incentive method for the same substantive program, the question must be what clear advantages can be obtained by using the tax method. Again, as a generalization, I think it unlikely that clear advantages in the tax incentive method will be found. Moreover, I stress strongly that the advantages must be clear and compelling to overcome the losses that accompany the use of the tax incentive, even the well-structured incentive. The problems of achieving a well-structured incentive are in themselves formidable. Even assuming that such problems as unfairness and windfalls are overcome, there are still the losses and drawbacks we have described: confusion and divided authority in the legislative and administrative processes, difficulties in maintaining budgetary control, confusion in perceiving and setting national priorities, and dangers to the tax structure itself.

It could be that a program of government assistance that is broadly based, relatively simple, and properly structured can be more readily administered if joined to the tax system. Some have defended the deductions for charitable contributions and personal inter-

est and taxes on this ground, though pointing to the need to correct abuses and recognizing that the corrections would make the tax incentive more like a direct expenditure program. Others have defended the investment credit for the same reasons, again with a recognition that improvements can be made. But none of these incentives has had to meet the test of comparison with a carefully structured direct expenditure program. Only after that is done can we reach the point of well-informed choice.

These are general guidelines; there may be particular cases to which they do not apply because special considerations are involved. Even so, care must be taken to look hard at special considerations advanced as reasons for an exception to be made "in this particular case." The legislative halls are crowded with advocates skilled in tying their problems to the last exception and in devising techniques to make each step from the last precedent appear to be only short, logical, and harmless. Our gaze can thus be averted from the constantly widening gap between proper tax structure and each additional special provision.

One question raised by this discussion especially merits more research and thought. Just why is it that in many cases legislators appear willing, with hardly any thought, to accept an expensive tax incentive program when they would just as quickly reject a similar direct expenditure program, even a much smaller one? Why do they require lengthy study and analysis of direct expenditure programs before legislative and appropriation committees while they are ready to enact tax incentives on no more than generalizations and hunches? Is it that they do not realize, or stop to think, that dollars are spent by tax incentives? Is it that tax bills are so complicated that hardly anyone studies them unless prodded by an industry or taxpayer that is hurt, in his tax pocketbook, and that therefore provisions dispensing largesse slide by—although this would be a case of the proper concession of tax expertise to the tax committees papering over their lack of expertise in the areas involved in tax incentives. Is it that the legislators know full well what is involved, despite the complexity of tax bills, but believe the public will not perceive what is being done because of the complexity of tax bills and because tax expenditures do not show up in the budget? To claim this would almost be to claim that any expenditure of funds is acceptable to a legislator—the more money to constituents the better—but most legislators do not follow this principle.

We could ask similar questions about administrative agencies. Just why do administrators of direct expenditure programs allow tax incentive proposals to be pushed when the funds involved in such programs could be used, and probably much better used, as coordinated parts of the direct expenditure programs? Is it that their policy is to accept gratefully contributions from any source? Is it that they will not face up to the need either to improve the direct expenditure program or squarely demonstrate the erratic and wasteful character of the tax incentive proposal? Is it that they are sometimes negligent in their legislative intelligence and are simply left at the legislative starting gate when the tax incentive is adopted? And why should a Treasury Department which is charged with preserving the integrity of the tax system ever willingly propose or accept a tax incentive solution except in the unusual and rare situation when a tax credit may possibly be properly tailored, and better suited to the purpose—conditions which do not appear to exist as to any of the recent proposals?

With new situations—that is, new or expanded government programs—we are in a position to follow a rational course in choosing between these methods. During the

1960's, as attention turned increasingly to government financial assistance to meet urgent social problems, almost every problem brought proposals of a tax incentive as the solution; often the tax incentive was the first solution to be advanced. The Treasury Department responded by pressing the White House staff and other agencies to devise, with the Treasury, non-tax alternatives for comparison on a cost-effectiveness basis. For example, the Treasury, with HEW, developed the federal guaranteed student loan program and expanded scholarship and work programs, so that they could be pushed in opposition to a tax credit for college tuition. In the manpower field, the Treasury urged strong and expanding federally-supported training programs which could be advanced instead of a tax incentive. The skepticism with which specialized tax incentives for social problems were regarded by the Treasury to be a strong force within the Government in developing and pushing direct expenditure programs, both to counter tax incentive proposals and to move forward to meet the problems in other ways.

With existing tax incentives, the task is one that falls in the category of "tax reform," where progress is difficult and slow. This is especially so with incentives which have long histories. We do learn as the tax years pass by: the newer tax provisions are in general more carefully tailored with an eye to many of these problems than their predecessors. For example, compare the moving expense and medical expense deductions with those for personal interest and taxes as originally adopted. Or compare the structure of the 7% investment credit with the provision for accelerated depreciation for real estate as it appeared in 1954. Unfortunately, we also can forget what we have learned, as the earlier discussion of the upside-down structure of the new five-year amortization for housing rehabilitation expenditures indicates.

It seems likely that tax reform for many existing incentives will be in the direction of contracting the area of incentives by reducing the number of those eligible for benefits, reducing the extent of the benefits, and removing the undue advantages granted upper income groups. The degree of change will presumably vary with the breadth of the incentive: those that involve specific areas and provide tax benefits for a restricted group—for example, accelerated depreciation for real estate and the natural resource provisions—will, or at least should, be subject to serious cutbacks in scope and benefit, whereas incentives with broad reach—for example, the charitable, interest, and tax deductions—will be scrutinized for particular abuses. This, in general, is the tenor of the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Once we begin to recognize that the existing tax incentives represent expenditures of funds that in many cases should be dispersed directly, we must develop legislative and administrative techniques to move the funds involved—to the extent that government assistance is still considered desirable—from the tax expenditure budget to the regular budget. The tax committees or the Bureau of the Budget could indicate to the Congress and the administrative agencies concerned the amounts involved in particular tax incentive programs. A period of time would then be allowed for the appropriate legislative committees and administrative agencies to develop direct expenditure programs, and a time limit could be put on the duration of the tax incentive programs. At the end of this period the tax incentive would be ended and the new direct expenditure program funded with the dollars returned to the revenue side of the budget. Certainly, new tax incentive programs, if any are to be adopted, should have a time limit set on their operation, to permit such a shift to a direct expenditure program, or at least to permit evaluation of the effectiveness and operation of the tax incentive.

For the present, a de-escalation of existing particular incentives would be progress, though it would leave a set of tax incentives that probably would not be used at all if we were able to treat the problems fully as new problems. But this is the path of tax history and indeed all legislative history. Knowing all this; let us at least attempt not to repeat past mistakes in future solutions.

VIETNAM LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in the extremely heavy influx of mail following the Cambodia incursion, I received one especially detailed letter from Mr. James J. Agan, 403 Cimarron Road, Rosemount, Minn. Mr. Agan is an Army veteran now completing law school under the GI bill.

His letter is a particularly well-documented defense of the point of view that immediate withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam is advisable.

Although I do not think it is possible to move that fast, I do feel that Mr. Agan's point of view deserves consideration, and for this reason I insert Mr. Agan's letter in the RECORD:

ROSEMOUNT, MINN.

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a member of your Congressional District and am writing you to protest the continued fighting in Vietnam and Richard M. Nixon's actions in sending troops into Cambodia.

I am employed at Control Data Corporation and have built a home in the recently incorporated Village of Apple Valley. I have served in the U.S. Army as a lieutenant for 26 months and am now completing my fourth year of the law school under the GI Bill.

Initially though I questioned the legitimacy of our role in South Vietnam, I was willing to support U.S. involvement when there appeared a possibility of our aiding a legitimate government in that country. I recalled the days of the Korean War when North Korea invaded South Korea and though Syngman Rhee was not the ideal President nor their Army perfect yet the overt aggression and the government that was to be imposed by that aggression were so repugnant, I found it justifiable to support the Korean War. The similarity to that war with the fighting in South Vietnam though on what was then termed covert subversion was sufficient in my mind to allow United States involvement.

Since that initial concept I have changed my mind and by writing you and outlining the reasons for my change of thought I hope to persuade you to support all efforts to immediately end our involvement in Vietnam.

In 1961 while in the U.S. Army my battalion received various TWX's asking for military advisers for Vietnam and even at that time the fighting was making front page news in the Stars and Stripes with our advisers being killed in clashes with the Viet Cong. The requirements for those advisers were usually airborne, special forces troops well beyond the qualifications of a Lieutenant in Army Intelligence.

I suppose the first questions were raised

in my mind when Premier Diem was killed by a coup de tat at the presidential palace. We, the United States, although not directly involved in this coup, certainly knew about the coup from the CIA who were heavily involved in Vietnam and any intelligence analyst with that knowledge could quickly extrapolate that Premier Diem would probably be killed. So we, by supporting the new government established by that coup, became accomplices to murder.

With that coup the legitimacy of the government was subject to question. Diem's government had chosen to ignore international agreement which had established his government, ended the Indo-China war, and required elections to determine whether the country would remain partitioned. Those elections were never held, and if held would probably have resulted in the unification of the country; and the war and our involvement would probably have resulted in Ho Chi Minh being President of a unified country and might have resulted in a Communist purge. But could this possibility have been worse than 9 years of U.S. involvement which resulted in innumerable deaths in both North and South Vietnam, the death of 41,000 Americans, the destruction of innumerable homes and villages and the continued fighting that will occur under the program of Vietnamization. Certainly not to the average Vietnamese, the peasant, who lived under a system which denied him his lands and made no pretense to represent him. That same treaty forbade the involvement of any foreign government in Vietnam and we chose also to violate its provisions and in so doing foreclosed those possibilities and were committed to war that became costly in lives and sorrow.

But this was the beginning—there was yet another coup and an election under guns which gave the people a choice of the coup leaders or other candidates but no choice as to the system under which they were to live. The government formed by that election consisted of the coup leaders who subsequently imprisoned those candidates who dared advocate a different system of government.

The government of Vietnam has been effective only by the strength of our arms and our government has indicated at various times it is not indispensable to a peace in South Vietnam. It is a government formed out of murder of the country's Premier and the dictatorship of military coups.

We are involved in basic Civil War as the massacre at Mai Lai has proved. After 9 years of fighting we have not won the hearts and minds of the people and our enemies are not only the Vietnamese from the North but also the people of the South.

Our involvement began first with supplies then with advisers to teach their soldiers how to use those supplies, then with air support, then ground troops, then air attacks and now invasion of a third country. The statements in support of each step of escalation were always that the step was necessary to meet increased enemy pressure and would insure victory. Victory never became assured and only resulted in increased deaths. They were studied falsehoods. McNamara claimed the troops would be home by Christmas—which Christmas I've forgotten—but the war continued. Westmoreland claimed a half million American troops would be enough to win then the General, being made Chief of Staff, said that was not enough. The Bay of Tonkin resolution was passed to punish North Vietnam for attacking a U.S. Destroyer in international waters and this resolution was used to bomb North Vietnam, but the attack upon the destroyer never took place. If we bomb the North it will end their war-making capabilities and their will to fight and though we shot water buffalo and bombed irrigation canals as legitimate tar-

gets, the war did not diminish until we stopped the bombing.

We invade Cambodia to destroy enemy headquarters, but instead find no headquarters and claim victory upon finding supplies and burning villages. We invade Cambodia to give South Vietnam breathing time, but President Thieu says his forces will stay for a long time. We invade Cambodia on three fronts, but this expands to six, a river force and a blockade. We invade Cambodia to allow our forces to withdraw, retreat means attack.

Just how long can we continue a war where body counts are a measure of victory? The body count continues weak in and weak out, the fighting does not diminish. Inhumanity rather than victory is the product. It was first torture of prisoners while U.S. advisors stood by. Then it was U.S. troops allowing wounded prisoners to die or executing wounded prisoners because evacuation for them was unavailable. Then it became execution of prisoners. It became the failure to treat civilian casualties at Army hospitals. It became taking ears and other parts from the bodies of the Viet Cong. It was shooting children as they ran to helicopters anticipating candy, but shot because grenades might be strapped to their legs. It was first pacification by evacuating villages and then burning homes and crops. Then it was reconnaissance by fire from helicopter gun ships. Bombs from 50,000 feet by B52's, precision bombing by tactical fighter aircraft. It then became shooting women and children because they were against us. To say we are fighting only North Vietnam is a lie. There are too many desecrations committed upon the lives of the South Vietnamese to say that we have or can ever win their hearts and minds. It is not the other side that has committed the atrocity but we ourselves who continue the war for war is an atrocity and it must be fought only when we are right and just and human.

The specter of international communism has been used to justify the war but there are almost as many varieties of communism as there are countries, it is no longer international but a national philosophy, witness Russia, China, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Albania, the collective farms of Israel, the communist aid to Egypt, or the socialism of Sweden or Britain. The communism of North Vietnam is national in philosophy as proved by the middle course steered between the two grants of Russia and China.

The war has brutalized American society, divided American society, overly simplified patriotism from an ideal to a slogan, caused by an American President to ever generalize and condemn those who actively and deeply disagree with him.

Enough—stop the war now, put the right to make war back in the Congress where the Constitution, Article I, Section 8 says it belongs. We have spent too much on war and too little on peace. Not all the combat troops home in 1971, all the troops home now!

JAMES J. AGAN.

FIFTEEN AVIATION GROUPS ASK AIRPORT/AIRWAY FUNDS NOW

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, the recently enacted Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 opens the way for badly needed improvement, expansion, and updating of the Nation's airports and facil-

ities. The pressing problem is to get this work and the necessary planning underway at the earliest possible date.

A petition, joined by 15 national aviation associations, was recently presented to the President and to the Congress urging all possible speed in the implementation of this vital program.

I join with these groups in calling to the attention of the Congress the seriousness of their need and I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the news release pertaining to this petition and listing the organizations participating.

FIFTEEN AVIATION GROUPS ASK AIRPORT/AIRWAY FUNDS NOW

WASHINGTON.—Fifteen national aviation associations today urged President Nixon and the Congress to recognize and act immediately upon a funding emergency in the nation's airports and airways.

Their petition was presented both to the Congress and to the President following his signing the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970.

The act will raise more than \$650-million in Fiscal Year 1971 through taxes on airline passengers, on air cargo shippers, on aircraft owners, and on general aviation fuel.

The petition asks Congress immediately to appropriate funds for Fiscal Year 1971 "not less than anticipated user charge revenue in that year and such additional funds as may be needed . . ."

Also asked is the immediate release of all appropriated airport and airway funds, including \$50-million voted for airports and \$90-million for airways.

"American leadership has advanced with air progress and can decline without it," the petition warns. "Private enterprise has done its part but government has not kept pace. Problems will continue to grow faster than the cures unless spending under the new program is wise."

The 15 national aviation associations signing the petition are as follows:

Air Transport Association of America, Aircraft Electronics Association, American Association of Airport Executives, Association of Local Transport Airlines, Aviation Distributors and Manufacturers Association, Flight Instruments Society, General Aviation Manufacturers Association, International Flying Farmers Association, National Aerospace Services Association, National Air Transportation Conferences, National Association of State Aviation Officials, National Business Aircraft Association, National Pilots Association, The Ninety-Nines, and the Whirley-Girls.

**FOR THOSE WHO FOUGHT FOR IT,
FREEDOM IS THE TASTE THE PROTECTED
WILL NEVER KNOW**

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, every day brave young men die on battlefields in Southeast Asia. They die because a decision was made several years ago to send American fighting men to defend freedom in Vietnam. Most of the thousands of soldiers who have died believed in that cause. Most of the Americans who are fighting today believe in that cause. Those of us in Government who seek an honorable conclusion to the Vietnam

conflict believe that the faith of those fighting men, both living and dead, must not go ill-requested.

Late last year, a young man from my congressional district was killed in Vietnam. S. Sgt. Curtis Frantz died on the day he was scheduled to leave for home. He was a soldier who had great faith in the cause for which he fought. He left a letter with his parents which described that faith. It is correspondence which cannot replace the loss of their son, but for Mr. and Mrs. Russell R. Frantz, of Palmyra, Pa., it is a letter which must be of real comfort.

Staff Sergeant Frantz wrote:

For those who fought for it, freedom is the taste the protected will never know.

Those words and others from his letter should be of interest to my colleagues. I include part of the text of Staff Sergeant Frantz's last letter home in the RECORD at this point:

A SOLDIER'S LAST LETTER HOME

As for the Moratorium, the way I look at it is that I'm over here fighting for freedom, and that includes the freedom of speech and public assembly. The majority of the people that participated want peace and to put an end to the war. The thing is, if we are pulled out of Vietnam, there won't be peace, at least not in this area of the world. The Communists will come down from the North and turn South Vietnam into a blood bath.

The more we give in, the more area would fall under Communist control; we have to check their expansion somewhere. I'd sooner do it here than on the shores of the United States.

I don't believe in killing, yet I've taken the lives of at least four NVA soldiers. I don't believe in war, yet I support the President and his policies. One of my buddies died in my arms in January, so I also owe him something, to make sure he didn't die in vain.

The decisions made in the future will tell us whether or not 40,000 Americans died in vain. Out of all the people that protest, how many have fought over here and understand this war? Understand what it's like to live for a year in fear of death, seeing a friend killed, to see a burned village, or a child that was orphaned because her parents were executed by the NVA, to go without a bath, shave and clean clothes for weeks on end, to walk five miles over mountains with a 60-pound pack on your back, to lie in a fox-hole during a mortar barrage and wonder if one of the shells has your name on it, to live on two glasses of water a day because you can't get resupplied and the streams are dried up, to see a Medivac helicopter loaded with wounded shot down and all on board killed.

I'm not telling war stories, just some of my personal experiences. If you haven't fought over here, don't protest against it. There's more to this war than meets the eye. I haven't seen home for a year.

I want to come home so bad, yet if giving my life would preserve freedom a little while longer, I wouldn't hesitate to make that sacrifice. Sure the White House makes mistakes, but right or wrong, it's our country. If it's wrong, let's make it right. But if nothing else, at least stand by her in time of need.

The Good Lord and the United States gave us a lot to be thankful for. Let's see to it that our children get the same opportunities we did. "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." I'm not putting myself in the trust of signs, slogans or marches, but in the trust of God and the hope that He'll guide our leaders and aid them in making the right decisions.

Nixon's doing more in trying to bring the GI's home than LBJ did. But nobody realizes that North Vietnam is happy about the Moratorium, and they are openly urging us to support it. And why shouldn't they? There's nothing like dissent to ruin a country. "A house divided cannot stand." We could beat the NVA, and a lot more to stop aggression, if we had the support of the people back home.

People used to be proud of its men in uniform. Now the trend is to regard them with distaste. I'm proud that I served, but when I come home, I'll get the weird looks, etc., because I'm a veteran, not because I shirked my duty. No wonder the GI's morale over here is zero.

I fought to protect all the people back home that think freedom is a right. But freedom is not a right, it's a privilege, paid for in blood by millions of Americans ever since 1776 and we must fight to keep that right at being a free country. "For those who fought for it, freedom is the taste the protected will never know."

I'd better quit now. I've said enough. But let me end my oratory on a question directed to the American people in general. I've earned my birthright and the right to call myself free and an American, have you?

CIVIL OBEDIENCE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have been a faithful reader of the publications of the Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y., and particularly of their excellent monthly publications, the *Freeman* and *Notes from FEE*.

The July 1970 issue of *Notes from FEE* contains a particularly outstanding essay by the foundation's president, Leonard E. Read, entitled "Civil Obedience." In this essay, Mr. Read outlines the bounds of what he considers permissible dissent from the law. As the author notes, not everyone will agree with his views, but when he makes the point that "Law-breaking merely adds to the existing confusion," I know that he speaks for a great number of us.

I commend Mr. Read's very thoughtful analysis to my colleagues' attention:

CIVIL OBEDIENCE

What a refreshing experience! The seventh annual Undergraduate Seminar at FEE had just ended—38 well-chosen young men from 19 states and 30 colleges. It would be difficult to imagine a class or group more sincere or eager to learn the ways of freedom than these, our student guests.

There were questions! Most of these questions weren't new, but! This one seemed to pop up in the discussion sessions more than ever before: "Am I not warranted in breaking an immoral law?" It wasn't how to answer that bothered me but rather the persistency and frequency of the question. Why? What accounts for this growing rebellion?

After much reflection, I conclude that this is but a phase of action and reaction. An extreme action has a natural tendency to evoke an extreme reaction: the further a pendulum is moved to the left and released, the further it will swing to the right—action and reaction. In this case the extreme action is an ever-increasing socialism, the politico-

economic pendulum pushed more and more to the left. The instinctive or natural reaction to this is equally extreme: anarchy! This is to say that lawbreaking—each person a law unto himself—tends to increase in proportion to the multiplication of laws and state intervention.

Three thoughts come immediately to mind. First, how is an immoral law to be defined? To me, any law that feathers the nest of some at the expense of others is an immoral law. However, I find mine to be quite a minority view these days. Does the propriety of breaking a law hinge on whether or not a person believes it to be immoral? But contemporary ethical standards vary so that no law will pass everyone's test of morality. Therefore, I am obliged to question this "morality" criterion as a green light to go ahead and break the laws of the land.

Second, this anarchistic reaction to socialism is an emotional, instinctive response—no more rational than is the swing of a pendulum.

And, third, we must never dismiss this matter of lawbreaking lightly: it is extremely serious. At least from my chair at the discussion table, I see an enormous anarchistic reaction to the growing socialism of which campus strife is but an annoying symptom. And back of it all—giving the movement a false dignity—are an increasing number of persuasive writers and speakers flaunting the labels of scholarship. Identify them yourself: those who deny any place for government—a formal agency of society—or who teach lawbreaking. Anarchy—unplanned chaos—is approaching epidemic proportions and is no more desirable than socialism—planned chaos.

It should be recognized, of course, that every citizen breaks laws, if for no other reason than the staggering number of laws. Many of these laws are unknown to most people; no person knows them all. For instance, I just observed a newcomer to air flight taking a nip from his own bottle and probably unaware that there's a Federal law against this. Or, to skip from a little law to a big one, there is no one in or out of government who can reliably assure a business firm that it is not breaking the antitrust laws. But these infractions do not fall in the same category as out-and-out, conscious, deliberate breaking of the law as a principle of appropriate conduct. There is a marked distinction between a rational respect for law and order and an intentional flouting of all laws a citizen believes to be inconsistent with his own concept of good and moral.

Very well! How does one answer the student who asks, "Am I not warranted in breaking an immoral law?" The following satisfies me, though it may be no one else's answer.

I shall respect the law, be it moral or immoral, liked or disliked—that is, I shall not condone breaking the law as a principled action—until I am ready to turn revolutionary and advocate the overthrow of government. This is a quantum leap, and one must seriously ask: When is this switch warranted? In other words, what is my criterion for turning revolutionary or anarchistic?

If one turns to the Declaration of Independence he finds: . . . that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter it or abolish it, and to institute new Government . . .

While the framers of this political document had in mind the oppressive laws imposed on the colonists by King George III, the grievances listed are hardly distinguishable from the oppressive laws imposed on us by our own government. According to the Declaration, I should have turned revolutionary several decades ago. However, I reject that criterion.

Parenthetically, I am more and more amazed at the exceptional consequences of the American Declaration of Independence: our Federal Republic. The more I study the history of revolutions, the more evident is an opposite result: the replacement worse than the government overthrow! This is to say that turning revolutionary is not the way to societal improvement.

Here's another popular criterion: Numerous constitutional lawyers have argued that we are warranted in coming out for the overthrow of government whenever it becomes capricious. Were we to act on this, we would now be longtime revolutionaries. But this is not acceptable to me, either. What, then, is my guide?

I shall respect the law—obey it as best I can—so long as the channels of communication remain open, which is to say, so long as I am free to speak my piece and write about it. I shall never go underground—break law as a matter of principle—until remaining above ground becomes impossible. *That's my criterion!*

I believe this criterion to be sound in principle, and practical as well. Indeed, whatever is sound in principle is always practical; it works, as we say.

In the first place, we can eventually win the case for the essentially free society if we are not effectively silenced. How not to be silenced is of prime importance.

Look at our problem this way: When we live with the laws we're stuck with, our presentations of the freedom philosophy cannot be discounted or rejected on grounds that we are outlaws; indeed, our respect for law and order may well engender a corresponding respect for our commitments to freedom.

Those of an anarchistic persuasion, on the other hand, the ones who flout law and order as a matter of principle, cannot logically or convincingly present the case for freedom in society. And for the simple reason that they stand openly in defiance of civilization, at least, as I define it.

There is no one—even among the revolutionaries—whose distaste for the plethora of oppressive laws presently on the statute books is greater than mine. The remedy, however, is to repeal these laws, not break them.

It takes no intelligence whatsoever to break the law; anyone can do that. But the repeal of oppressive laws calls for all the wit, skill, and genius man can muster, the kind so brilliantly exemplified by Father Paul (Sarpi) and Adam Smith. Wrote Andrew Dickson White of Sarpi, a sixteenth century Venetian priest, whose analysis, reasoning, and expositions crumpled the mighty power combination of Church and State, more entrenched perhaps than our own Labor-State combine:

... he fought the most bitter fight for humanity ever known in any Latin nation, and won a victory by which the whole world has profited ever since.¹

And wrote Henry Thomas Buckle of Adam Smith who, more than anyone else, toppled mercantilism and the closed road to wealth and erected the intellectual foundations for the free society and the open road to wealth:

In the year 1776, Adam Smith published his *Wealth of Nations*; which, looking at its ultimate results, is probably the most important book that has ever been written, and is certainly the most valuable contribution ever made by a single man towards es-

¹ Perhaps Edmund Burke had the explanation, "a revolution not made but prevented."

² See *Seven Great Statesmen* by Andrew Dickson White. (New York: The Century Co., p. 3).

establishing the principles on which government should be based . . ."²

Lawbreaking merely adds to the existing confusion. Repeal of oppressive laws, on the other hand, calls for a new and enlightened consensus. If an idea or action does not lead to enlightenment, it is worthless, if not downright destructive.

This is my answer—and challenge—to inquiring students. And I sign it, not "Your obedient servant" or "Long live the King," but "Respectfully yours."

OUR FLAG

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as the Fourth of July approaches I consider it important to reflect for a moment on the greatest symbol of the United States—our flag. Too often this great flag has become a political symbol of one cause or another. This is wrong for it is the flag of all our people and it represents the ideals to which this country has been committed for almost 200 years.

Recently the Mid Island Plainview Herald, which is a weekly newspaper published in my congressional district contained an editorial from Old Glory. Then a friend and constituent of mine, Jack Peplow, wrote in reply a moving tribute to our flag. I think Mr. Peplow has done an excellent job of capturing the spirit with which I know most Americans regard the Stars and Stripes.

I consider this time of the year, between Memorial Day and Independence Day, an appropriate time to include in the RECORD the editorial and Mr. Peplow's poignant letter. All Americans should reflect on the significance of Mr. Peplow's letter. The material follows:

[From the Mid Island Plainview Herald, May 28, 1970]

REMEMBER ME

Hello, remember me? Some people call me Old Glory, some call me the Stars and Stripes and the Star Spangled Banner. But, whatever they call me, I am your flag, the flag of the United States of America. . . . Something has been bothering me, so I thought that I might talk it over with you because it is about you and me.

I remember some time ago, people lined up on both sides of the street to watch the parades and naturally I was leading every parade, proudly waving in the breeze. Then your daddy saw me coming, he immediately removed his hat and placed it against his left shoulder so that his hand was directly over his heart? . . . remember?

And you, I remember you. Standing there as straight as a soldier. You didn't have a hat but you were giving the right salute. Remember little sister? Not to be outdone, she was saluting the same as you with her right hand over her heart . . . remember?

What happened? I'm still the same old flag. Oh, I have a few more stars since you were a boy. A lot of more blood has been shed since those parades of long ago.

But now I don't feel as proud as I used to.

² See *Introduction to the History of Civilization in England*, written in 1857-61. (London: George Routledge & Sons, Limited) p. 122.

When I come down your street, you just stand there with your hands in your pockets and I may get a small glance and then you look away. I see children running around shouting . . . they don't seem to know who I am. I saw one man take off his hat and then look around. He didn't see anybody else with theirs off so he quickly put his back on.

Is it a sin to be a patriotic anymore? Have you forgotten what I stand for and where I've been? Anzio, Guadalcanal, Korea and Viet Nam. Take a look at the Memorial Honor Rolls sometime, of those who never came back to keep this republic free . . . one nation under God. . . . When you salute me, you are saluting them.

Well, it won't be long until I'll be coming down your street again. So when you see me, stand straight, place your right hand over your heart . . . and I'll salute you, by waving back . . . and I'll know that you remembered.

MAY 30, 1970.

Hi: It won't be hard for you to see that writing letters, especially a love letter is new to me, but today I read your letter and I felt someone had to tell you how the majority of us feel. You don't actually know me, but you've seen me many times; you had so many admirers that all I ever did was to stand by the sidelines and Thank God for your being near.

My Flag, you make me tingle with pride as you come down the street, or wave high above the scoreboard at Shea Stadium, or stand in quiet dignity behind the pulpit of my church. You make my shoulders straighter, my heart beat faster and my eyes sparkle. Cynics might say the above symptoms could be diagnosed as a disease and who would disagree? I only wish it were more contagious. I believe the medical term is called Patriotism or in the words of us little people, Love Of Country.

A poem was once written about you that was put into music and it is now our National Anthem. I believe Francis Scott Key caught the feelings of most of us in the second stanza when he wrote:

"Now it catches the gleam
Of the morning's first beam
In full glory reflected
Now shines on the stream
"Tis the Star Spangled Banner
Oh, long may it wave
O'er the land of the free
And the home of the brave"

Remember Old Glory, don't lose faith in us. Though most of us just don't know how to say I love you, it doesn't mean we don't. Forever yours,

JACK PELOW.

THE RIGHT TO BE PATRIOTIC

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared recently in the *Scottish Rite Torch*, which I feel is especially timely and well worth our attention: "The Right To Be Patriotic!" How wonderful it would be if only those who are so eager to protest would pause long enough to consider these words and concentrate on uniting toward a common goal of world peace through understanding instead of dissent and confusion. I share this article with you, as one of my friends shared it with me:

THE RIGHT TO BE PATRIOTIC

The cry is heard throughout the land—the right to dissent—the right to protest.

There is always the right, of course, to protest, but there is also the responsibility of the citizen of America, one who enjoys the privileges and blessings of America, to support his country in time of war.

There is also the right to draw a distinction between honest dissent and disloyalty to one's country.

There is a great deal of confusion. War is not a Foreign Policy. War is a fact, a condition that exists.

Let us not forget the right which is also our highest duty, the right to love our country, to appreciate the sacrifices that have been made in the past, and the debt that we owe to those who are now fighting and dying for us and for our freedom in Viet Nam.

If we dissent, let it be against any philosophy which gives aid and comfort to America's enemies when our country is at war.

The Mason will insist upon the right that is his, to stand up for America and to be a patriotic citizen.

SUPPORT OUR STUDENTS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished scholar and regents' and distinguished service professor of physiology at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Maurice Visscher, recently delivered a thoughtful and provocative defense of our student generation.

I recommend Dr. Visscher's excellent address to my colleagues:

TRoubled ACADEMIA IN A TROUBLED WORLD

We are here today to pay honor to persons who have demonstrated a devotion to the work of the mind. We are meeting, however, in a time of crisis in this country, when there is greater public distrust of academic institutions, of freedom of speech and assembly than at any time that memory can recall. Academic freedom is at stake. In fact the future of a democratic society is at stake. We must ask ourselves, why is academia, and why is the world, in trouble?

It would be a great mistake to believe that the student dissenters are, as the President of the United States said recently in remarks at the Pentagon, "mindless burns," or as the Vice-President has said "exhibitionists who provoke more derision than fear." Furthermore it is not true that as Mr. Agnew has also said "faculties and students sit in catatonic trance while raucous militants destroy academic freedom." It is true that there is a very positive body of opinion on academic campuses that present United States foreign policies and military actions are wrong in principle and disastrous in their effect. The great majority of student protest is entirely non-violent and completely within the protections of the Bill of Rights. There have been instances in which improprieties have occurred. I decry the burning of buildings or books or records, or physical injury to persons.

However, vandalism is not the tool of the great majority among those who are in protest and it should not be ignored that much of the violence that has occurred has been provoked by police violence and that the reaction to violence has often been more violent than the initial act itself. The Kent State University killing at random of four students far removed from the center of a

rock-throwing disturbance is an extreme case in point. At Kent State we have seen a foretaste of Orwell's 1984. Storm troopers will be just as unhealthy in the United States as they were in Germany in 1933, or as their counterparts are in Spain, Greece, Russia, China or in South Vietnam today. The McCarran-Walter Act "preventive detention" law authorizing imprisonment without any of the protections of the Bill of Rights is still on the books. Today dissenters still have some civil rights. Tomorrow they may have none.

There is today not only a high level official distrust of students and teachers, but there is an unfortunate battle with youth as a group. I wish to point out a few facts in connection with this alienation between the younger and many of the older parts of our population, but before doing so I shall quote a statement by Mr. Fred Dutton, a member of the California Board of Regents who is obviously not in agreement with Ronald Reagan. Mr. Dutton said "A society that hates its young people has no future". This statement embodies within it, and suggests by implication, the kind of wisdom this country needs and must have if democracy is to survive. Anyone who is willing that a fascist state should be set up in this country will, of course, disagree with this analysis. However, most of us want neither anarchy nor dictatorship, either of the political right or of the political left. I hope and trust that you may all agree. You would probably not be attending this ceremony to celebrate intellectuality, unless you are in agreement.

The first obligation of the older generation, if it really believes in rationality and does not "hate its young people" because of their demand to be heard, is to listen. The next obligation of the older generation is to stop and think. I submit that a majority of the older generation has not been willing to listen and has not begun to think about the merits of the complaints of young people.

Among the major student complaints, the war and our global military policy obviously come first. Many students have learned more relevant facts about the war than their elders have. The majority of scholarly experts on Asian history, sociology and politics have never agreed with the politicians who determined policy in the U.S., that if left alone Vietnam would become a satellite of China. If the Asian scholars are correct the whole rationale for entering the Vietnam war collapses into fantasy. Students have concluded that President Eisenhower made a colossal blunder when he refused to allow elections in South Vietnam in 1956 and that what has happened in Southeast Asia since is a misfortune compounded into something approaching genocide. Many besides students also look at the facts about the use of napalm, anti-personnel bombs, defoliation of crops, search and destroy missions, strategic bombing of both North and South Vietnam and now Cambodia, and question the morality of such actions. They ask how a supposedly civilized people like ourselves can justify such brutality in the name of saving democracy for a little country that has never had democracy and has no prospect of gaining it under its present government. A government which keeps tens of thousands of political dissenters in prison to maintain itself in power is not a democracy.

Students have learned that the United States is not now and never has been interested primarily in the fate of the South Vietnamese people. Rather it is interested in maintaining an American beachhead to the Southeast of China. The informed student is not deluded by the public protestations that we are in Vietnam to preserve the rights of the South Vietnamese to choose their form of government. Further, they realize that the Nixon Vietnamization plan is not and was not intended to permit total U.S. disengagement from Southeast Asia but

rather that it is a scheme to placate domestic opposition while continuing the war.

Students are not only crying for honesty. They are demanding humanity. Students are asking the fundamental question as to whether the people of the United States have such callousness to human welfare as to cause them to inflict misery and death upon millions of human beings whose only crime was to have been born in a country which by accident has become strategically valuable to our military machine to serve as a base for future operations against China. In fact the question extends beyond American military policy towards Indochina or China. It is a question of whether the entire American policy of establishing world hegemony, a Pax Americana, is compatible with decent human ethics. The student strike against the war is primarily a strike for the recognition of human values, a strike against what they, and a growing number of us over thirty consider to be unpardonable unethical behavior.

In the academic community students are not alone in this moral judgment. For example, just one week ago today the Executive Faculty of the Medical School of this University met in a Special Session called to consider the problems facing the institution in relation to the protest against the Indochina war. It passed overwhelming, with only ten dissenting votes, this resolution: "The Executive Faculty of the Medical School hereby declares that it is the majority view of that body that the continuation and escalation of the Vietnam war is both immoral and contrary to the best interests of the people of the United States."

Although the war and the extravagant pretense of our government to a right to dominate the world are the immediate reasons for the massive student protest movement, other reasons exist which motivate protests today. Racial discrimination and inequities loom large in the spectrum of complaints. The social inequities resulting from poverty in an otherwise affluent society are also prime complaints. Students question the validity of many traditional educational policies and practices. They feel that they are being deprived of meaningful education in relation to the realities of social, economic and political life today. Finally, a large body of youth today has revolted against hypocrisy in the manners and morals of the older generation.

They see racial bigots in the North as well as in the South attempting to frustrate integration in the educational system. They see heartless men and women begrudging more than a pittance of aid to poverty-stricken children. Students who know something about the range of human abilities hear stern admonitions that the poor are poor simply because they are lazy. They hear advice that the way to cure the maldistribution of wealth is to semi-starve people into working harder. Students soon learn that there is in adult society not only a lack of sympathy for the unfortunate but also a lack of knowledge about the facts.

Students have learned from no less an authority than the Director of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration that ethyl alcohol is actually a more dangerous drug than marihuana yet they see a hundred million people in this country using it, and whole industries making and selling it for profit with impunity. At the same time they find adult society putting the young who use marihuana in prison. Who can blame them if they call us hypocrites?

Students have learned from Kinsey that a large fraction of adult society has not limited itself to monogamous marriage as to sexual pleasures. They see that whole industries pander to sexual stimulation, motion pictures and television being the prime examples. Who can blame them for seeing incongruities between what adults preach and what they practice?

Students hear falsehoods at every turn in advertising sales pitches. They see useless or even dangerous drugs advertised as cures for undiagnosed diseases. They listen to a milk-selling organization hawking its wares saying that the United States is the healthiest country in the world. Students know that the statement is a bald lie. There are many other countries with better health records. And students know that there is a fair body of evidence to show that milk fat is actually unhealthy for some people. If the hucksters had said that dried skim milk is the cheapest reasonably tasty source of several essential nutrients they would have been telling the truth.

The student is allergic to misrepresentation and rightfully questions the ethics of a society which is full of it. He also develops a healthy skepticism of anything he is told for which he cannot find satisfactory substantiating evidence.

The enquiring mind is a skeptical mind and the anti-war movement is a result of the acceptance by adult society of a lower standard of ethics as to candor and honesty than young people can admire.

America is in trouble, not because its youth are violent or obstreperous but because its adults are not candid. They don't "tell it like it is." A Mayor Daley who refuses permits for peaceful demonstrations and then allows police brutality, a Mayor Stenvig who does the same on a mini-scale, and thousands of others may proclaim their devotion to law and order but in practice they violate the most important provisions of the Bill of Rights. The great hazard to our society today is not from those who are alienated. It is from those responsible for the alienation.

The United States today is dominated by a paranoid fear and a messianic fantasy. Its whole national policy is derived from a set of premises that have no adequate basis in reality. Since World War II we have lived under the influence of two myths. The first is that this country is in mortal danger of a communist take-over and the second is that the United States has the right, the duty and the capability to rule the world. Both sets of premises have been bolstered by contrived logic which is being exposed today as the hoax which it was from the beginning. These are not simply the views of an academician. Mr. Louis B. Landborg, Chairman of the Board of the Bank of America, the largest banking institution in the country, said on April 15 before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "Our enlightened self interest . . . does not dictate . . . that we set ourselves up as the self-appointed and solo policeman of the world". We are in a state of national crisis, not because youth is stupid or prone to violence, but because the house of cards that was supposed to provide the justification for American foreign policy over the last quarter century has fallen apart. The anger that frustrates Nixon, Agnew, Mitchell and others in power today comes first and foremost from their determination not to admit that they were wrong. This is not meant to exempt from criticism Lyndon Johnson, Hubert Humphrey and their supporters and predecessors. Many of these people still hold to their delusional frames. The young, most of whom never attached themselves to the paranoid fears or the messianic fantasies of the older generation, want to be liberated from the psychopathology of their elders.

There is really not so much a generation gap today as there is a fantasy gap. The young are not so much burdened by the hallucinations and delusions of the late forties and early fifties as are their elders. We of the older generation who are ultimately responsible for the so-called establishment that holds the power, should ponder upon our own errors. The choice between destroying ourselves and mending our ways should be for the majority of Americans to make. The ma-

ajority has apparently recognized that the Vietnam war was a mistake. It is by no means certain that a majority realizes what needs to be done in the future. Whether we preserve democracy or become a fascistic State depends today, not on whether our youth will stop their protests, but rather upon whether the rest of us will listen and think and act now in rationally moral ways. "A Society that hates its young people has no future". We must not be that Society.

AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORTS AMERICAN POLICY AND AMERICAN SERVICEMEN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the great contributions that the Nation's veteran organizations, such as the American Legion, make to our national life is providing constant reminders that patriotism is every citizen's obligation. The organization provides leadership in establishing patriotic observances. A more recent effort is in connection with Flag Day—June 14. In connection with this program, the national commander of the American Legion, J. Milton Patrick, made a statement which is included below:

AMERICAN LEGION ANNOUNCES NATION-WIDE MOVEMENT TO MUSTER SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN POLICY AND AMERICAN SERVICEMEN

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.—A move to capture the spirit of an "aroused America," by petition and by a "visible display of concerned citizenship," was revealed today by National Commander J. Milton Patrick, of Skiatook, Okla.

The Legion chief said he was contacting Legion leaders in every state, calling for a grass roots movement, programs to be initiated by some 16,000 local Legion posts, to show the true spirit of America and the depth of support for a national policy seeking peace with honor in Vietnam.

Patrick said he was encouraging local Post leadership to use "your own thinking and imagination," to plan programs that would be most effective in the local community but, by bulletin to state Legion Commanders, Adjutants and National Executive Committeemen, was outlining a number of possible approaches to the problem that could be adopted to local usage.

"We suggest the circulation of petitions, calling for the exercise of responsible citizenship.

"We further propose a local 'parade of flags,' or 'public patriotic rally,' for Flag Day (June 14), Independence Day, or any other date in the immediate future most suitable to the local community. This we propose in the belief a visible display of patriotism is essential in the present crisis.

"We also suggest the veterans of the Vietnam era be given a place of honor in any local observance as a means of giving these young men the heroes welcome they deserve, but probably didn't receive when they returned from active service," he continued.

Patrick said he also was suggesting that every effort be made to encourage the participation of student groups of all ages, grade school, high school and college, as well as that of other civic, fraternal, service and patriotic groups. "The dissenter, the rabble rouser and the radical represent but a tiny fraction of the rising generation and we want the truly concerned young people who love their country, and that is by far the most

of them, to know we recognize their stake in the future of America, and to communicate with them in planning its future and recognizing its past."

The Legion chief said he felt the present program would prove to be one of the most effective means yet devised to implement the theme of his term of office as National Commander, which is: "Unity and Service for America—U.S.A."

Noting the volume of letters, telephone calls and telegrams from all parts of the country, from Legionnaires and non-Legionnaires alike, coming into all offices of the Legion, Patrick said: "The public is looking to The American Legion to take the lead, and we propose to provide that leadership now, when it is needed and wanted."

He discounted the notion of taking a political point of view, saying: "The Legion, by virtue of its Congressional charter, is non-political. The course we champion now is the same as that which we followed during the Johnson and Kennedy administrations. The course we pursue is, to our way of thinking, neither Republican nor Democrat, but American."

ROCHE LABORATORIES, A PUBLIC- MINDED PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it behooves me to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some facts about Roche Laboratories, a division of Hoffmann-La Roche, Inc., of Nutley, N.J.

Although Roche has a history of philanthropic endeavors for which it remained anonymous, I recently dealt with the company on a matter that should receive public approbation.

A constituent with a sick child requiring doses of Larodopa could not locate a doctor to administer the medication when it was an experimental drug. A Washington-based neurologist agreed to accept the child into an experimental group, although supplies of the drug were scarce. Knowing that Roche had sponsored a collaborative study of Larodopa, I contacted a representative of the company. Shortly thereafter, I was informed that the neurologist would be supplied with the required drugs after displaying the necessary FDA approval.

On June 5 the FDA announced approval of Larodopa as a new drug. It is the culmination of a major effort by the company. Over 100 leading research centers, which investigated the clinical use of the drug in thousands of patients, participated in the study of Larodopa in order to develop the necessary data.

Roche had decided on a major commitment to make the drug available in large quantities, while developing a quality control procedure that would assure the purity and uniformity of Larodopa. The initial distribution of Larodopa has been channeled through a group of approximately 400 hospitals. This plan was adopted in order to make certain that patients currently on Larodopa will continue to receive adequate doses and new patients can be assured of continuous therapy once they are started.

Roche Laboratories is truly a public service oriented private enterprise.

THE NEW GRADUATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Capital is also the home of many institutions of higher learning. Over the past weekend graduation day evolved in a new manner from what most of us experienced and cherish in our memories.

Unfortunately, a small minority of college graduates persist in public displays of animalistic nature to demonstrate they are unprepared to accept the challenge as individuals in a highly competitive and free enterprise society. They have never learned discipline or etiquette.

Understanding that the majority of the qualified and morally responsible youth do not receive sensational newspaper coverage, I insert several pertinent local news stories covering the antics of the new graduation:

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1970]

CATCALLS MAR GRADUATION AT COLLEGE PARK
(By Stephen Neary)

The University of Maryland celebrated its 164th commencement yesterday, granting almost 4,000 degrees in a ceremony marked by one arrest and occasional heckling—much of it from parents. Thus ended the stormiest year of student dissent in the university's history.

The 400 or so uniformed Maryland national guardsmen called to the College Park campus May 4 were on alert yesterday in nearby armories, but none of them attended the three-hour ceremony.

Instead, about 50 plainclothes Maryland and Prince George's County policemen wearing American flag lapel pins for identification purposes patrolled the Cole Fieldhouse. About eight of them formed a protective cordon around the speaker's platform.

The heckling and booing began about midway through the program, when clusters in the 7,000-person audience, composed mostly of the graduates' families and friends, disagreed with a speech being given by Student Government Association President Stuart J. Robinson.

The noise from the audience continued and turned into chants of "Throw them out" when a handful of robed graduates stood and began to dispense "people's diplomas" that had been handed to them from friends in the audience.

Many of the 3,000 graduates present would not accept the mock diplomas, granted in the field of "radical awareness" by the Democratic Radical Union of Maryland "in honor of your completion of the requisite courses of fascist indoctrination and pervasive dehumanization . . ."

The one arrest was largely unnoticed in the confusion. University officials reported that Richard J. Muirhead, 22, of Ellicott City, had been charged with disorderly conduct.

Muirhead, a graduating senior, was arrested after a tussle with a state policeman, the officials said, and had been one of those in the audience handing the mock diplomas to the graduates on the floor.

University President Wilson H. Elkins won loud applause when he interrupted the demonstration with a plea to "continue the program" and was followed by a performance by the University Glee Club.

The choral group's second song, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," brought parents and friends, accompanied by some of the graduates, to their feet. Apparently they were applauding the song's patriotic merits.

At the same time, other groups of graduates wearing peace placards on top of their gowns, rose to their feet, some with raised fist, to applaud the song's "radical" message.

Meanwhile, the demonstrating students continued to pass out the "radical" diplomas to those who accept them. Some graduates took the rolled papers only to throw them on the floor.

[From the Washington Star, June 7, 1970]

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EXERCISES SPARSELY ATTENDED

(By Lance Gay)

The red standards of modern student rebellion yielded to the black robes of medieval ceremony yesterday as nearly 4,000 were graduated from the University of Maryland.

Only about half of the graduating class attended the two-hour exercises and less than 10 percent of the faculty came to officiate. Some students wore red armbands and carried "peace" and "strike" placards around their necks.

The morning ceremonies were held in Cole Field House. The sprawling College Park campus was decked out with red, white, and blue bunting and American flags for the occasion. The same campus was the scene of student-police confrontations in May.

University President Wilson H. Elkins, in one of his rare appearances before the student body, congratulated the graduates for "attaining their cherished goal." His brief remarks commended the university's board of regents for their support as the role of the university and the pressures have grown more complex. Seven of the 12 regents attended.

UNPRECEDENTED MOVE

In an unprecedented move, a student representative was permitted to address the graduating body.

Stu Robinson, president of the Student Government Association, his head shaved from recent training at the U.S. Marine Corps training center at Parris Island, told the graduates, "You have learned many things in many ways. In the classroom and from the professors you have learned facts. . . . In the streets and on the mall, from police and National Guard, you have learned to wash tear gas from your eyes and tend bruises you received from clubbings."

To cries of "right on" and applause from the students, Robinson warned them not to heed those who "urge you to seek national unity and lower your voices." You must not "listen to the siren song of false tranquility," he told the group.

"PEOPLE'S DIPLOMAS"

Boos and hisses arose from the audience of about 8,000, predominantly parents and observers.

After his speech, students passed out "People's Diplomas" to the group. Some in the audience yelled for the students to be "thrown out" while they distributed about three boxes of the papers.

The choir then sang "Battle Hymn of the Republic." Dissenting students cheered, regarding the civil war tune as having radical connotations, while others in the audience stood and applauded, apparently regarding the choice of the song as patriotically motivated.

The yellow, ornate scrolls designated People's Diplomas, congratulated graduates for "your completion of the requisite courses of fascist indoctrination and pervasive dehumanization, and in recognition of your sur-

vival despite political repression, gestapo pig tactics, hysterically paranoid administrators and plain being f---ed over . . ."

One graduating student not in a robe was arrested on a charge of disorderly conduct. Police said he had pushed a plainclothes state trooper.

Dr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, in his commencement address urged educators to "shield our universities against destructive forces" both within and without "while we work together for their improvement."

"Like all other social institutions," he told the assemblage, "the university is imperfect. To keep abreast of the times it must accommodate to change, and to rise above mediocrity it must promote change and anticipate as well as evaluate future options. The university, at its best, however, is an instrument of both stability and change," Logan concluded, urging that the institutions be maintained as bastions of rationality and civility.

Dr. Logan was among three who received honorary degrees.

With a kiss, a handshake and flowers, Dr. Elkins conferred actress Julie Andrews an honorary doctorate in fine arts. Civil War historian Dr. John Hope Franklin received an honorary doctorate of letters and Edwin H. Gott, chairman of the board of directors of U.S. Steel, was awarded an honorary doctorate of laws.

Later 3,249 undergraduate and 710 advanced degrees were given to the candidates. Those undergraduates who did not attend were to receive their degrees by mail.

Faculty members, reached at home, said they did not attend the ceremony because the event was usually boring and tedious. Another professor said that the move was not a planned boycott, but rather part of a "general feeling of the faculty" to express their protest of administration handling of student protests in the first three weeks in May, when classes were disrupted by student demonstrations.

[From the Washington Star, June 7, 1970]

AREA GRADUATES HEAR HEW AIDE

James L. Farmer, assistant secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, told the graduating class of Prince Georges Community College yesterday that the nation has not provided sufficient opportunity for the disadvantaged people.

"Where we have failed is in opening the doors to upward mobility" for poor Negroes, whites, Puerto Ricans and Indians, he said.

Farmer, head of the Congress for Racial Equality (CORE) from 1961-66, compared today's campus dissent to labor activism in the 1930's and civil rights campaigns in the 1960's. He said conflict would be beneficial if it is non-violent.

President Watson F. Pindell conferred degrees on 299 students in ceremonies in the Largo campus. It was the 11th commencement for the college, which was founded in 1958.

[From the Washington Star, June 7, 1970]

VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY RITES REFLECT TRADITION, UNREST

(By Brian Kelly)

CHARLOTTESVILLE, Va.—Nearly 2,000 University of Virginia students were receiving degrees here this weekend in exercises that reflected both campus tradition and recent student protest activities.

University President Edgar F. Shannon Jr. delivers the final address today on the magnificent green Lawn that Thomas Jefferson designed more than 150 years ago.

Playing marches from the Jeffersonian era, a U.S. Marine Corps Band provides the music

for the ceremony, the highlight of which is the procession of graduates and faculty.

At the same time, leaders of the student strike movement have urged degree candidates to forsake the traditional cap and gown as a final mark of protest for this school year.

MAJORITY BACKS ROBES

An unknown number of students had failed to obtain black robes, but a majority voted in a recent referendum to wear the academic costume. A university spokesman announced yesterday that the formal dress will be optional this year for those "who prefer not to wear them."

The parting gesture is meant "in a way of protesting against business as usual," explained Steve Squire, a former student who has been active in anti-war demonstrations here and serves as a coordinator for the Virginia Mobilization Committee.

In one of the paradoxical touches that characterize the unrest at Jefferson's school, the long-haired youth spent his weekend handing out gowns to students lined up in Newcombe Hall here.

At rooms flanking the Lawn, formal calling cards still identify students who remained in class this spring and leaders of the strike movement at this rapidly expanding educational center once known as a finishing school for Virginia gentlemen.

Long hair and dungarees have replaced the coat and tie but, "It's still a place where a certain style and grace prevail," said one campus source.

Yet, protest rallies on the Lawn, the appearance of Viet Cong flags at times, two brief occupations of a campus building and a "honk-in for peace" on a nearby highway gave the 151-year-old university its most troubled spring since disturbances of its early years.

Before the final exercises this weekend, workmen painted over strike slogans on the walls of the Rotunda, the protests quieted and Shannon had weathered the initial burst of criticism for his response to the disorders early in May.

Meeting on the eve of graduation, the school's board of visitors gave Shannon a vote of confidence for his leadership, but acknowledged "differences of opinion" on the methods used and pledged a continuing study of ways to deal with future protests.

STUDENT SPEAKS

Yesterday, at Class Day exercises, a student speaker challenged alumni and students who insist on operating the university according to their own rights.

"Both the irate alumnus and restless student would castigate the university for its unwillingness to become a political instrument, their political instrument," declared Frederick L. Greene of Colonial Heights, Va., a fourth-year medical student chosen by senior class officers as the day's student speaker.

Praising Shannon's conduct, Greene said certain alumni and student activists failed to realize the university is not a "public corporation accountable to shareholders" nor a "town meeting of transient student citizens, but is a charitable trust in the public interest."

He said most students are not interested in the "participatory democracy" urged by campus activists and that the faculty deserves immunity from pressures that would dictate its goals.

"If we will teach the rest of the impatient world that persuasion is the only weapon in the conflict and that reason is the only arbiter, I think we shall survive," Greene said.

Retired Navy Adm. George W. Anderson, former chief of naval operations, addressed candidates for Reserve Officer Training Corps commissions.

Greene, meanwhile, received an award for outstanding contributions to the school of medicine. Presented Algernon Sidney Sullivan awards for "excellence of character and service to humanity" were Julia L. Weaver of McLean, recipient of a nursing degree, and retiring law professor T. Munford Boyd, a blind scholar credited with inspiring generations of new lawyers here.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., GAINS CLEAN AIR AWARD

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Jacksonville, Fla., the largest city in America areawise, is justly proud of its accomplishments in the antipollution field. With a large metropolitan area, water pollution, air pollution, and solid waste problems are apparent, but the consolidated city of Jacksonville is vigorously attempting to overcome these problems. Jacksonville has just won a national competition for cleaner air; and as the U.S. Representative from this north Florida city, I want to bring attention to the city's accomplishments—through official and private efforts—to the Nation. I insert in the RECORD the following article from the Jacksonville Journal:

[From the Jacksonville Journal, June 2, 1970]

JACKSONVILLE WINS CLEAN AIR AWARD

(By Paul McGinty)

Jacksonville is one of 11 national winners of the Cleaner Air Week Blue Ribbon for outstanding performance in air quality education.

Charles N. Howison, chairman of the National Cleaner Air Week Committee, said Jacksonville survived competition with some 161 other urban and regional Cleaner Air Week programs to win.

The 11 winners exhibited a combination of creative concepts of air conservation education based on analysis of community air quality and spurred by individual effort, said Howison.

Other winners are Albuquerque, N. M.; the state of Colorado; Pittsburgh, Pa.; The Delaware Valley; Elizabeth, N.J.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Nassau County, N.Y.; Meriden, Conn.; New York City and the State of Texas.

Howison described Jacksonville's program as an effort "to make the individual resident a participant in several Cleaner Air Week programs," during the final week of October, the time set aside for clean air observances.

The League of Women Voters worked with the Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association in distributing orientation literature reporting Jacksonville's air quality and highlighting problems.

Among the 1969 Air Week's innovations was an advertisement running in the classified sections of local newspapers heralding a "Cleaner Air Week Hot Line." A caller could contact his congressman to ask that Jacksonville be designated an air quality region.

Neighboring cities receiving certificates for Meritorious Cleaner Air Week achievements are Atlanta, Charleston and Columbia, S.C.

POPULATION INCREASES

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a most thoughtful letter concerning population increases from Wayne E. Moore, Department of Physics, Clemson University, Clemson, S.C. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of the views expressed in this letter, I include its text at this point in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS,
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY,
Clemson, S.C., April 30, 1970.

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

Sir: On July 18, 1969, the President sent to Congress a message concerning the problem of unchecked population increase in which it was proposed that a committee on population growth be established. On July 25, 1969, Senators Mundt and McClellan co-sponsored Bill S. 2701 which would create said committee. The bill was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and hearings before that committee were begun on September 15, 1969. On September 24th, Senator Mundt submitted Senate Report 91-431 which was to accompany S. 2701. On February 18, 1970, Representative Sisk called up House Resolution 819 which led to consideration and subsequent passage of the corresponding House Bill H.R. 15165. During the interim between the President's message to Congress and the passage of H.R. 15165, the net increase in our country's population, by conservative estimate, was the staggering figure of roughly one million, two hundred thousand individuals! In perspective, this increase in population is approximately equal to the entire population of the original Colonies in 1750 and is about half of the total population of the nation at the time of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Even more awesome is the net increase in world population, which amounted to nearly fifty-two million, five hundred thousand people during the same 215 day period. The latter increase is more than one fourth of the total population of these United States! I submit to you, Representative Dingell, that the problem of population control is the greatest dilemma that mankind has ever faced and is the most urgent issue which you as a legislator will confront.

There are many avenues by which to enlarge on this issue. I should like to touch briefly on those aspects which seem to be of greatest import. One effect that an increase in population has is to alter the distribution of people as a function of the land area. Thus far in America we have witnessed an almost continual exodus from rural areas to the cities. Thomas Jefferson was one of the first Statesmen in this country to openly express concern about this trend. Having toured in the cities of Europe, he voiced his concern about the urban problem in a letter in the year 1800 to Dr. Benjamin Rush:

"I view great cities as pestilential to the morals, the health and the liberties of man. True, they nourish some of the elegant arts, but the useful ones can thrive elsewhere, and less perfection in the others, with more health, virtue and freedom would be my choice."

Only three years later, in a letter to David Williams, Jefferson wrote:

"Even here we find too strong a current

from the country to the towns; and instances are beginning to appear of that species of misery, which you are so humanely endeavoring to relieve. Although we have in the old countries of Europe the lesson of their experience to warn us, yet I am not satisfied we shall have the firmness and wisdom to profit by it."

Today, we and all of the people of this great nation, have seen these words assume an almost prophetic character; the break down of the human personality when forced to co-exist, in close proximity and, often, in a wretched environment, with a vast sea of other personalities has become all too common and is manifested in waves of riots and crime in our city streets. Our burgeoning populace, coupled with the movement of people from less populated areas to the cities, has forced the affluent and the starving together and in so doing has opened humanity's eyes a little wider to problems which in the past have simply been ignored. As the weight of humanity increases, the crush of its problems become less and less ignorable.

Consider the problem of providing the energy for the needs of the world a mere thirty years hence, assuming that the present population increase goes unimpeded. What the next generation must face in that event is a world with the astonishing population of twice that of today. No generation in history will have been asked to shoulder a burden as heavy as the one which the next must carry. Although the energy provided to the Earth by Solar radiation could, in the best circumstances, provide food for more than ten times the present world population, practically speaking the ability to feed even twice today's population would presently require the utilization of almost every square inch of the Earth's uninhabited, arable land. With such a gigantic demand, the Earth's reserve of fossilized fuel could not possibly provide the energy requirements of civilization over a long period of time; only solar or nuclear power could fulfill the long term needs of seven billion people.

The problems of preserving a life sustaining environment are quite possibly unsolvable. For example, in 1969 alone, more than one million acres of oxygen producing trees and plants were stripped and paved over in the United States. Though as much as seventy percent of the Earth's oxygen is produced by ocean phytoplankton, the paving over of a large portion of the remaining thirty percent (land vegetation) would have far reaching implications for the constituency of our atmosphere (not to mention the pollution of the oceans themselves). (At the rate of a million acres per year, the United States can expect one half of every square inch of its land area to be covered by the time of its millenium). Already such planners as Constantinos Doxiadis of Greece have proposed that the future dwelling place of man will be one vast city covering practically all of the Earth's land area. Some have proposed that to solve many of the problems which an increase in population creates we must begin to build new cities in areas not already urbanized. If we began today the Sisyphean task of constructing a new city each month would house a number of individuals equal to the increase in population of this country for the preceding month, our first city would contain roughly 150,000 people and the last month of the year 2,000 would see the erection of a city for more than 250,000 inhabitants. During that interval we would have created 368 such cities—almost three times over the present number of American cities with populations of 100,000 or more! What is even more astounding however is the effect upon the ecological balance such a dispersion of people across the land would generate. In the northeastern portion of the United States there are already almost no enclaves left which can support a self

sustaining wildlife population. By cutting across the land with more roads and cities would deprive already diminishing species of the last vestige of that precious commodity—wildness. No country in the world can attest to the destruction of wildness that this country—a virtually untouched land only three hundred years old—has seen. Today for the first time in this nation's history, large numbers of citizens are beginning to ask themselves whether or not their country can afford to lose any more of its wildness. They are questioning whether or not their alteration of the ecosystem is an irreversible process and if so, what the value of holding on to wilderness is. Resettlement and dispersion of people into rural and wilderness areas is no solution to the population problem. At best it is a tactic to delay more responsible action; the result of such a program would almost certainly lead to further devastation of the nation's wildness.

Also to be reckoned with is the continual advance of the life-expectancy. With the development of more effective artificial organs coupled with the possible breakthrough in geriatrics which our newly gained knowledge of molecular biology promises, we may soon be faced with the problem of a society of bicentennarians. In this event, if no rise in population is to be achieved, our population growth would not only have to reach zero-growth but for a while it would be required to fall to a non-regenerative level until such time as the mortality rate again balanced the rates of migration and fertility.

Another serious predicament which a rising population has generated strikes at the very roots of our form of government. The founding fathers of this nation were the product of centuries of experimentation in government; some past forms being representative, others totalitarian. This country is, in the greatest sense of the word, a continuation of that experiment, the progress of which is gauged by each succeeding generation. The concept of the rights of the people had, by the end of the seventeenth century, been developing for hundreds of years. In relative terms, the minds of the early settlers were politically sophisticated. The seemingly inexhaustive, rich America was the ideal soil in which to plant the roots of this idea. The problems of interaction between individuals were minimized since a livelihood was available from the land for the willing, and the land was available in what seemed to be unlimited quantity for whoever desired it. This is not to say that life was easy then, but rather to say that the problems of those days were of a much different character than those of a densely populated, urban society such as our own. Settlements were small enough that issues of representation were intensely personal. Inasmuch as each individual represents a unique set of vested interests, the larger the number of individuals the greater the range of desires that must be satisfied by a governing body. This is not to suggest that unanimity reigned supreme in the early days of our country but that the relatively small populace then was well fit for the trial of representative government, particularly when united in a common cause such as resistance to the oppressive rule of the English. In contrast the already impoverished, densely populated eighteenth century Asiatic nations and even some of the European nations were moving towards a more highly centralized governing system; one designed to meet the multitudinous needs of a vast number of rather poor people. The United States has already reached the ranks of the densely populated. Of the 126 largest sovereign nations, the United States ranks 69th in population density; China stands 45th. But our vast number of people are certainly not yet materially poor. Insofar as the wealth of the world's people is directly proportional to the available natural resources and the distribution of

these resources, we can expect the per capita wealth to begin to decrease when the supply of non-reconvertible resources reaches a certain critical level. That day is perhaps many generations hence for this nation. Yet there are already signs that the American people have reached a plateau in the rising standard of living. With the advent of a population double that of today, it is questionable that we will be able to maintain the present level of wealth in this country and even less likely that our living standard can rise appreciably higher than that at present. Thus the outlook for America, if the population is not soon stabilized, is that of becoming a nation with vast numbers of people with, at most, a fixed level of wealth; that is, a nation whose social and economic conditions are quite parallel to many of those which are today ruled by totalitarian government. As more and more people inhabit the land, each with his own singular interests, an ever increasing number of legal restraints by the governing powers must be instituted. Very recently, Senator Mansfield commented that "... this nation is up to its neck in laws." I assert that as our numbers increase the natural progress of things is for government to gain ground at the expense of liberty. It is time that we asked ourselves, "Is democracy heading full circle?"

So we seek to discover what it is that can be done if we as a people decide to take preventive steps. There are already various so-called population control programs in existence throughout the world. I use the word "so-called" simply because, almost exclusively, these programs are programs for providing individuals with contraceptives. Admittedly a contraceptive of some sort is the rudiment of any successful program for population control. But simply providing the means of control is certainly no guarantee that control will result. In general the decrease in population growth resulting from these programs has been minuscule if at all measurable. Ostensibly at least, the cause for such failure is more or less clear; for one reason or another, the number of children the average family of today "wants" exceeds the number two. As long as this desire remains, no present day program for contraception can stem the flow of humanity. Examining the picture more closely we find that there are a myriad of reasons for "wanting" more than two children. For example, in this country, the most prominent religions—Protestant, Catholic and Jewish—have tacitly, if not openly, encouraged their numbers to "be fruitful and multiply, and fill the Earth and subdue it," as it is written in the first chapter of Genesis. In this generation we have seen this commission fulfilled in every respect. Man, three and one half billion strong, now has achieved the power to totally annihilate his Earth. Yet today the religious leaders of the world have failed to come to grips with this issue and in some instances have not so much as endorsed the use of contraceptives! In broader terms the religious community has created a substantial doubt in their followings as to the morality of birth control. The result is a tragic mismatch of ethics to morality, coupled with the equaling damning fear to act.

As a second instance, our entire legal and tax structure sanctifies the unchecked proliferation of the species. There has been some encouragement from legislators on the state level. For example, it is my understanding that the state of Colorado has recently considered limiting the legal number of tax dependents to three, thus lending legal and economic support to the cause of population control. This is a commendable step. Yet it must be realized that this type of measure alone may increase the burden of the impoverished segment of American society. We need something to accompany economic restraints.

To this end I wish to suggest a technological tact to this problem. As technology is intimately coupled with the philosophy of those who make use of it, the method which I here propose involves a shift in the thinking of many people. Specifically, I believe that every newborn child should properly be the result of a planned creative act. Unfortunately the number of individuals now living whose conception satisfies this criterion is far smaller than one would hope for. To affect such a program, I propose that studies be initiated immediately with the intent 1) to produce a safe, effective pharmaceutical and/or biologic, minute quantities of which will render either the human male, or female, or both, infertile; 2) to produce a neutralizer, or antidote, the use of which will completely annul the infertility induced by its counterpart. Such a program could be instituted by providing funds, earmarked for this purpose, to the appropriate research groups across the country. On the basis of previous work in this area, it is reasonable to suppose that such medicinals can be produced by the end of this decade if adequate support is provided for their discovery. Concurrent with this program should be a comprehensive study to investigate the most efficient and effective methods of insuring that all potent individuals are treated with the infertility pharmaceutical and are provided with its neutralizer and simple instruction for its use. Several possible ways come to mind, among which are 1) lifetime treatment (e.g. through the Public Health Departments) similar to smallpox vaccinations, for all potent, or potentially potent, individuals now living and for all newborn; 2) treatment of all public water facilities coupled with individual treatment (through the H.E.W.) of the 50 million United States citizens who supply their own water; 3) public distribution of these pharmaceuticals in capsule form. Naturally the neutralizer must become a very common and easily obtainable item. And care must be taken to insure that no one is denied the neutralizer as a result of their race, creed, color or economic condition. There will be cries from some that our liberty is being trod upon. Yet what of the law that requires a man to take but one wife. Surely there is no less liberty involved in this law, and the logic underlying monogamy is specious in comparison with the logic which points toward legislation for population control.

There will be other problems to cope with if the United States embarks on a program of this sort. For one thing, as the population of the world increases relative to that of the United States, the pressures from those who seek to immigrate to this country will be intense and must be withstood. Of far more consequence however will be the demand for foodstuff and other materials of subsistence from those nations who inexorably will be reduced to famine in the absence of an enforceable program of population control. It is certainly conceivable that by the time this nation grasps the problem, our capacity to provide for the needs of the people will be limited to our own citizens only. We would then be forced to sit and watch another nation literally starve to death. Clearly our concern in this matter must be global; we must realize that all nations sail, or sink, in the same vessel.

What is most ironic about making this change in our thinking and habits is that very soon, if we do not make this change, so many more changes will be forced upon us. Our non-policy of today is not equivalent to non-action. Rather we are clinging to a definite stand; a stand which, by our own timidity and timorousness, can only lead to our subsequent annihilation. By any objective point of view, the path we are pursuing today is tantamount to suicide. Yet foolishly we persist. Uncommon problems may well demand uncommon solutions. Those

(sometimes called conservatives) who are willing to slowly change when change is called for, but who strive to hold on to what they believe to be worthwhile things from the past, must recognize that stabilization of the population is an essential step to prevent wholesale alteration of the structure of this country. Those (sometimes called liberals), on the other hand, who are anxious to change when there is merit for change, feeling that man must continually improve upon his past, must pause to consider that some aspects of life, such as wildness and the ecological balance, cannot now be improved upon (indeed matched) by the hand of man. The continued encroachment of civilization upon these most precious of all natural resources is a direct and inescapable consequence of an enlargement in human population.

As a final note, it is interesting to observe for comparison the behavior of various insect colonies in a closed state. It turns out that some of these creatures have developed over the eons a built-in mechanism which either destroys or inhibits their proliferation when the population density reaches a certain critical value. As an example, the common fruit fly, a species of the genus *Drosophila* and from whom we have gained invaluable information as to human genetic structure, has a population growth cycle (in a closed state) which resembles the shape of an S that has been turned on its side. Qualitatively, that is, the population first begins to increase, then passes through a point of inflection, then the rate of increase slackens, finally reaches zero growth (stabilization level) but passes on to begin a negative population growth until the original population level is reached. At this point an overall decrease in population begins but the rate of decrease soon goes through an inflection point, then reaches zero growth but passes on to begin a positive population growth until at some later time the original number is restored. This process continues in a repetitious fashion. We cannot suppose that this process results from a rational, voluntary control exercised by the members of the colony. What we undoubtedly are seeing is the workings of a biological regulatory mechanism which has evolved over millions of years and untold numbers of colonies destroyed by virtue of their own number. No doubt Man, in the absence of self control, would pass through a rather similar process of mass famine or nuclear war and subsequent regeneration by the survivors. In fact, there is much evidence that we are already moving upward on what may be an S-like curve of our own. But Man contains the seeds not only for his own destruction but also that of the entire biosphere of the Earth. With the growth of his numbers unchecked, it is not unreasonable to picture the human species as a cancerous-like growth, spreading over the planet and choking its life-sustaining capacities until nothing remains save for a barren sphere. With courage, reason and selflessness we can take the necessary steps now to insure that such is not the future of mankind. We no longer have the luxury to do otherwise.

As a representative of the people, surely one of your greatest challenges is to discern the mandate of the people. It perhaps is fair to say that Americans today are generally undecided as to the proper course of action to take regarding this impending crisis. It is interesting to note however that a Gallup poll taken in January of 1969 under the sponsorship of the National Wildlife Federation showed that already 44 percent of those polled felt that in order to maintain today's standard of living it would be necessary to limit our population. In good faith I could not ask you or your colleagues to legislate in this matter without the sanction of the people. Perhaps the most fundamental principle of representative gov-

ernment is that every individual possesses a unique set of interests and beliefs and that, taken collectively, the people form the broadest spectrum of both needs and doctrine—a vast reservoir of truth from which the ultimate dictates of society must flow. If at times the people seem to be unenlightened and therefore unable to provide the discretion necessary for sound rule, the remedy cannot be to proceed without their consent and thus dilute their power, but rather to illuminate their judgment by education. I support, in addition to the technological methods suggested herein, a broad program of informing the people of this nation of the purblind course that is now being followed and to present the foreseeable alternatives to this course. I am confident that an informed American public will see the need for, and have the selflessness to carry out, the necessary legislative action. That is not to say that the road will be easy. Perhaps the greatest barrier to progress will be the polarization of opinion that is advanced by some groups and organizations throughout our land. Many social, economic and religious groups have become so polarized in opinions that only when their ethics catch up to their vested interests and moralities can we expect there to be a real choice in this matter for the members of these groups. It is for such reasons that I think it will be important to emphasize that this exigency has arisen not as the result of human wrongdoings but rather from a basic biological drive. Thus no man can afford to shake his finger at another; we cannot afford to see the World Council on Population be pitted against the Pope. Instead we must recognize the problem of unchecked population growth as the most subtle natural mechanism for self-destruction known to man and one only matched in awesomeness by the evolution of the Sun which, in some six and one half billion years, will begin its ascendance to the ranks of the red giant stars, rendering the Earth a molten sphere again. We, like the ancient Byzantine Eagle which faced both East and West, must look to all facets for the life-preserving balance which we seek.

Some say we are destined to become a society of steel and concrete. Perhaps. Yet I choose to believe that man has a decisive role in determining his future. If this be so, then never has a choice been of such great import as this one. I can express it no more clearly than did Samuel Barber when he wrote, "the future is purchased by the present."

Respectfully yours,

WAYNE E. MOORE.

ACCOLADES FOR NEMO AND
DR. STACHIW

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, last month Dr. Jerry D. Stachiw, acrylic expert at the Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory in Port Hueneme, Calif., was honored by being accorded the 1970 Military Oceanographic Award. This recognition coincided with the epic descent to 500 feet in clear water of the Naval Experimental Manned Observatory—NEMO.

Dr. Stachiw's work on material technology and applications was instrumental in the NEMO's successful dive. The sphere was brought to that depth at the

capable hands of Edward Briggs, project manager for Southwest Research Institute, and Martin Snoey, senior project engineer for the Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory at Port Hueneme.

Dr. Stachiw, along with NEMO and her associates, deserves high praise and recognition for their excellent work and contributions in this field. We here in Congress salute you.

POSTAL REFORM ACT OF 1970

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the Rules Committee this morning and this afternoon, there were short discussions regarding the compulsory union aspects of H.R. 17070, the Postal Reform Act of 1970. I believe that all Members of this body are aware of the fact that this bill would authorize the negotiation of union shop agreements.

In today's Washington Evening Star, columnist David Lawrence presents a very succinct and informed discussion of this issue. For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting it into the RECORD:

THE UNION SHOP AND POSTAL REFORM (By David Lawrence)

One of the strangest phases of modern democracy is the belief that "liberals" always defend freedom of speech and freedom of individual thought. Presumably the last proposal in the world to receive their approval would be any form of coercion—such as, for instance, compelling a citizen to belong to a particular political party or a national organization claiming to represent any group of citizens.

Yet the "liberals" are strangely silent over the section of the postal reform bill now pending in Congress that would permit labor unions to negotiate for a "union shop," which means that employees may retain their jobs only if they join a union.

The idea that a government employee could lose employment because he or she refuses to become a member of or pay dues to a private organization would seem to be the kind of thing one would expect under a fascist system—certainly not under a democracy.

The postmaster general, who agreed to the new plan, evidently did so, because of a desire to settle the recent postal strike and to obtain support for the reorganization of the Post Office Department. The AFL-CIO, while helping to end the dispute, apparently saw an opportunity to get a "union shop" for postal workers as a step toward compulsory unionization for federal employees generally.

The union leaders are already saying that, if they get the scheme into operation in the postal service, with its 750,000 workers, they will endeavor to obtain the same arrangement for all civilian workers in the federal government. There is an intimation that they will seek to extend it to state, county and city governments.

Nineteen states prohibit any interference with the "right to work," but forced unionism could be imposed on public employees in the other 31 states.

In the executive order President Kennedy issued in 1962 authorizing for the first time the unionization of federal employees, compulsory unionism was specifically prohibited.

This was reaffirmed by President Nixon in his executive order covering labor-management relations in the federal service, effective Jan. 1, 1970. It expressly gives each employee "the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join, and assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right."

The new legislation would withdraw that protection so far as postal workers are concerned.

Compulsory unionization has long been a matter of controversy in America, and it would be logical to assume that the "liberals" would be the first to denounce any effort to penalize a federal employee who refuses to be forced to join a union. But they have very rarely spoken out against such coercion even in non-public employment. Possibly this is because they have been friendly to the cause of labor in a general sense.

If, of course, the delivery of the mails is turned over to a private organization and the government has no power over it except to contract for service, such a corporation could deal with unions that insist on a "union shop." But there is no sign as yet that the government will completely detach itself from whatever project is set up to handle the mail service. The Washington Daily News said the other day in an editorial:

"The Post Office is a public service, and even under the reform bill would be financed in part by taxes. It ought not be subject to rule, directly or indirectly, by union politicians.

"Government service should be open to any citizen who wishes to work for the government, who is needed and who can qualify for the job, whether or not he belongs to a union."

In these days of spectacular controversy and debate on public issues, much emphasis is placed on "repression" as an undemocratic attitude toward the rights of a free people. But somehow the compulsion involved in requiring a worker to join a union as the price of keeping a job in the government itself seems to have been completely neglected by the intellectuals as well as by all activists supposedly interested in the cause of true freedom for the individual in America.

There are no signs of any picket lines or "demonstrations" to protest against compulsory membership in a labor organization. Perhaps "conservatives" who oppose such coercion won this label because they believe in "conserving" individual rights.

IN PRAISE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent WRC editorial in praise of the Washington police during the recent antiwar demonstration.

For those who did not hear the editorial broadcast, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE

Mayor Walter Washington, Police Chief Jerry Wilson and every last man on the force down to the rawest recruit deserve the thanks of the people of the Washington area for a job well done during the antiwar demonstration last Saturday. The civilian volunteer crowd marshals also performed splendidly.

The tens of thousands who came to the city wanted to register their protest and they

did. They did not seek a confrontation with the authorities, and the handful who tried were quickly contained and immobilized.

Police officials have an interesting theory that extreme militants could not get organized to come to Washington, or they were spread out across the country at other demonstrations.

The police, under Mayor Washington and Chief Jerry Wilson, performed superbly. They were under control at all times. There was no massive show of force that might have sparked a reaction. The men were restrained in their dealings with the protestors, and in the scattered incidents where it was necessary to act, the police used just enough power to contain the problem.

It was encouraging to see the cool impassive professionalism of the officers in the face of provocation. And it was rather heartwarming to see police and protestors exchange cigarettes, water and small talk.

Perhaps it is experience, perhaps it is maturity, but it is welcome and reassuring to have a police force of this stature and ability on hand during these critical times in our Nation's Capital.

DRIVE TO ACHIEVE ECONOMIC SUPREMACY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, today I am including in the RECORD the last in a series of articles dealing with the aggressive drive of the Japanese Nation to achieve economic supremacy throughout the world. The articles were written by Sylvia Porter and appeared in issues of The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. They were informative and alarming.

In her concluding report, Miss Porter outlines what Japan has done to trigger such a tremendous surge in economic growth. She explains what Japan hopes to do with the accumulated wealth and power. The goals could be commendable and, from all indications, will be achieved.

Under normal conditions, I would wish Japan well in such a venture. But I cannot today. I cannot when I see her blueprint for power, drawn on the strength of unrealistic Japanese trade barriers and a continued open door U.S. trade policy, will ultimately destroy America's industrial might.

We know the crisis faced today by our textile and shoe industries. Miss Porter's articles reveal what is in store for the electronic and auto industries. I am deeply concerned over the prospective dangers since I represent an area, the 20th Congressional District, which supplies steel for the auto manufacturers. I fear a delay today in checking foreign imports will lead to a disaster tomorrow.

The article follows:

"NO IMPOSSIBLE DREAM" IS JAPAN'S VAST SURGE

(By Sylvia Porter)

Tokyo.—What is Japan's dream?

At the close of each interview with Japan's top leaders, I shot this last question, for to you and me, it is the heart of the tale. (Translation: What do you intend to do with all this power?) Before I get to the answers, let me re-emphasize:

Japan is now a truly global economy. De-

spite her size, manpower shortages, lack of raw materials, profound forces going for her are:

Her aggressive determination to achieve a high and uninterrupted rate of economic growth, her national desire to excel.

The industriousness of her skilled, dedicated workers, the high level of education of her business leaders.

Her unique economic system in which government-industry-finance-labor plan together to achieve national goals.

Her "group spirit" which I saw being developed in infancy in the uniformed, disciplined kindergarten kids at Expo '70.

And Japan, already a nearly \$200 billion economy—third only to the U.S. and Russia—is on her way to a \$400 billion Gross National Product by 1975. Her per capita income is targeted for \$2,700, double '69's level.

Her wages are to rise more than 12 per cent a year, the productivity of her workers to climb up to 15 per cent a year, her cost of living to be rising under 4 per cent a year by the mid-1970s; her personal savings rate is to stay at the fabulous level of 18-20 per cent. A magnificent blueprint indeed.

OF COURSE, SHE HAS PROBLEMS

A shortage of labor will be a massive obstacle, but she plans to solve that by pulling more workers off the farms; increasing the employment of women; by automation; by putting up plants in such cheaper labor areas as Taiwan and Korea.

Also steep hurdles will be the resistance of other nations to her protectionist trade policies and the resentment of neighboring underdeveloped lands from which she buys cheap raw materials and to which she sells expensive finished products.

But Japan is waking up to all of this.

So what is her dream? I think this might be a "consensus."

First, to look inward now, raise the standards of the Japanese people and enhance the Japanese environment.

Dedicated to the nation as her people are, they are getting restless. Third in output, she is 20th among world nations in living standards.

In recognition, Japan is scheduling sharp increases in spending for social and public improvements in the next five years.

And does she need it! While Expo '70 is a beautiful and exciting area, industrialized Japan today looks like one big dreary factory broken up by crackerboxes of houses and housing developments from which the laundry hangs out all day every day.

While she is well into an impressive low-middle class housing program, much of her housing is unspeakably bad by our standards and a sewerage system is actually nonexistent in many big city areas.

While she is actively building roads, her roads and traffic congestion pose the biggest threat to her own auto industry and her problems of pollution dwarf ours.

Second, to look outward too and to take her place among the great economic powers of the world.

Japan is preparing to earmark an impressive one per cent of her GNP—\$4 billion by 1975—for economic aid, primarily in Southeast Asia, her giant combines are uniting to form even greater giants to move into other lands of Asia and into Australia in search of new manpower, raw materials, markets.

Third, to grow and grow, to prosper and prosper, to become a greater power and a super power.

It's not so inscrutable—not to another economic miracle named the U.S. Surely, a Japan intent on becoming an economic super power is to be much preferred to a Japan intent on other goals.

And if we both start now to handle it right, our mutual economic competition can lead to an immensely beneficial expansion of two-way trade and real breaks for you and me, the consumers.

REPRESENTATIVE HOGAN OFFERS CHALLENGE TO GRADUATES

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, during this commencement season, my colleague, Representative LAWRENCE J. HOGAN of Maryland, has offered a challenge to graduating seniors. It is a challenge to those young people who recognize the needs of this country and who want to do something to improve our country. It is not the easy way. It requires study, hard work, dedication, and action.

I commend my colleague for his candor and for his understanding of both our strengths and weaknesses. Although the Congressman's remarks were addressed to graduating seniors, he has presented a message of vital importance for all concerned Americans and I therefore enter his address in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

It is an honor and a privilege to share this important occasion with you.

Many of you undoubtedly view today as the end of a long journey, but, really, it's the beginning of a longer journey. The course which you chart from today on will determine, not only what the future will hold for you, but in a very real sense, what the future will hold for this Nation.

It is generally the practice for guest speakers at high school graduations to give a rousing speech about the challenges and opportunities awaiting the graduating seniors of any given year. However, this is not "any given year." This is 1970, a year unlike any which we have experienced in the past and one which, in many respects, I hope we will never see repeated in the future.

It is true that the proverbial opportunities and challenges have never been greater than they are today. But, the pitfalls and pressures are also greater.

Each of you in your own special way has been given a talent, a gift from God which no one else has and which America desperately needs in her quest for the solution to her problems. And, if you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem.

Winston Churchill once said:

"To every man there comes in his lifetime that special moment when he is figuratively tapped on the shoulder and offered the chance to do a very special thing, unique to him and fitted to his talents.

"What a tragedy if that moment finds him unprepared or unqualified for the work which would be his finest hour."

Your time . . . your finest hour approaches. If you succeed, America succeeds; if you fail, America fails.

What an exciting time to be alive, even with all of our problems. Ninety-three per cent of all the scientists who have ever lived in the entire history of the world are alive and working today. We've landed a man on the moon and will soon explore the far reaches of outer space. We're about to harvest vast new resources from the oceans. Satellites enable us to communicate instantaneously with people on the other side of the globe. More books and periodicals are being published about more subjects than at any time in history, and that vast reservoir of collected knowledge lies out there waiting for us to tap it.

America offers today what she has always offered: a share in an opportunity—an opportunity for free men working cooperatively to carve out their own destiny . . . the

opportunity to stretch our talents as far as they will go and to share proportionately in the rewards of America.

As citizens of this country, we share America's blessings—and they are many; but we also share America's problems—and they are many.

This country was founded by those who wanted to create a more perfect union. Never did our forefathers promise the perfect union.

Because we are still struggling to improve the union does not attest to our weakness, but rather to our strength! America has succeeded in her quest as no Nation in the history of the world has succeeded, but we must continue the search for that perfection. As long as there is a hungry family in the world, that search must go on. As long as one man is excluded from opportunity because of the pigment of his skin, that search must go on. As long as disease steals breath from a child and as long as there are those who plot aggression against their neighbors, the search must go on. But let us never mistake a nation that is still searching for its way for a nation which has lost its way. The fact that we are still searching is the greatest assurance we have that our course is correct.

The favorite ploy of the revolutionary is to point to those weaknesses in our system—and they do exist—and cite these exceptions to the American dream as reasons for destroying the system. Their reasoning is not less irrational than a physician's would be if he advocated destroying a patient rather than attacking the ailments that cause a patient's distress.

Let's not delude ourselves. We have a full bag of problems. We are anguished for peace in the midst of war. We see misguided young people who should be reaching for ways to cultivate a better society, reaching instead for placards and molotov cocktails to destroy society.

How blind are those who demand that our system be torn down. I say to these revolutionaries: "What would you construct after you have destroyed America? What would the rules of your new order be? If America is all wrong, show us a nation which is right. Show us a nation which has given her citizens more freedom, more opportunity, more progress, more compassion for our neighbors in the world." Few nations would tolerate the vicious dissent which America tolerates. It is precisely because we are a strong nation of free men that these detractors are able to preach their hatred and their poison. But let's distinguish between preaching ideas and engaging in violent criminal activities. This we cannot tolerate.

America encourages peaceful dissent. Constructive dissent stimulates us to improve, but let's also protest for America when she is unjustly belittled. Let's preserve the system of government which allows its citizens to protest.

All is not bliss in America. It never has been and perhaps it never will be, but we've had our revolution in this country and we've been building and improving ever since.

Of course, we have problems. As long as there are citizens who are discriminated against, we have a problem which needs solving, but as long as we have those who justify violence and anarchy and rebellion as the means for aggravating their wrongs, we have another problem which needs solving.

Is there evil in this land of ours? Yes, there is. Is there injustice? Yes, there is. And these are causes for regret and dissatisfaction. But is there any nation . . . any people . . . anywhere in the history of the world which has struggled harder or achieved more success in eradicating evil and injustice? I say there is not!

Is it a cause for despair that we are not perfect? We're a nation of men, men are not perfect. The capacity for evil and the capacity for good exist in measure in the hearts of all men. Edmund Burke said:

"All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing."

In these times of apathy in the face of brewing revolution we should remember these words. Let's look at what we are: We're a mixture of good and bad, black and white, young and old, healthy and sick.

We're Protestants, Catholics and Jews. We're English, Irish, German, Polish, French, Italian, Greek, Scotch, African, and many more—a melting pot of strangers unified by a common purpose: to live as free men with the right of personal dignity and self-respect and to share in the opportunity which America offers. In this unity lies our strength, our hope. We must insist that all citizens respect the rights of others, including revolutionaries.

America has never promised her citizens prosperity without work, reward without effort, strength without struggle or security without sacrifice. America has never promised a life without problems.

If you're dissatisfied with things as they are—and well you should be—you have three choices: You can drop out from society and distract yourself with pot and speed to blot out your responsibilities and pretend that the real world doesn't exist, or you can join the band of extremists and revolutionaries and help to destroy the greatest system of government the mind of man has ever conceived—even with all of its shortcomings, or—and this is the alternative I pray you will pursue—

You can personally get involved to help solve our problems.

One of the greatest gifts passed on to us by the founders of this Nation was the mechanism for changing and improving our society in a peaceful, orderly way. That mechanism is politics. Politics is the only way to strike out against the deficiencies in our society without destroying the system itself. It affords us the opportunity to correct the inadequacies within the existing structure without undermining its foundations.

To those who cry for the destruction of the system, I say "Destroy this system and you will destroy not only the hope of America, but of all mankind." I say, "Use this mechanism within the system to make changes to make this a better country and to make this a better world."

Corny? Trite? Perhaps, but what a challenge! What an opportunity!

You can have a tremendous influence on the kind of world you're going to live in.

Many of you will leave here and go on to college campuses across the United States next fall. I urge you to stand firmly for what you believe. Don't let a loud-mouthed minority speak for you. Look at both sides of an issue and make up your own mind as to which is right. Don't blindly follow the Pied Pipers who are dedicated to leading us all to destruction. Don't let yourself become a pawn for someone else's brand of activism if he espouses a cause that you cannot buy. Sure, you should attend political rallies, but before you decide to rally around some flag, make sure that you know which flag you are rallying around.

We have seen instance after instance where the voice of reason and the voice of dissent has not been tolerated when it conflicted with the views of a small minority of revolutionaries who, in the name of change, constantly claw at the very fabric of our society. Students have been cajoled into the streets, they have been induced to burn buildings, they have been induced to destroy the life work of dedicated and learned scholars by those who use them and manipulate them in the same manner as a puppeteer makes his marionettes dance to any tune he plays. Have enough respect for yourself to not let that happen to you.

I beg you to extend your intellectual curl-

osity and integrity to the dialogue in which you will be participating in the months and years ahead. I will not suggest to you how I believe you should think. That is *your* responsibility. All I ask is that *you do think*.

I wish I had the eloquence and persuasiveness or the inspiration to say something here today which would light a spark in you and motivate you toward a deeper, more personal love of country. I wish I could say something which would infuse in you a missionary's determination to absorb yourself in helping to make a great country better and prevent it from being destroyed by those who hate it.

Some of you young men may be called upon to die for your country... and I pray to God that you *are* willing to die for this country, and if you are willing to die for this country, I hope you will be equally willing to live for your country to help insure that it is worth dying for.

America's promise—and your opportunity—is in the untilled desert, in the untapped ocean, in the unexplored outer space, in the unconquered disease. It is the uneducated minds of the potential Einsteins who live in our slums whom you might educate, it's the untrained unemployed whom you might train. Yes, your challenge lies in the unplowed fields of America where blessings lie dormant, blessings to enhance America's progress toward perfection.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "The older I get the more I realize that there is but one wealth—one security on this earth, and that is found in the ability of a person to perform a task well."

The future of this great Nation—its security, its wealth—will be determined by how well we perform our task. That's a weighty responsibility, but great rights must carry with them great responsibilities. Let's never forget that. It is our challenge, our role in life, our responsibility to exert all of our energies to insure that the world which we bequeath to our descendants will be a better world than the one which has been bequeathed to us.

You and I, as beneficiaries of this society, have a responsibility to defend and preserve it. We have an obligation to keep the American dream alive. And, as Richard Nixon said, "The American dream does not come to those who fall asleep."

President Nixon also said in his inaugural address: "We are caught in war, wanting peace. We're torn by division, wanting unity. We see tasks that need doing, waiting for hands to do them."

And I say to you graduates today: America needs and is waiting for your hands... and your hearts.

WATER POLLUTION AND OUR CHILDREN

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the urgency of our environmental crisis; yet we often forget that pollution not only affects the air and the water but has a profound impact on the daily lives of our citizens.

I recently received personal letters from over 30 children in the third grade class at St. Columba School located in the Second Congressional District of Illinois, all expressing sincere and moving concern that the pollution of the rivers and lakes near their homes would spoil

the beauty and recreation of their summer. One such letter is placed in the RECORD in the hope that it will help bring about the vitally needed human response to this disastrous technological problem, as follows:

SAINT COLUMBA SCHOOL,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR Mr. MIKVA: In my class we were talking about water pollution.

The Calumet River and other lakes and rivers are being destroyed because the factories are sending their wastes into the water.

In the summertime there won't be any beaches to swim in or lakes to catch fish because the fish will die and the water will be polluted. And if you wanted to go water skiing you couldn't because the water would be polluted and dirty.

What will the future be for babies and children that are still young and are just born? What will happen if nobody stopped the people and things that make pollution possible?

We need your help and everyone else to help stop pollution. So please try to stop it now.

Yours truly,

POLICE "REFORMERS"

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the past, our law enforcement officers have been subjected to undue criticism and distortion from the "police watchers" and self-styled reformers.

Now, as a result of social progress from these so-called reformers, the police officer can expect new attacks from within his own ranks.

The resolutions from the National Council of Police Societies, meeting in Atlantic City on June 6, will supply interesting agitation and confrontation in the weeks and months ahead.

Most Americans have been led to believe that a police officer is a police officer regardless of his color. Likewise, that a criminal is a criminal regardless of his color.

Many will question why the black police officers, during their meeting, did not also go on record proclaiming that they would arrest any black police officer they saw abusing white citizens—or that they would arrest any criminal abusing any citizen.

A news clipping and a message from J. Edgar Hoover—reprinted from the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin—follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1970]
BLACK POLICE VOW TO OPPOSE RACIST ACTS
BY WHITE POLICE

(By Robert C. Maynard)

ATLANTIC CITY, June 6.—Declaring they are "no longer co-conspirators with white authority," the largest and oldest organization of black policemen in the United States decided here today they will arrest any police officer they see abusing black citizens.

In a series of strongly worded resolutions, the National Council of Police Societies also called on President Nixon to lay down strict

guidelines for police use of firearms, condemned their supervisors for laxity in the enforcement of narcotics laws in the black community and committed themselves to "change the racist behavior of white policemen since we cannot change their attitudes."

The council is the national association of a score of Negro police societies, many of whose members are veteran policemen in such cities as New York, Chicago, Newark, Atlanta and Oakland, Calif.

Council meetings in the past have been largely social gatherings with a sprinkling of discussion of such questions as how to encourage more Negroes to join police forces.

But the council, according to one officer, is "running to catch up" with the increasing militant stand of the black community.

"The black policeman knows the same heel on his brother's neck leaves a heelprint on his own neck," said Howard Sheffey, chairman of the board and a New York City police sergeant.

"We will no longer be coconspirators with white authority," Sheffey said, reading one of the council resolutions. "We have resolved to rededicate ourselves to involvement in black community problems."

Giving a practical example of what the new stance means, Sheffey, assigned to Harlem, said, "If I see a white policeman beating a prisoner, I'll place him under arrest for assault."

Disturbed by the recent shootings at Jackson (Miss.) State College, in Augusta, Georgia and at Kent State University, the council called on the President and the Department of Justice to lay down a "sane firearms policy."

The council gave the responsibility for protecting black citizens from excessive use of firearms to the black police officer himself.

The council advised black policemen witnessing excessive use of firearms to "take proper police action," meaning to arrest the offending officer.

The council which represents 10,000 black policemen and policewomen, urged the adoption of the guidelines for the use of firearms formulated in 1966 by the Task Force on the Police of the U.S. Crime Commission.

The guidelines recommend that deadly force should not be used against any suspect unless the arresting officer's safety or the safety of bystanders is endangered.

The crime commission recommended that deadly force should never be used "on mere suspicion" or against a felony suspect "when lesser force could be used."

Robert Lamb of the Community Relations Service, a division of the Department of Justice, agreed to present the recommendations of the council's 600 delegates to the department at the request of the society's leaders.

The council said it was calling on the community relations service to assist because "it is an agency that we feel shares our concerns."

The council said in a resolution "the use of narcotics has increased in black communities and nothing has been done to stamp out this evil. . . . Narcotics is yet another silent firearm brought in, sold and controlled by whites to destroy black America."

The members were urged to "move against pushers and others who sell" or support the sale of drugs.

Calvin Allen, president of the Council of Police Societies and a New York City policeman, charged that police officials have failed to administer the narcotics laws in ways that are effective.

"As long as it remains a problem in the black community," Allen said "it isn't apparently a serious problem. But to black people it is a serious problem and we intend to do something about it."

The council endorsed the candidacy of Kenneth Gibson, who is running for mayor of Newark.

[From the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin]
MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR TO ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

An old proverb says that a fool, among other things, may be known by his anger without cause, his speech without profit, his change without progress, and his inquiry without object. Today some of the theories being advanced for "watching" and "containing" law enforcement would suggest that, in addition to these quirks, fools may also be known for their lack of commonsense and judgment.

Crime terrorizes many communities throughout the country. In some areas, people are afraid to be on the streets, particularly at night. It would seem, therefore, that preventing crime and helping police to bring violators to justice would be a primary and reasonable concern of all citizens. Unfortunately, the light of reason blinds some people.

Groups have been established to gain "community control" over police departments. Some, receiving financial support from well-meaning but misled organizations, have set up "police watching" programs. Some spokesmen advocate that each city ghetto be given public funds and authorization to form its own racially segregated police force. Others say college youth should not be subjected to contacts by police officers, and that only specially trained, highly paid, unarmed, elite police forces should be used to handle civil demonstrations. If these ideas and techniques seem half-baked, it is because they are. But the intent of those who foster such schemes is clear. They want to negate the rule of law. To do this, they must first create public distrust of and ill will toward those who enforce the law.

"Police watchers" and self-styled law enforcement reformers have no place in our society. Their altruistic mouthings are a front and a sham, for they have already prejudged law enforcement as an enemy to their nihilistic cause. Their real objective is to intimidate and harass police. They care nothing about public protection and orderly due process. They seek special privileges which place them above the law and commit abuses which encroach on the rights of others.

Civic-minded groups and individuals who are fed up with gimmicks and attacks against our established principles and lawful processes should rally to the support of law enforcement. Our system of government provides adequate and proper safeguards for remedial action against indiscretions of policemen. Certainly, we do not need to resort to sidewalk kangaroo courts made up of militants and malcontents who cannot even discipline themselves. Further, we should remember that frequently those who defy the law are prone to criticize and attack agencies charged with enforcing it.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 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?

CONGLOMERATE MERGERS FACE CELLER'S WRATH

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the highly respected and most able dean of the House, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER), has secured his place in history many times over.

His leadership of the Judiciary Committee has been remarkable, not only for the number of important laws and constitutional amendments passed, but also for the never-failing legislative creativity of the chairman. The high admiration I held for the gentleman before I came to Congress has multiplied many times since I have had an opportunity to view first hand his excellent standard of congressional service.

Thus it was that I was pleased to see a well-written and illuminating article about the chairman in that excellent newspaper Women's Wear Daily recently. The author of this article, Penny Girard, managed to capture the beguiling spirit of Mr. CELLER while doing a substantive interview.

So that all the Members might have the benefit of reading this fine article about a fine man, I wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

CONGLOMERATE MERGERS FACE CELLER'S WRATH

WASHINGTON.—Vases of red roses and carnations crowd his accommodating desk, but conglomerate mergers busy his mind.

Emanuel "Manny" Celler, Dean of the House of Representatives with more than 47 years in office, is today as keenly involved in business and antitrust legislative matters as he ever was.

The current project of the 82-year-old Brooklyn, N.Y., lawmaker is legislation to curb conglomerate merger-mania, and Celler appears as determined and convinced as he's ever been that Congress "is in the mood" to back him up.

The grandfatherly-looking veteran lawmaker-lawyer tells WWD there will be a law controlling conglomerate expansion movements, despite Administration statements that things are going sufficiently well under current procedures and policies. Celler says he's pushing for completion of a bill this session, but reiterates that Congress probably won't take any action until some later date.

"I have a pattern to follow," he tells WWD. "I anticipate opposition," he says, but he expects to "hammer out" this bill just as he carved out the 1950 anti-merger legislation the Celler-Kefauver Act—the first major addition to Federal antitrust laws since the 1914 Clayton Act.

"There have been more suits filed under that law than any other act," he proudly asserts.

Celler chairs the powerful House Judiciary Committee, as he has done since 1945. In addition, he heads an antitrust subcommittee currently probing the conglomerate merger development.

The subcommittee "haphazardly" picked six corporations which fit the conglomerate pattern: ITT, Ling-Temco-Vought, Gulf &

Western-Industries, Inc., Leasco Data Processing & Equipment Corp., National General Corp. and Litton Industries, Inc.

"We wanted to find out just what makes them tick," Celler said. His subcommittee has been holding hearings off and on for several months.

According to Celler, the subcommittee isn't trying to probe or criticize. "We just want to lay the foundation for sound legislation."

The subcommittee chairman admits he's "pretty well satisfied" with the hearings, and the companies' participation. But even after those sessions, and more recent ones with Administration spokesmen, Celler, hasn't altered his thinking about the need for legislation.

One point he brings out in the interview and again in hearings is the uncertain future pace of conglomerates. While he tells the Justice Department's antitrust chief Richard McLaren he's doing a commendable job, and concedes that the merger trend has cooled off a little, Celler still isn't relenting. He contends that a change in the nation's economic picture could spur more conglomerate expansion.

"What about the future?" The meticulous and conservatively dressed Celler quips. The next man (after McLaren) might treat the subject completely differently, Celler maintains, and that requires preventive legal protection.

Noted for his jovial story-telling nature, he compares the conglomerate situation to an "elephant saying it's every man for himself as he dances among the chickens."

The merger trend, which accelerated sharply during the late 1960s, witnessed sizable firms rapidly acquiring other firms, and gaining larger and larger conglomerate stomachs, which Celler said resulted in "economic indigestion"—doing too much too quickly without stopping to think it all over.

Though he staunchly defends the existing law, he contends it must be, "supplemented" and "strengthened."

The New York lawmaker was born in Brooklyn May 6, 1888. He graduated from Columbia College in 1910 and the law school in 1912. He practiced law in New York for 10 years, then ran and was elected to the 68th Congress in November, 1922.

He had been in the House ever since, representing parts of Kings and Queens Counties, reelected by margins that would easily gratify any politician.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he's also currently involved in a special subcommittee study of impeachment charges against associate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

Proponents of the Dump-Douglas Movement, spearheaded by House GOP Leader Gerry Ford has hoped to avoid Celler's committee, thinking that it would be less harsh on Douglas than a special independent committee. The Judiciary Committee, claiming a separate study would usurp its powers, set up its own special subcommittee, headed by Celler.

Celler also was chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee which first brought the word thalidomide to public notice during hearings.

Celler has just turned 82. In his spacious office, with walls lined with pictures of a legislative career spanning terms of nine Presidents—including his good friend FDR—Celler's desk is filled with flowers, and he finished lunch, topped off with a slice of chocolate birthday cake.

On the House floor a little earlier, "Manny" answered tributes from colleagues who called him "a masterful debater and skilled parliamentarian," and the man "who managed more Constitutional amendments through Congress than any man in the history of the House."

"His fingerprints are on every important measure adopted by Congress during the past five years," another colleague added.

Celler responded warmly that "oftentimes those of us who have gone beyond, say 50, are berated for our age and some would like to toss us out like broken tools."

"Well as far as I'm concerned, I may be chronologically old . . . but I feel that I am spiritually young and young in spirit."

"There is an old adage, you know: The older the fiddle the sweeter the tune," he chuckles.

PENNY GIRARD.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—MAY 25, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Recently, I've had the privilege of attending several high school commencements in the District, and I'm always pleased to note that large numbers of graduates are heading for institutions of higher learning.

In the excitement of the commencement, most graduates are probably not thinking about the future of those institutions, but with all the major legislation on higher education up for renewal next year, the President and the Congress now are reassessing the impact of federal programs on these vital institutions.

The strain and stress of higher education are causing college and university officials to describe their situation as desperate, especially as they view exploding enrollments and costs.

College and university enrollments totaled 7.4 million last fall, an increase of 60 percent over the last five years. Enrollment is expected to double over the next 30 years. A century ago, 2 percent of our young people went to college. Today more than 40 percent are enrolled in a college or university.

Tuitions and required fees have increased an average of 16.5 percent this year at state and land-grant colleges. The increase has been even greater at private institutions. The average, all-inclusive annual cost to a resident student has climbed from \$1,260 a dozen years ago, to near the \$2,000 mark this year. At private institutions, the average annual cost is at the \$3,000 level. It is not surprising, then, to note that of the number in college today, half come from the wealthiest 25 percent of the population, and only 7 percent come from the poorest segment of the population.

These increased costs are falling more heavily upon the student. Traditionally, he has paid 20 to 25 percent of the total costs, but more recently, his share has been about one-third of the cost.

All of this is of vital concern to the Federal government, which already pays about 20 percent of the total costs of higher education—amounting to \$4.4 billion in 1969. The government is being urged to increase its contribution substantially. Higher education already is a favored beneficiary of the Federal dollar, receiving 25 percent more than welfare recipients, and three times more Federal money is spent for college buildings than for public housing.

Federal programs for higher education consist of direct assistance to the institution and assistance to the student. The major discussion at present relates to the government's programs for students. In this area, there are four major programs:

Educational opportunity grants, which provide funds for low-income students on a

matching basis with the college or university.

Work-study programs, which provide employment for low-income students on the campus or college community in jobs of public interest.

National Defense student loans, from government funds and repayable after graduation or the termination of education.

Guaranteed loans, from private sources, administered by the banks, in which the government pays the loan interest while the student is in college.

The first three are administered by colleges and universities, and to qualify a student first must gain admission to an accredited school, then apply to it for aid. The college decides how much to offer the student and in what proportions of grant, loan and work program aid.

The deliberations of the Congress will center upon the three major problems of these programs.

(1) inadequate funds, which have forced colleges to turn away applicants;

(2) uncertainty for the student, who cannot predict how much aid he is going to receive, and

(3) inequity in funding, which many times finds students who need it most, not getting enough money.

WHERE WE SHOULD BE HEADED IN AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, amid all of the discussions about our environmental problems, we have heard too little from the men in industry who deal with the practical solutions for air and water quality controls. One of the recognized experts in the field is William J. Harnisch of my district, the legislative counsel of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. Mr. Harnisch has participated in the multi-million dollar air pollution control program undertaken by his company. He has spoken on the subject before many distinguished gatherings. I wish to include in the RECORD his latest address, delivered to the recent annual meeting of the National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association.

The address referred to, follows:

WHERE WE SHOULD BE HEADED IN AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

(Address by William J. Harnisch)

You and I, and every person in our country are responsible in some degree for the ecological disaster that threatens us.

Air quality control of our environment is a collective responsibility of all elements of society. The technical and financial resources, and talents, of people and industry, and of government, must be marshaled to meet the challenge presented by air pollution. Only through such a joint approach, can these combined forces, in partnership, manage our environment for the greatest net benefit to man and his total community.

Industry should acknowledge the sense of stewardship for the natural resources upon which our environment depends. It is the responsibility of government, with the participation of industry, to identify objectives, establish the assimilative capacities of receiving environments, and enact reasonable standards.

Industry should control immediately any

air pollution determined to be injurious to health. It is a question of what is technically feasible and economically reasonable for the control of all other air pollution. Most of industry is doing this as fast as possible.

The cost of air quality controls to industry is astronomical. It has been estimated that industry's annual expenditure for clean air probably exceeds the budgets in most of our 50 states.

The New York Times, on page 1 of Sunday's edition of May 17, reports that American industry will spend over two billion dollars for air quality control in 1970. (Do you realize that this sum probably give each one in this room over a million dollars!)

The National Academy of Sciences has reported that transportation is responsible for 60% of the air pollution in the country; generation of electricity, 13%; refuse disposal, 3%, and all manufacturing, 18%. Thus, if all manufacturing and power companies were able to reduce their emissions to zero, only one-third of the problem would be solved!

The public should stop pointing the finger at industry which has taken substantial action, and take some personal action to control pollution. This would require installing pollution controls on their automobiles, the elimination of home incinerators, many of which are defective and emit extremely harmful concentrates of pollutants, stop the unnecessary use of personal automobiles, eliminate open burning of trash and leaves, curtail the use of home electrical appliances and air conditioning—excessive use of which is requiring the utilities to generate more power before emissions can be controlled—and stop personal smoking. The taxpayer must also approve increased taxes for control of emissions from municipal plants, hospitals, schools and other public institutions. The consumer must realize that industry will have to increase the cost of its products, to obtain funds to install costly air pollution equipment, from which there is no profit, only additional operating cost.

It must be realized that there is a definite contrast between the problems of new and old plants in industry. The older plants which were originally built in rural areas have been encroached upon by the expanding residential and business community. The older plants have a problem of very little or no space, in which to erect large and complex pollution control facilities. On the other hand, the new plants which are located in rural areas have space to permit the erection of air quality controls as part of the new plant.

Industry must, therefore, undertake research and make engineering evaluations to determine the type of controls which are practical because of problems of space, and yet which are sufficiently efficient to comply with the probable federal, state, and local regulations. The locations of the plant often determines the equipment which can be used.

The public is not cognizant of the space required for an electrostatic precipitator, which, for instance, is used on a steel plant open hearth or basic oxygen furnace. Such a control eliminates all smoke and particulate matter. It is more than six stories high and is larger than the furnace it controls. Furthermore, there must be large bins in which to store the particulate matter, and access areas for trucks to haul away the waste material. This material may have to be trucked long distances, to be buried in an abandoned mine, or perhaps buried in extensive acreage, which must be purchased for this purpose.

An electrostatic precipitator, or similar equipment, costs over a million dollars. For instance, the cost for a steel plant with twenty open hearths is over 20 million dollars. There is not one nickel of profit from

this tremendous expenditure, only additional operating costs.

The federal, state and local governments promulgate regulations for air quality control. These air quality standards must be based on scientifically sound criteria, which are the foundation for a successful, effective, air pollution control program. The standards should not be uniform, but tailored to the particular region involved. Local topography and physical conditions should be taken into account. The economic impact on the community resulting from compliance with standards, in relation to benefits to the people of the region, must be considered. In other words, to repeat, any emissions dangerous to health must be abated at once, but control of other processes should be subject to the test of what is technically feasible and economically reasonable.

A most difficult problem for industry will be complying with the varied provisions of the federal, state and local laws. These differences will undoubtedly cause confusion and legal difficulties. The federal air quality criteria and ambient air standards may very well differ from those issued by the states and local jurisdictions.

Industry has already expended millions of dollars to install pollution controls on its operations. These comply with existing regulations. However, the federal government could establish criteria and ambient air standards, that may result in costly controls not being in compliance with federal regulations or regulations adopted by the state in compliance with the necessary federal approval under the Clean Air Act.

This situation has already caused confusion.

This problem, the engineering problem, and the problem of where and how industry is to obtain funds for the extremely costly air pollution equipment, require determination before industry, large and small, can completely control all of its emissions.

The present hysterical attitude concerning pollution will not solve the environmental problem. Some people would close down industries, and ban the internal combustion engine. When asked what they would do to provide work, food, shelter or transportation, the answer is a blank look. When asked how they would finance the unemployment, the charitable institutions, associations like the TB Association, the demands of education, the protection from crime, the financing of the free university, and solving the ghetto problem, the answer is "first we must save the earth." Thus, individuals by promoting simplistic, ill-understood proposals under the flag of crisis and panic, can endanger the very environment they would protect.

There is also the danger that some politicians needing a crutch for reelection, have concentrated on this one emotional issue, which distracts voters from their failure to solve other vital problems. These politicians do not understand the problems involved in air quality control, and have not made the effort to research the matter. Pronouncements are made that air pollution must be abated at once or the people of the world will perish in a few years. This adds to the hysteria, solves nothing, and defeats reasonable efforts to accomplish controls. In fact, people are already losing interest, and disregard the exaggerated dire predictions.

The TB Association, by a scientific approach and educational programs, can promote pollution control that is technically feasible and economically reasonable, just as the TB Association has conquered tuberculosis.

I would like to suggest one possible solution to assist in solving the pollution problem. The federal government could sponsor a public corporation, such as COMSAT, which would make available to industry and

municipalities, loans at a low interest rate, over a reasonable period of years, which could be used for installing pollution control equipment. There should be a minimum of "red tape" to obtain the loans. These loans would permit industries and municipalities to undertake at once engineering for possible control facilities. The loans would provide funds for the purchase of expensive air quality control equipment. Funds would also be available for research, to discover methods to control processes which today can not be feasibly controlled.

In conclusion, the key to success, in reaching the goal of saving clean, healthful, air, is *joint voluntary cooperation, by industry, government, and all other segments of our society.*

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day in America is traditionally the day set aside for us to pay honor and respect to the men who fought and died for the principles of this great land. It is a day particularly dear to those who, while they fought beside their fallen comrades in bloody conflict, were fortunate enough to return to their family, their home, and their country.

It is a day which blends the color and blare of marching bands with the muted trumpet sounding "Taps." It is a day when the dead heroes are eulogized by their living counterparts.

But, in light of the violence, disorder, and disrespect so prevalent in America today, there was a subtle change in the Memorial Day observance at Braddock, Pa., a community in my 20th Congressional District which has an historical link with the Revolutionary War when this Nation won its freedom.

At a cemetery service there, Edward Schenberg of 1444 Jancey Street, Pittsburgh, quartermaster of Veterans of World War I, Department of Pennsylvania, came not to eulogize but to apologize. He came to apologize to his former comrades for Americans today who ridicule the ideals for which they died and who spit upon the flag under which they served.

Mr. Speaker, I am including for the RECORD a copy of Mr. Schenberg's Memorial Day address at the Braddock Cemetery. I urge my colleagues to read it:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

(An address by Edward Schenberg)

Buddies and Comrades as we stand here before these hallowed graves; of the men who fought in the wars of freedom for mankind. From the Revolutionary War to the present conflict in Vietnam. Men who fought these wars for the principles of the American way of life.

I do not come here to praise and eulogize them. They have been praised and eulogized at this same spot, by many in years gone by. I come here to apologize.

We here do not apologize for ourselves, for we believed in the principles that you fought for and the principles that many of you died for.

We apologize for those who are being misled to believe that our country is not worth fighting for. Who believe that the flag we fought under is nothing but a rag.

The Flag that to you was a symbol that stood for a Nation united. A Nation that we were willing to give our lives for. A Flag that we would sacrifice our lives to keep it flying. To you and to us it never was a rag to be burned and spit on.

We here again pledge that we will uphold our government. The government of the United States of America and the Constitution adopted by the founders of our great country; also to respect the flag that we fought under.

We stand here today before these graves of those who have gone to their Maker; to repledge that faith.

We, as men who have in time of war, were ready to defend our Country, will uphold the laws of our Country. Now and as long as we live.

We here pledge ourselves in the memory of your sacrifices and the sacrifices that are being made by our men today on foreign soil, to combat all forces that are conspiring to destroy everything that you fought for—that we fought for and our forefathers fought for.

EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST DISPATCH

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with the House the observations of a distinguished St. Louis newspaper, particularly as they concern the dean of the Missouri congressional delegation, my distinguished colleague and good friend DICK BOLLING. Accordingly, I offer for insertion in the RECORD the following, taken from a St. Louis Post Dispatch editorial which appeared May 20, 1970:

ST. LOUIS POST DISPATCH EDITORIAL OF MAY 20

The announcement of House Speaker John W. McCormack that he will not seek re-election in the Boston district he has served in Congress for more than 40 years opens the way to significant reforms in the House. The question is whether liberal Democratic Representatives have the power to seize the opportunities now presented and effect long-sought changes in the antique seniority system.

Mr. McCormack is 78 years old and apparently, if Democrats retain control of the House in the fall elections, he will be succeeded by Representative Carl Albert of Oklahoma, currently serving as majority leader. Mr. Albert is 62, and although he had an unfortunate time of it presiding over the 1968 Democratic convention in Chicago he is a man of integrity, intelligence and liberal impulse. He was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford.

Mr. Albert seems to have the votes of the House Democratic power structure; but the significant House choice will not be the Speaker but the new majority leader to succeed Mr. Albert. Probably the three major factions in the House will have candidates—the Southern conservatives and moderates, machine-backed urban representatives and the younger progressives, mainly from the North and West, about 140 of whom have organized into the so-called Democratic Study Group.

There are several likely contenders for Mr.

Albert's present post. One is Representative Dan Rostenkowski of Chicago, who has the support of Mayor Daley and many of the committee chairmen from the South who have achieved their chairmanships through the seniority system; election of Mr. Rostenkowski would mean the triumph of the old-line conservatives. Representative Hale Boggs of Louisiana, the majority whip, probably would be opposed on sectional grounds but could emerge as a compromise candidate.

The best hope for reform lies in the choice of one of the younger liberals, a person such as James G. O'Hara of Michigan, Edward P. Boland of Massachusetts, Morris K. Udall of Arizona or Richard Bolling of Missouri. Mr. Bolling has been perhaps the most consistent, articulate and perceptive critic of the present House organization, but he could be ruled out for his very outspokenness.

And this is too bad, for Mr. Bolling has ideas—and optimism. He said the other day in an interview with Timothy Bleck of our Washington Bureau that the House "is potentially the saving grace of the federal system," but has failed to measure up to its potential. Part of the failure is due to the seniority system, which rewards longevity rather than ability. Mr. Bolling has urged that chairmen be nominated by the Speaker and elected by the majority party caucus, a great improvement.

The first requirement if there is to be a major reform would be for the Democrats to choose a reform-minded majority leader, and that means defeating whatever candidate is fielded by the Old Guard Southern committee chairmen who have a vested interest in the seniority system. That would at least offer a chance for replacing the seniority system with a method of election based on merit.

There is no doubt that liberal House Democrats will have a greater sense of forward motion under Mr. Albert; but the choice of a vigorous young majority leader would be exhilarating.

THE HIGH COST OF BEING ELECTED

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the primary campaign in my State of California occurred last week. Aside from the results, some good, some not so good, I was struck by the estimates of spending on campaigns for office.

According to one newspaper estimate, a candidate for the Republican senatorial nomination in California, spent very nearly \$2 million in his unsuccessful bid for office.

Mr. Russell Hemenway, director of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, told a congressional hearing that an estimated 90 percent of all campaign funds are contributed by less than 1 percent of the American population.

Mr. Speaker, the public must be encouraged to participate in political campaigns to lessen the dependency on large contributors by candidates.

I am introducing legislation today that would encourage increased public participation by allowing income tax credit or deductions for certain political contributions.

Increased public participation will also result, in my opinion, in diminishing the remoteness and unresponsiveness of the

institution of representative government which are so evident today.

A 4-YEAR COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIP AWARDED JERRY GREEFF BY SIU

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the labor unions frequently come under criticism by some segments of our population and they are blamed for many of the country's ills. The benefits which are extended to their members and their families, are frequently overlooked.

It was with great interest that I read in the Baltimore Sun a few days ago of the benefits extended to a young Baltimorean at birth, in the form of maternity benefits to his mother, and now extended to the young man in the form of a 4-year college scholarship.

Despite his many extracurricular activities, his excellent work has won for him a scholarship to the college of his choice, which is the University of Maryland.

My personal congratulations to Jerry Greeff for his splendid record, to the Seafarers International Union for providing him with a college education, and to his father, Ferdinand C. Greeff, who has been a member of the SIU for 25 years, and who helped to make this possible. The article follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 6, 1970]

SAILOR, 18, SEEKS COLLEGE LIFE—HE TRAVELED SEAS FOR 2 YEARS; WILL ATTEND UM

When Jerry Greeff entered his first year of elementary school, his seafaring father told him some day that he would earn a college scholarship. This year he graduated from Baltimore Polytechnic Institute and next fall he will attend the University of Maryland on a four year grant awarded him by the Seafarers International Union.

He was one of 23 seamen or their dependents who applied for the 4-year, \$6,000 scholarship, and early last month he became one of four named to attend any accredited college or university of his choice in the country.

Jerry's father, Ferdinand C. Greeff, has been a member of the Seafarers International Union for the past 25 years, sailing for 20, and for the past five, working as a boatswain with the Calmar Steamship Company shore gang at Bethlehem Steel.

Though Jerry explained that the sea separated his father from the family often for several months, the 18-year-old student emphasized, "the union has been fantastic to me."

His association with the Seafarers International Union began before he crawled off the bear-skin rug when in 1953 his picture appeared in the union's publication, "Seafarers Log," hailing him as "one of the first SIU maternity benefit babies."

But his latest association with the union has apparently had more influence. At age 16 he receive Coast Guard papers and authorization to sail aboard American merchant vessels, and within the two years that followed, he sailed the Caribbean, through the Panama Canal, and along the West Coast.

"GREW UP"

"And everytime I came back," he added, "I grew up a little bit more."

Last summer, Jerry attended the Harry Londonberg School of Seamanship at Piney Point and now is qualified as a fireman-oller.

Although Jerry is hesitant to predict his own future, he said he would attend the University of Maryland as a major in business administration.

"When I complete my college studies," he said, "then I'll start thinking more specifically about my future—maritime or otherwise."

Already in business with a friend, Mark Loundis, Jerry promotes "college mixers" of a downtown ballroom—a profitable business, he is finding. In addition, the young scholar plays the drums and trumpet with a local rock band.

AN 87 PERCENT AVERAGE

While engaging in these activities, he maintained an 87 per cent average at Poly. The scholarship award is based on scholastic records and extra-curricular activities which for Jerry included holding the office of president in his junior and senior years.

Although Jerry emphasizes that his father does not interfere with major decisions concerning his future in the maritime world, Jerry admits that "it was easier to get permission to go to sea for two years than it was to go to Ocean City for one weekend."

CONGRESSMAN ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN RECEIVES UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME SENIOR CLASS FELLOW AWARD

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the ablest and most highly regarded of our colleagues in the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from New York, Congressman ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN.

As the Representative in Congress of the district in which the University of Notre Dame is located, I count it a great privilege to announce to the House that this year Congressman LOWENSTEIN has been selected by the Notre Dame senior class to receive its annual Senior Fellow Award.

Mr. Speaker, previous recipients of this award include such prominent Americans as John F. Kennedy, Richard Nixon, Everett Dirksen, and William Westmoreland.

That the students of this great Roman Catholic university should have singled out Congressman LOWENSTEIN for this coveted award is indeed a tribute to the stature and respect he has won among the people of our country, particularly among the future leaders of our Nation.

AL LOWENSTEIN's sense of dedication, his integrity, his idealism, have become an inspiration for, I think it is not unfair to say, millions of young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is particularly significant that, at a time of deep divisions within our own society, the Notre Dame Senior Fellow Award should have been made to a young legislator whose entire life has been devoted to bringing people together.

We who serve with him in Congress

know AL LOWENSTEIN as a gifted spokesman for the people of the Fifth Congressional District of New York.

But, as the Notre Dame Senior Fellow Award attests, AL LOWENSTEIN is known all over our country as a gifted spokesman for Americans across the land.

NOTRE DAME CITATION

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record, I insert the text of the citation to Congressman Lowenstein:

Placing principle over party, you have proven yourself a person of unusual integrity and ability. A true crusader against injustice, you appear to us an example of what a legislator and an educator in this tumultuous era should be. You have made many courageous stands throughout your life. Although many of us might disagree with much of what you have said or done at specific times, we all hail the spirit of honesty and the courage which motivated your actions.

Mr. Speaker, I should like here to observe that it is just 1 year since Congressman LOWENSTEIN's prophetic class day address at Harvard University in which he warned that hate multiplies hate and violence multiplies violence in a descending spiral of destruction. He said on that occasion:

It is not too late to show that those of us who love this country next only to liberty and justice themselves—who are proud of the work and sacrifice and miracles that have produced America, and that America has produced—it is not too late to show that we are determined not to abandon this country but to reclaim it, not to leave the arena to those who would force a choice between Ronald Reagan and the SDS, but rather to pick up where we were a year ago this week-end.

CONGRESSMAN LOWENSTEIN CHEERED AT NOTRE DAME

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record, I wish to insert excerpts from an article in the South Bend, Ind., Tribune:

U.S. Rep. Allard K. Lowenstein, D-N.Y., received the University of Notre Dame senior class fellow award Tuesday night in Washington Hall as more than 1,200 wildly cheered their approval of the congressman.

The 41-year-old representative criticized the Nixon administration's handling of finances and military efforts, and then challenged the young people to make a peaceful fight to unite the country . . .

"You can't say that we can't do it, the kind of turning that is needed. It's tougher now because we've had a lot of heartbreaks. There's too much at stake to quit."

He quoted what Robert Kennedy said on the night of Martin Luther King's assassination. "One thing is sure, violence breeds violence."

Said Lowenstein, "It means a great deal to me to come back to Notre Dame during this commemoration of what we would like to be able to say about our country. We're a people at Valley Forge, but we've been to Valley Forge before.

"We will unite and become a nation indivisible. We must let the President know we are in a fight to save our country and let one thing be made clear—we will prevail."

At the conclusion of his speech the students gave him a five-minute standing ovation, the second such ovation of the evening. The students were jammed into the auditorium, they were sitting in all the aisles, and stairways, filling the stage behind Lowenstein and standing shoulder to shoulder in the stage wings."

CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARD POLICE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a letter written by John J. Harrington, of Philadelphia, president of the Fraternal Order of Police, a national police organization. This letter appeared in a number of newspapers over the country, including the Cleveland Plain Dealer. It sums up succinctly the crime problem and the relation of the police to that problem.

I would also like to comment upon an article on the police which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, May 18. The Times story, one of a series, emphasized that many of the Negro residents of the inner city no longer regard the police as enemies but depend increasingly upon the officers for protection. The Times also refers to Commissioner Frank Rizzo of the Philadelphia Police Department and his program of strict, but fair, law enforcement, which has had an increasingly high level of support from the public. The Times said that "Mr. Rizzo's efficient administration enjoys the support of much of Philadelphia's black community."

Mr. Harrington was on the Philadelphia police force for more than 20 years, at one time a colleague of Commissioner Rizzo. He has been a strong supporter of the commissioner.

Under Harrington's leadership, the Fraternal Order of Police is thriving and will continue to thrive. For, as I see it, the FOP president has grasped some essential truths. One is that law enforcement must be firm. The public must cooperate with the police to insure stability, safe streets, and curbing of hoodlums, and the curtailment of crime. So long as the large sections of our cities are so crime ridden that business is conducted under constant criminal attack, there can be none of the city restoration and renewal our planners are talking about.

The new businesses which they hope to bring in will face the same insuperable hazards which already have crippled vast areas of our biggest municipalities. If respect for and maintenance of law are restored, the task of city renewal is comparatively easy.

We have been going through a period which has put an almost intolerable burden on our police forces. They have been faced not only with an increase in crime but with demonstrations of various kinds and in some instances have had to deal with extremist groups, some of which have openly urged the slaying of police officers. Moreover, policemen are underpaid and most forces are understaffed—and no wonder in view of what the average officer has to face, day in and day out.

Nevertheless, there is some comfort in the fact that, more and more, the average citizen, particularly in our big cities, is coming to understand and appreciate the vital role a policeman plays. I am confident that the police forces of this coun-

try are more popular today than they have ever been.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I enter in the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Harrington's letter which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Wednesday, April 1, 1970, and an article in the New York Times of May 8, by Mr. Jack Rosenthal:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Apr. 1, 1970]

READER'S FORUM—FOP OFFERS CRIME CURB PROGRAM

I am national president of the Fraternal Order of Police, an organization composed of active police officers. The FOP has approximately 120,000 members in more than 40 states. I, myself, served for 26 years with the Philadelphia police force.

My experience and the experience of other officers and members of the FOP have led to some conclusions about the crime problem. Let me state them briefly.

Our police forces must enforce the law firmly, but fairly and without fear or favor. Where there is political or outside interference, the result, almost invariably, is to discourage the policeman, encourage the criminal and penalize the law abiding citizen.

Effective law enforcement by police officers cannot wait upon the elimination of poverty, ignorance and other deplorable conditions which some persons hold to be the cause of lawlessness. These conditions have been with us since civilization began and will be here indefinitely. The theory that society is responsible for crime has done enough damage already, being responsible for lenience towards lawbreakers, including court decisions which have shielded the criminal at the expense of his victim and the populace.

Police pay is far too low and the conditions under which most officers work so bad that crime will not be curbed or abated until the situation is remedied. No wonder that so many police forces are below their authorized strength and that finding good men who will take the punishment which the work entails is becoming more and more difficult.

The handling of criminals and criminal cases by the courts is so backward, chaotic and confused that the entire system has almost broken down. This system must be completely overhauled. Until this job is done, much of the money now being spent by the government, the states, counties and municipalities to combat crime will be wasted.

Many other things need doing but first things first. The FOP is going to exercise all its influence to insist that the police carry out a no-nonsense policy where crime and criminals are concerned. This is an imperative first step in dealing with the country's major problem.

JOHN J. HARRINGTON,

National President, Fraternal Order of Police.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1970]

THE CITIES: POLICE ROLE SHIFTING—NEW EXPERTISE AIDS IN EASING TENSIONS OF MANY AREAS

(By Jack Rosenthal)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—Wes Uhlman, the young, mod Mayor of Seattle, was anxious. His police force felt it could handle a major peace demonstration not long ago. But then, two days before the march, the Justice Department indicted eight of the march leaders.

Mayor Uhlman and Police Chief Frank Moore settled on a hasty but creative stratagem. When 200 policemen took their places at the demonstration, they brandished billy clubs, each of which was adorned with a fresh daffodil.

Apparently it worked. The young demonstrators were astonished—and peaceful. The

pleased police promptly dubbed the Mayor an "honorary pig."

The incident illustrates a major development in big-city law enforcement evident in cities across the country: the rapidly increasing sophistication and professionalism of police agencies.

This is a development paralleled by a pronounced change evident in the principal law enforcement concern of black city neighborhoods. Long angered by what they saw as police brutality, ghetto residents now are shifting their primary emphasis to the need for more police protection.

The shift is not universal. In some cities, such as Boston, Chicago, Augusta, Ga., and Jackson, Miss., recent clashes between the police and Negroes or white students have stirred up new bitterness. But in many other settings, where enhanced police sensitivity is evident, the first plea of blacks is not for less police brutality but for more police.

Taken together, in the judgment of law enforcement officers questioned in such diverse cities as Seattle, Detroit, St. Louis, Philadelphia, Birmingham, Ala., and San Antonio, Tex., these two developments may do much to avert confrontation and mass disorder as the summer approaches.

"I think police are learning to meet the people half way," says Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. "And I think the community is learning to meet the police half way. We're not at a meeting yet, but both sides are going in the right direction."

The styles of professionalism vary dramatically. Police Commissioner Frank Rizzo of Philadelphia is hefty, outspoken and widely popular for his often dramatic law-and-order posture. (He once rushed to a disturbance directly from a formal dinner and was photographed at the scene, a billy club stuffed into his cummerbund.)

Detroit's new Police Commissioner, Patrick V. Murphy, is small, soft-spoken and so far has shunned public attention. Mr. Rizzo wears a blue suit, buttoned, and a bold striped tie for an interview. Mr. Murphy sits in shirtsleeves and a tie figured with the scales of justice.

For all the contrasts in style, however, both men stress the same theme of professionalism.

Though criticized after several recent asserted incidents of brutality, Mr. Rizzo's efficient administration enjoys the support of much of Philadelphia's black community. And he has attracted the admiration of visiting law enforcement officials for his professional management.

"How can he possibly get so large a proportion of his force out on the street?" one observer asks.

Mr. Murphy, though in office only four months, already has won wide credit, from ghetto and industry leaders alike, for improving the quality of police work.

Even Carl Parsell, president of the Detroit Police Officers Association, a frequent critic of police management, says: "He's a first-rate administrator. We're handling incidents a little better now. We've got better training, better intelligence. We're learning not to overreact."

Enhanced professionalism is manifested in different ways around the country.

The St. Louis police, recognizing the importance of community confidence, now conduct police entrance examinations not just at headquarters, but also at neighborhood Urban League offices, seeking to increase the 14 per cent proportion of Negro officers.

The International Association of Chiefs of Police is distributing a film of what Mr. Tamm describes as "the model way" the Washington, police handled a peace demonstration last fall.

In Birmingham, Ala., a third of the members of the force either have college degrees or are taking police-related courses. In

Seattle, police recruits receive training in crisis intervention. In San Antonio, Tex., Anglo and Mexican-American officers routinely patrol side by side.

In Detroit, Mr. Murphy was confronted with community tension because of police shootings. In response, he did not sermonize, but asked only that every time a patrolman fired his weapon, the officer's sergeant submit a detailed report.

"The number of shootings has declined," Mr. Murphy observed drily. "It's not just that sergeants don't like to write reports. This is a way to motivate them to give more training to their men at roll call."

Police brutality on insensitivity remain serious concerns in many black communities. But reforms like these have made a dent.

"The mistrust of the police is not as great as it was several years ago," says Sam Smith, Negro member of the City Council in Seattle. "The number of police brutality cases is down considerably."

CRIME INCREASING

Crime, however, continues to increase, creating a climate strongly favoring intensified control.

In St. Louis, voters recently approved overwhelmingly a city sales tax—to pay for law enforcement improvements. In Detroit, Lynn Townsend, president of the Chrysler Corporation, says: "If crime continues to increase much longer, I fear a lot of people are going to call for more police measures than a lot of us in the country want."

It is in the urban ghettos, where violent crime rates run four and five times those of the suburbs, that the concern is most dramatically expressed.

The Oakland Lion, a Detroit Ghetto neighborhood paper, recently displayed a large picture of an angry Negro grocer wielding an ancient shotgun. The caption said, "The next robber to cross his door is a dead man."

Mr. Parsell of the Detroit police association says: "Not so long ago, black leaders were talking about the police being the 'army of occupation.' Now the black clubs are going down to the Common Council asking for more police."

The Rev. Buck Jones, a leader in the Carr-Vaughn area of St. Louis gestures to tall rows of abandoned public housing towers.

"So long as people are afraid, you're not going to get anybody to live here without security," he says.

In Philadelphia, a former gang leader says, "I admit they're a little rough, but let's be 50-50. What would we do without the police? And constantly jumping on the police doesn't make them one bit better, either."

Henry S. Ruth, director of the National Institute of Criminal Justice, observes: "A much larger proportion of the black community now is willing to tolerate police infringement of the rights of young hoodlums. Five years ago, it would have denounced such infringements as racist. Now black communities are scared of the young hoodlums."

This apparent drawing together of police and ghetto residents is no full guarantee of urban quiet this summer, officials say. There are substantial unknowns.

"Mob violence may be less of a concern now," says one chief, requesting anonymity. "What I really wonder about is the possibility of unpredictable individual action by fellows who think of themselves as guerrillas."

A second imponderable in some cities, is white radical activity. A big-city Mayor, who would not be quoted by name, says: "It's hard to be professional, let alone liberal, with such a strong law-and-order tide running in the country. But I think we have credibility with the black community. I think we can cool it this summer."

But the white radicals? My god! They're not kids. They're not students. They're not

rational. They're nihilists. The great danger is that what they're doing will bring down repression on everybody, especially the blacks."

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR MILLIKEN

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been concerned over the violence which has torn the Nation over the past few years. Violent dissent endangers the very institutions which have protected the right to dissent in this Nation. In a brilliant address to the Associated Press annual awards dinner in Michigan, Gov. William Milliken outlined the challenges and opportunities which dissent affords the Nation and the dangers which are posed by turning that dissent to violence.

I insert Governor Milliken's remarks at this point in the RECORD and I commend them to every Member of Congress for their thoughtfulness and perceptiveness:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR MILLIKEN

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Tonight I want to talk to you about some of my concerns for the safety of private citizens and the preservation of public institutions. I have chosen this subject first of all because I feel that it is important and timely, and secondly because as thinkers and communicators I believe you will give it the fair hearing and the reasoned discussion that it deserves.

I believe one of the most important and one of the most dangerous developments in this country today is the growing acceptance of violence and disruption for achieving social change.

Hardly a day passes when the forces of chaos have not gained new recruits. Every group wants more than it has—more money, more power, more of whatever it considers important—and the fashion today is to get it through disruption and violence.

Teachers and college professors, perhaps more than any other segment of society, can attest to the growing use of violence. The groves of academe are no longer necessarily quiet places of research and contemplation; in many instances they have become the scenes of guerrilla warfare. And as most of you know, the hooliganism that has disrupted many universities has already spread to some of our high schools.

Fortunately, many faculty members are becoming alarmed about this growing danger to academic freedom. A group of 500 faculty members at the University of Michigan placed ads in Michigan newspapers deploring violence on the campus. And just recently, a group of leading scholars and teachers at Columbia University formed an organization to fight campus violence.

In their first public statement, these Columbia scholars clearly described the danger that violence on the campus posed to society in general. They said—and I quote:

"Centers of education, inquiry and discussion, where people can meet together without fear and with the understanding that all questions may be asked and no answers forbidden, are indispensable to the adequate solution of any social problem we face. If these centers are crippled, the condition of our society, no matter what else happens, will be substantially worse."

Let me make it clear that the kind of violence and disruption that I am talking about is not restricted to the college campus.

Everywhere we look, we can see evidence of a growing willingness to flaunt the law—not necessarily individually but also collectively.

Postal workers stage an illegal strike to get more wages. Garbage workers defy court orders to return to work. Teachers, welfare mothers, truck drivers, policemen, firemen, air traffic controllers and many other groups defy the law to press their demands and obtain satisfaction for their grievances.

Now I am not attacking any one of these groups for seeking to redress their grievances. The plain fact is that injustice in this society is very real and very widespread. The plain fact is that many teachers are not paid enough in relation to their contribution to society, that many policemen and firemen are poorly paid in relation to the risks they take and the sacrifices they make, and that welfare mothers who fight a desperate war against hunger and despair deserve more help.

But above all of these facts of life in 1970 America hovers a more important reality—that the institutions of democracy can stand only so much battering and so much abuse before they collapse in the face of this angry onslaught.

Our system of government is built upon the rule of the majority. It is not a perfect system, because what the majority wants at any given time is not always clear. Furthermore, at any given time the majority may be far from perfect. At one time it may be misinformed. At another time it may be simply wrong. At another point in time it may be silent. As a matter of fact, it may be all of these things at the same time. But it is the majority, and over the long run it is more often right, better informed, and more dependable in its judgment than any minority could ever be.

That is what democracy is all about. The fact that it does not always work the way it should does not permit us to discard it in favor of anarchy, or in favor of a revolution that would leave us with some vague and undefined form of government which could be worse, far worse, than what we have now.

In what I am saying tonight, I am not speaking out against speaking, picketing, writing, marching, demonstrating, or any other legitimate form of dissent. I believe that during the Sixties great social progress resulted from this kind of protest.

But as we move into the Seventies, we are seeing an ugly turn in the direction of protest. Many people have become impatient with the non-violent forms of protest which worked so successfully in the civil rights revolution. They have turned instead to the rock-throwing, window smashing, disruptive brand of protest motivated not so much by compassion for the aggrieved as it is by hatred of the oppressor, real or imagined.

The great danger in this turn of events is that those who commit violence in the name of dissent could, in the process, destroy the right of dissent.

I believe very strongly that this right of dissent is part of the genius of American democracy. It was carefully woven into the Constitution, and for nearly two centuries, men who believed in liberty have scrupulously guarded it against attacks designed to reduce it or to abolish it altogether.

However an individual might feel about these violent forms of dissent, the mood of the American public must be taken into account. And the reality is that the American public is angry and disturbed by violence, and I believe has just about reached the limits of its patience.

And this is where the perpetrators of violence are in danger of destroying the right of dissent altogether. For the real possibility exists that today's violent and excessive dissent could become tomorrow's violent and excessive repression.

No one who places the slightest value on

free speech would like to see that happen. The best way to prevent it, it seems to me, is for dissenters to use their powers of protest wisely, in a way that does not bring injury to people and damage to property. We cannot, and we will not, sacrifice the rights and privileges of the lawful citizen in an attempt to satisfy the grievances of those who break the law.

I am sometimes appalled at the way in which the advocates of violence ignore the harm its victims endure. When a handful of militant students invade classrooms and break equipment, they victimize thousands of students who are there to obtain an education. When anarchists set the ghettos on fire, they destroy the only place where poor people have to live.

The advocates of violence in this society conveniently ignore the suffering which their violence inflicts on people. They excuse their violence in the name of some abstract cause, refusing to admit that violence only begets violence, or that the means do not justify the ends.

Let me say again that the causes of dissidents in this society are very often good causes. We can no longer excuse the existence of hunger in America, of poverty, of racism, pollution, and injustice. But breaking windows, setting off bombs, firing at patrol cars, burning buildings will not make these evils disappear.

We can save democracy only by setting fire to the conscience of America. With words, not bombs, we must stir this great sleeping majority out of its sleep. With work, not bullets, we must make these great encrusted institutions—the universities, the government, the corporations, the courts, and the public schools—we must make them human, make them responsive, and equip them with ears that can hear the complaints of the aggrieved minorities in this land.

In a recent column, James Reston put it this way: "The astonishing thing in this fabulously rich country is not that so many people are organizing and protesting against war, inequality, crime, inflated prices, shoddy work, poor services, and polluted streams and politics, but that so many people tolerate all this through feelings of indifference or helplessness, and leave the resolution of public disputes to the warfare of organized minorities."

We have to reverse this situation, and we have to do it now. I wish there were an easy way to inject new blood into our tired institutions. I wish it were as easy as the militants seem to think—that if we destroy them some race of geniuses will suddenly appear to rebuild them in perfect form.

No, our society will not be perfected by turmoil and violence. It will be perfected only by decent people putting their anger and their frustration and their discontent to work to make things better.

To make our system of justice truly blind, so that the poor and the powerless will receive the same kind of justice as the rich and the powerful.

To make our universities more representative of the country's racial composition, so that poor blacks can aspire to the same rewards of the affluent society as whites receive.

To make the huge, ungainly bureaucracies of government—local, state and federal—responsive to the needs of people. To make the political parties more truly representative of the people's aspirations and the people's thinking.

To end poverty so that welfare mothers won't be prompted to picket. To end racism so that neither race will be prompted to shoot. To end economic injustice so that policemen and firemen and teachers and postal workers won't be prompted to strike to receive what society truly owes them for their work.

Above all, to put an end to hatred and violence. To end the hatred between blacks and whites, between rich and poor, between young and old. To stop shouting and showing, and to start talking to each other in voices of mutual respect and tolerance.

I am worried, but I am not pessimistic. I am not pessimistic because for all its faults—my faith and hopes for this country rest ultimately on my belief in the decency and

good sense of the majority—the people, black and white, who know that the law is all that stands between them and tyranny.

In our impatience with this majority, we sometimes lose sight of its virtues. It takes a man who knows his history, a great historian like Will Durant, to know what forces have really written the story of civilization. He wrote: "Civilization is a stream with banks. The stream is sometimes filled with

blood from people killing, stealing, shouting and doing the things historians usually record, while on the banks, unnoticed, people build homes, make love, raise children, sing songs, write poetry and even whittle statues. The story of civilization is the story of what happens on the banks. Historians are pessimists because they ignore the banks for the river."

Thank you.

SENATE—Wednesday, June 10, 1970

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of our lives, Light of Lights, we need Thee every day and everywhere—at home, in the office, in public expression, and in this Chamber. Draw us and all men close to Thee that we may be closer to one another.

Spare us from mistaking a prejudice for a principle, or a superstition for a faith. Make Thy presence real and Thy guidance clear to us.

Give us courage to make brave choices, and wisdom to make the right ones; and grant us faith, having made our choices in the fear of God, to flee all doubts and regrets, and leave the consequences to Thy providence.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. 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 legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 14306) to amend the tobacco marketing provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN).

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of

the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 9, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time, in accordance with the previous order, the Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

A FAIR PRICE FOR CATTLE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, during the past year and particularly during the past few months, we have heard with increasing frequency the disturbing suggestion that it may be time for drastic action to increase the flow of foreign beef into this country.

The meat import quota system has come under attack by a congressional subcommittee having little visible jurisdiction over either farming or foreign trade, the mayor of a great eastern metropolis, and a number of others. Periodically rumors circulate that meat prices are about to go up unless some means is found to weaken the existing import regulation.

Confronted with this consistent and increasing agitation for a relaxing of beef import quotas, it seems appropriate to remind this body today of the reasons for the meat import law, the dangers of tampering with it, and the role of the cattle industry in this country.

Mr. President, my remarks will deal with the following four points:

First, the cattle industry is vital to a stable agricultural economy, an integral phase of our national economy.

Second, the near-disaster of 1963, in which our cattle markets were nearly destroyed, must never be repeated.

Third, the price of cattle today is no higher than it was 20 years ago.

Fourth, we face a serious problem today because of heavy imports during the early months of 1970.

TEN BASIC PROPOSITIONS

First, imported beef, if at a disproportionate volume, has a direct and depressing effect on cattle and agricultural prices in the United States. It also has an adverse effect on jobs in America.

Second. The import quota law on beef is reasonable and fair. It does not prohibit imports. It is based on a historical import volume, and is adjusted each year by the increase in U.S. production.

Third. The farmer and rancher does not sell beef. He sells cattle. A differentiation should be made.

Fourth. Cattle are selling today for about the same—or even a little less—number of current dollars as they sold for in 1950–51—20 years ago. In terms of constant dollars, they are selling for about 40 percent less than 20 years ago.

Fifth. Meat prices, including beef, have not increased disproportionately. In the past 10 years, retail prices of meat increased about 21 percent. In that same period, the following table shows other increases:

Increased costs 1970 over 1960	
	Percent
Retail meat—average.....	20.7
Average—all food.....	29.6
Average cost of all consumer services other than rent.....	46.3
Average hourly wage for nonagricultural workers.....	50.7

Sixth. Average wages for nonagricultural workers rose 50.7 percent from 1960 to 1970. They were \$1.44 per hour in 1950. In 1970, they were \$3.32.

Seventh. For these wage increases, we rejoice. But compare this with choice steers in Chicago: In 1950 at \$29.68 per 100 pounds; in 1970 at \$30.52, as of June 4. About the same, notwithstanding the passage of 20 years' time.

Eighth. U.S. cattle producers have the capacity to meet any increased demand which the rise in population and increased beef consumption will place upon them. They have historically and consistently done this in the past. In