

He was very, very interested in some step such as this being taken.

Furthermore, Mr. Lloyd Cutler, a very prominent and outstanding member of the Washington bar, who served as administrative director of the Commission, did a great deal of legal research on the matter and was very helpful in phrasing and constructing the language of this bill. It then went to the Department of Justice, where other research and rewriting was done. There also was consultation with the two Members of the other body who served on the Commission—to wit, Representative HALE BOGGS and Representative WILLIAM McCULLOCH, of Louisiana and Ohio, respectively.

I mention those things to indicate that this is a well-considered measure, one which has been carefully thought out. It is my hope that it will be promptly considered by the proper subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and later by this body itself.

Mr. HART. I share that hope, and I share the statement just made by the Senator from Nebraska that it was carefully developed. This does not mean that as we study it further in committee, improvement may not be made. It is conceivable that this initial draft falls short of the objective we seek or includes a feature which none of us at the moment is aware of but which would be subject to legitimate objection.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HART. The point of the hearing, however, is to identify any such areas and to permit us to improve, and, most important, to permit us to move as a result of that further thoughtful study.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct in saying that there is room for considering any suggestion for amendment or improvement, either by way of widening or by way of restricting. In fact,

from the time of the report as it was issued by the Commission until its introduction today, many alterations have been made. So that process can continue when the matter is brought before the committee and is later brought to the floor of the Senate. I feel that this Senator and the Senator from Michigan would be very receptive to anything that would be constructive and helpful to make a well-balanced bill.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I described my feeling, and I know that it conforms to his. I hope that the Commission on Violence will not be cited as one of those long list of commissions which file a report and then, 15 years later, when someone stumbles over it and opens it and reads it, he discovers a long list of recommendations on which no action has been taken. This bill gives Congress the opportunity to respond affirmatively to one of the most important recommendations which the Violence Commission made.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the statement of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Michigan. Several weeks ago, I read an account of the recommendations of the National Commission on the Cause and Prevention of Violence, chaired by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, on this subject, and I was happy to hear the explanation given by the two distinguished Senators from Nebraska and Michigan.

I am sure that there will be questions arising as to the application and use of the injunction; nevertheless, it certainly seems to me that the purpose of the bill, which will be thoroughly considered by the two Senators and their colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary, is a good one.

Those who claim to have the right of free speech and dissent, and of petition to the Government, do not have the right

to deny those same first amendment rights to others by the use of violence.

It seems to me that is simple to understand. But I still believe that we will have some difficulty working it out, but its purpose is right.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Kentucky may be right. The Senator knows, of course, that, generally, the right to an injunction and a temporary restraining order is available in many situations just like this. An effort has been made to get the essence of the decisional law in this field embodied into the bill, so as to make it a matter of statutory procedure rather than a general principle of injunctive law.

Mr. COOPER. I know there have been some trials in my State of Kentucky recently, in the Federal courts, on the general principle of this same subject, involving the rights of students, faculties, and the administration of the University of Kentucky. Thus, I have already received some information on this subject.

But it seems to me, as both Senators from Nebraska and Michigan have pointed out, that it is wrong for those who militantly claim their rights, at the same time to deny those very same rights to others.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 17, 1970, at 11 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE CITADEL

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, The Citadel is a distinguished institution of learning in Charleston, S.C. Throughout its 127-year history, it has stood for the finest in character, education, and patriotism. Today it stands in marked contrast with many other institutions of higher education, a fact which has not gone unnoticed across the land.

California's remarkable commissioner of education, Dr. Max Rafferty, is also a fine newspaper columnist, who frequently writes on the problems of education. In a recent column, Dr. Rafferty pays tribute to the historic tradition of the Citadel, and heaps high praise upon the institution.

I am delighted that Dr. Rafferty should see fit to honor a South Carolina tradition in this way, and I would like to bring this column to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "View of the Citadel," written by Dr. Max Rafferty, and published in the Charleston News and Courier of June 11, 1970, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

VIEW OF THE CITADEL

(By Max Rafferty)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This syndicated column by Max Rafferty, superintendent of education for California, has appeared in numerous daily newspapers.)

"Whatever happened to the strict, no-nonsense military school, where boys were turned into men and where patriotism was a state of mind to be proud of instead of an object of official scorn?"

Hear ye the authentic voice of an awful lot of American fathers. You'd be surprised how many worried dads write to me in this vein. They look unbelievably about them at the well-publicized college campus of today, bristling with beards, fraught with filth, dripping with disloyalty, and they say, "Oh, no! Am I going to have to spend \$15,000 to send my kid to THAT?"

Buck up, dad. What would you say to a small but thoroughly accredited college in

an ancient setting teeming with tradition, where for 127 years a dedicated staff has been graduating class after class of young men whose academic excellence is exceeded only by their love of country and their healthy reverence for the great traditions out of our national past?

A college which proudly stresses its Cadet Corps of 2,000 men but which also emphasizes a fine general education for 4,000 other students? An institution of higher learning where every member of the faculty is a distinguished former military officer?

(Editor's note: The "general education for 4,000 other students" refers to the master of arts in teaching program, the evening program, the summer school, summer camp for boys and Palmetto Boys State. The statement that every faculty member is a former military officer is a mistake. Many faculty members are retired, or reserve officers, but some are not.)

Incredible, you say, in this day and age? Not if you know about The Citadel. In case you don't let me tell you what I found out a short time ago when I flew back to South Carolina to check up on these "incredible" rumors I'd been hearing about a school which actually and openly stood for decency and loyalty and high scholastic standards.

First, its home town of Charleston is proud of The Citadel. It has been since it was founded. This is a bit of a switch these days,

when the residents of so many of our college towns are sick at heart over the nauseating antics of their local students and faculties. Charleston isn't at all sick about The Citadel. Quite the contrary.

Second, and closely connected with Charleston's pride in its college, is the remarkable record of its graduates in the service of their country. Fifteen fell for the Flag in World War I; 280 died in World War II; and 31 in Korea.

Hundreds are now grimly at grips with America's enemies in Vietnam. Apparently the men of The Citadel stand ready to put their lives where their mouths are, a phenomenon all too rarely encountered among our hysterical college activists.

Indeed, it has been always thus. Cadets of The Citadel fought for the Confederate States at Yemassee Station in 1864 while helping to defend the Charleston and Savannah Railroad, and their descendants fight as gallantly today for Old Glory as their predecessors did for the Stars and Bars.

I met two of the cadet commanders in the office of Citadel President Hugh Harris, who is a four-star general, retired. One of the boys was from California, the other from South Carolina. Tremendous young fellows, with shoulders like a bison and a grip like a vise. Clear-eyed. Straight-talking. My kind of collegians.

Third and perhaps most important is the caliber of The Citadel's leadership. Gen. Harris is the latest in a long line of distinguished presidents who have recently included Gens. Mark Clark and Charles Summerall. Over the years, they have consistently stood for strict discipline, high standards, and a liberal education in the best sense of that term.

So, dad take hope and heart. There may not be many Citadels still going strong, but there are some. The boys who attend must be unmarried, they must live in barracks and they must behave like gentlemen. They work hard, they go to chapel and their athletic teams are honored throughout the South.

Now, dad, the rest is up to you. What The Citadel can do, other colleges can do also, if you just start sending Junior to institutions like this one instead of to the pot-puffing, obscenely placarded, confrontation-minded colleges where your son and thousands of other men's sons wind up these days, largely as the result of sheer apathy and yawning indifference on your part.

It's your money, you know. You can spend it to subsidize centers of sex, drugs and treason, or you can spend it on citadels of scholarship, morality and patriotism. It's still a free country.

And certainly the answer you come up with is going to be important to you. But it's going to be one heck of a lot more lastingly important to your son.

THE BURDEN OF INFLATION

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as this Nation is burdened by the continuation of inflationary pressures, coupled with some movement toward recession, it is painfully apparent that the administration's total reliance on monetary restraints is not adequate. Within the last few weeks it was announced that the President's slim budget surplus turned into a deficit, but the burden of inflation

is much more graphically reflected in rising food, clothing, and housing costs. The most tragic aspect of this current inflation is the increase of unemployment. During May, the unemployment levels reached 5 percent. There were over 4.1 million persons looking for jobs. This was an increase of 1.3 million over the December figure. Our production has slipped badly and the stock market has reflected this economic malaise. It is necessary to realize that the unemployment figures do not represent slow downs and shorter hours that effect many wage earners. The economic situation for most people in our society represents a dire threat. Wages chase prices without any chance of catching up.

In this economically troubled time, the "business as usual" attitude has little academic or more importantly humanitarian appeal. In recent weeks Arthur Burn has indicated that some wage price guidelines might be advisable. In a recent article Harvard Economist John Kenneth Galbraith recommended a wage price freeze for 6 months for major companies employing more than 100 people.

It is now reported that the President on Wednesday will implement voluntary wage price controls as symbolic attempts to curb inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the economic condition of this Nation requires more than cosmetic changes. It is past time for such symbolic gestures. An enforced system of wage price controls should be implemented.

I am including John Kenneth Galbraith's article for the benefit of readers of the RECORD:

[From the New York Times magazine, June 7, 1970]

PROFESSOR GALBRAITH RELUCTANTLY RECOMMENDS WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS—THE CURE FOR RUNAWAY INFLATION

(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

These last few months have, just possibly, been decisive in the modern history of economics. Ideas in which economists have reposed the greatest confidence have been proved wrong and therewith, not surprisingly, the responding policy. And this has happened under circumstances which admit of no really plausible explanation, rationalization, or alibi—things in which we economists are more than minimally accomplished. There was, to be sure, more than a suspicion of error before; the evidence was highly adverse to the reputable ideas. But the heretics were a minority and the adverse evidence could be attributed to a lag. In economics, any inconvenient disassociation of effect from cause is always attributed to a lag. But not forever.

The doctrine was, of course, that the United States economy could be regulated by general measures in such manner that prices would be approximately stable. A "trade-off," a new and popular word among economists, would exist between price stability and employment. The closer the approach to level prices, the more people who would be out of work; the lower the unemployment, the greater the rate of price increase. The relationship had been given quantitative expression by the so-called Phillips curve—the annual rate of price increase which, on the basis of historical data, could be expected to accompany any particular percentage of unemployment in the labor force. The choice between unemployment and inflation so shown seemed to be essentially benign—reasonable price stability could be combined with a tol-

erable level of unemployment. Also, an unspoken point, the unemployment would be among the unskilled, uneducated, mostly young and black, who are also unorganized. These are assumed to accept unemployment philosophically, there being nothing they can do about it. There were no other decisively adverse side effects from the stabilization measures.

The difference of opinion was not over the efficacy of the general measures but over technique. Since Keynes, most economists have placed major reliance on fiscal measures—on control of total spending in the economy by means of the Federal budget. Inflation being the problem, this policy consisted in making Federal taxes and spending sufficiently restraining on total demand in the economy. But in recent times there has been the so-called monetary revival. This makes control of spending from borrowed funds the key instrument in the control of prices. The difference between the exponents of fiscal and monetary management must not be exaggerated. Both believed in the efficacy of general measures. Both urged some combination of fiscal and monetary measures. The difference was in the mix.

The Nixon economists when they came to office a year ago last January were superlatively confident of such management. Under their guidance, the President promised never to interfere with wages and prices; in one of the more ecstatic examples of economic phrase-making, he said that inflation would be ended by "fine-tuning" the American economy—a figure of speech roughly comparable with one about fine-tuning major Mississippi flood. The then current inflation was blamed on the previous bad management of the economy—on tuning that was too coarse. The reaction to anyone who suggested that wage and price restraint might be necessary was lofty. Pierre Rinfret, the consulting economist, dispatching a letter to his clients telling them, quite correctly, that so far as the Administration was concerned, the lid on prices was now off. It is possible that in these first weeks the Administration did more to promote inflation than it accomplished in the next year and a half in controlling it.

But promises that inflation would end were not lacking. Advising the President of the United States on economic policy, since few Presidents find the subject at all interesting, is tedious work. The tedium is relieved, after a fashion, by the liturgical functions of the office. Every week in the year some convocation of businessmen, bankers, economic sages or professional seers is assembling somewhere in the United States. Often combining business with tax deductibility, they meet at the better spas. All of these—the South Florida Savings Bank Association, the John Hancock Million Dollar Club, the Associated Sport and Saddle Shoe Manufacturers of America—have a prescriptive right to economic education by members of the Council of Economic Advisers. The speeches so given are not always informative. But they are firmly repetitious and during the first year and a half of the Nixon Administration, all promised that inflation would end, that prices would become stable.

Always the stability would come approximately two quarters in the future. As the promises continued, so at an increasing rate did the inflation. (In time, the date when the promise would give way to performance was given a little more "lag.") Dr. Paul W. McCracken, the head of the Council of Economic Advisers, became, perhaps, the most overpromised man in the history of the economics profession. There is an unfortunate tendency in public life when you want something to happen to predict that it will happen. And then when it does not happen, you escalate the predictions. Not since Herbert Hoover predicted the turning of the immortal corner has prediction

therapy been so remorselessly pursued as in the last 18 months. It was called the "game plan" for defeating inflation. There has been no game quite like it since the Rose Bowl of 1929, when Roy Riegels ran 75 yards toward the wrong goal.

Outside the Administration, the view was slightly less sanguine. But the economists who had served the Kennedy-Johnson Administration did not strongly question the reliance on general measures. In the early sixties, prices were fairly stable. Unemployment, though initially high, was falling—from an annual average of 6.7 per cent of the labor force in 1961 to 4.5 in 1965. These were the years of the so-called guideposts, which meant that wage increases were held on the average to what industry generally could afford from productivity gains. And industry accordingly was persuaded to forgo price increases. Enforcement was hortatory; it was a price increase by U.S. Steel in violation of this general understanding that provoked President Kennedy's eloquent denunciation of the corporation in April, 1962. The economics underlying the guideposts obviously accords a prime determining role in price-making to unions and corporations. That is why they must be restrained. But this power is not greatly stressed in standard, macro-economic doctrine—roughly the economics of the textbooks—which holds that prices are set in markets, and respond well to changes in demand. So even in the Kennedy-Johnson years, the guideposts were the poor relation of economic policy. We economists greatly prefer to believe what we teach. When the guideposts later came under pressure from the Vietnam war, they were not strengthened but abandoned. As the Kennedy and Johnson economists returned to the campus, talk of wage and price restraint was muted. The guideposts were defended as a useful adjunct to the policy—more cosmetic than real: It was fiscal and monetary policy that really counted. Almost no one talked about making the guidelines mandatory, i.e., making them work. That was too radical.

There was never any strong proof that high employment and stable prices could be combined. Much of the proof antedated modern corporate price-making and collective bargaining. Rather there were hope and faith. But in economics, hope and faith coexist with great scientific pretension and also a deep desire for respectability. Fiscal and monetary measures in whatever mix are impeccably respectable, and the question of the particular mix is the kind of thing that can be resolved between gentlemen. Control of wages and prices has no similar standing. Its advocates have been thought to lack subtlety of mind and manners—to go too abruptly to the point. The sociology of economics is not without interest and by no means unimportant.

The flaw in the respectable doctrine is the appalling obduracy of circumstances. Wages do now shove up prices. Prices do pull up wages. The bargaining that produces the wage and price increases continues even under conditions of severe fiscal and monetary restraint. It is almost as though those engaged in collective bargaining and corporate price-making were out to discredit the best economic scholarship. Circumstances can be unbelievably cruel.

Accordingly, after a full year and a half of the most rigorous application of the general measures, prices are still rising at a nearly record rate. Dr. McCracken and his colleagues have been forced to take comfort from the fact that the rate at which the inflation is getting worse has been declining—or, as Herbert Stein of the Council of Economic Advisers did recently, from the even more exiguous fact that "the behavior of prices in the past year has been consistent with [the] expectation of a decline in the rate of in-

flation." In April, alas, even this modest expectation was defeated. There was an increase in the rate of inflation. Meanwhile unemployment has risen to nearly 5 per cent of the labor force and exceedingly uncomfortable side effects of the policy have appeared. Smaller businessmen who must borrow money are being punished with a highly selective brutality. Tight money does not much hurt the big corporation which has internal cash flow and a favored position at the banks. In contrast the policy has put the housing industry into an acute depression, as the Administration itself concedes. The continuing price increases in the private sector of the economy have been exported to the public sector as increases in living costs. And there, among teachers, police, firemen and sanitation workers, they are causing an unprecedented but wholly predictable turmoil. The balance of payments is also weakening again.

Finally, there has been the effect on the financial markets. These had been made vulnerable by jerry-built and debt-burdened conglomerates, overbitten glamour stocks and the multiplication of the mutual funds headed by financial geniuses whose genius consisted only in a rising market. Under the pressure of the tight money policy, this price structure has collapsed. This had to happen sometime. But further pressure on the financial market would be very uncomfortable for all involved.

Within the framework of general measures, there is almost nothing the Administration can do. It is trapped. It could allow an increase in loanable funds at lower rates. This would ease unemployment, encourage home construction and ease the sorrow in Wall Street. But inflation is still at a near-record rate. This action would make it worse. And just ahead are wage negotiations which, with the compensating price increases, will give that inflation another protean shove. To continue the present policy is to accept the side effects and to invite more of the inflation that the policy has not cured. To tighten up and end the inflation is to invite worse side effects and perhaps a serious recession. There are many misfortunes that can befall an economist. The worst, by far, is to have a theory in which he devoutly believes, and which is wrong, put into practice.

The response of the Administration economists to their entrapment is a rewarding study—or would be were the matter not so serious. Economics, like foreign policy, allows for an escape from error through what may be called the Indochina effect. This generous device enables a man who has been wrong to denounce his previous position without admitting error and, by becoming right, thus greatly to enhance his reputation. Arthur Burns, now Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has taken this route. He now demands the wage-price guideposts he previously condemned. His transmigration is still incomplete, for he proposes something less strong than the Kennedy-Johnson measures, which themselves proved too weak. Dr. McCracken has been more complex. He admits the cause but refuses the remedy. In a speech in Dallas this April, he noted that in the fourth quarter of 1969, labor costs per unit of output (which were about 75 per cent of total costs) were rising at an annual rate of 7 per cent. He then went on to say that "both evidence and theory are pretty clear that a rising cost level tends to mean a rising price level." Later he condemned controls. One thinks, somehow, of a fireman who finds fire to be a cause of property loss, but greatly opposes water as a way of putting it out.

For, in fact, the only answer is one that has for so long been dismissed as too disreputable. That is to act directly on the wage-price spiral—to have wage and price control where the spiral contributes actively to inflation.

This must be real control. Dr. Burns and

the economists of the Kennedy-Johnson period are ducking reality when they talk about a return to the voluntary guideposts. (As this goes to press, a pellmell rush is developing toward this particular escape hatch.) The guideposts will not do. They were not strong enough before; even stronger measures are now required. Also voluntary measures are highly discriminatory. They favor the individual or organization which refuses to comply and penalize those that are cooperative. This guarantees their eventual breakdown. And there is nothing to be said for billingsgate as an enforcement device. It is much better public practice to lay down fair firm rules after careful consultation with all concerned and then, when someone violates the rules, have resort to law.

Given wage and price controls, interest rates can be reduced for they will not have to carry the present burden of inflation control, which they cannot carry anyway. With lower rates, home construction would increase, the pressure on small business would be reduced, employment would rise, and all without a new surge of inflation. Were this policy combined with prompt withdrawal from Indochina—which would ease the pressure of demand and, a more important matter, restore our reputation for elementary good sense—the immediate economic problem would be largely solved.

Such price and wage action, it is said, interferes with free markets. This is self-evident nonsense. The policy interferes with markets in which the interference of unions and corporations is already plenary. It fixes in the public interest prices that are already fixed.

Only prices that are so set by unions and strong corporations need to be (or should be) controlled. Prices of farm products, most services and products of small manufacturers need not and should not be touched. These are still subject to market influences. Where prices are still set by the market, general measures to restrict demand still work—or they do as much as can be done. As one needs to set prices that are already set, one does not need to interfere with the market where the market still governs.

Over the years I have experimented with various ideas for such a limited system of wage and price control. (I am not without experience in the matter or in the difficulties involved. During World War II, price control was under my direction from its inception until mid-1943. No one else, I suppose, has ever fixed so many prices.) But the most practical pending proposal is not mine, but that of Robert Roosa, former Under Secretary of the Treasury under Kennedy and now a leading Wall Street banker. He would simply freeze all prices and wages for six months. During this time, presumably, there would be extensive consultation with firms and unions to work out a more durable system of restraint.

Such a course would get immediate results while offering eventual accommodation to the problems and inequities of particular unions and industries. It would be possible to incorporate in the Roosa proposal arrangements for an even earlier correction of gross irregularities. And immediately after the freeze, all small enterprises—those employing, say, fewer than a hundred people—should be exempted. I would also exempt all retail firms; they have little independent market power. The objective is not perfectly level prices, but something much better than the grossly inflationary thrust of the present wage-price spiral. The long-run objective is, of course, an annual wage gain that accords roughly with the increase in productivity and thus requires no general increase in prices.

Controls are not a temporary expedient. There must, alas, be a permanent system of restraint. That is because we will continue

to have strong unions and strong corporations and a desire to minimize unemployment. The combination, in the absence of controls, is inflationary. It will not become otherwise in the future.

No one who has had experience with wartime price control will be casual about the problems in managing it. Nor is it a formula for popularity; everyone unites in disliking the price-fixer. But if it is confined to the unions and to the corporations with market power, as here proposed, the administrative structure need not be vast. Dealings will be with only a few hundred unions and a few thousand firms, and for the latter it is sufficient to specify the limits within which average as distinct from individual prices may be moved. All price and wage control involves an arbitrary exercise of public power. But this is not an objection, for it replaces an arbitrary exercise of private power and one that has further and exceedingly arbitrary effects for those that suffer from the resulting inflation.

In the weeks and months ahead, more and more economists will come to accept the remedy here proposed—including, one suspects, those who advise the President. They are very decent men who have been substituting hope for reality, and hope unrequited does not sustain even an official economist forever. Promises of eventual price stability have become comic. Within the older framework of policy, the choice is between very severe inflation—worse than now—or severe unemployment, extreme distortion within the economy, great turmoil among public employes, and serious strain in the financial markets—and along with all this, a good deal of inflation, too. Whoever made respectable economic policy a choice between such repellent alternatives had obviously a bad upbringing and is a very mean man. But so it is. So the less reputable course of controlling the wage-price bargain obtrudes itself. And, since there is no escape, it will continue to obtrude itself.

LOOK HOMEWARD, ANGEL—ADDRESS BY DR. JACK H. ADAMSON

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on the 6th of June 1970, I was present at the Special Events Center at the University of Utah to witness the graduation ceremonies of the College of Letters and Science of the University of Utah. At that convocation, Dr. Jack H. Adamson delivered a very appealing and perceptive address to the graduating seniors. His analysis of the changes that have occurred in the past 20 years in this country and the present attitude and moods of college graduates today is both enlightening and moving.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Adamson's address, entitled "Look Homeward, Angel," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

LOOK HOMEWARD, ANGEL
(By Jack H. Adamson)

I was asked by the Dean, in a voice tinged with consideration for the graduates, their wives and parents, to give a brief address. This, I felt, was something of a challenge to my inheritance. For an ancestor of mine, a sturdy Scotch Calvinist, a man who believed

that virtue and pain were twin-born into this world, over three centuries ago in an open field near Edinburgh, had once distinguished the family by giving a sermon that lasted five hours, presumably without interruption of intermission. I have always admired this man, although I never knew which to admire more, his voice or his kidneys. There is no evidence that his heroic effort changed either the course of history or even one man's mind, but in a culture which has come to cherish world records, he was, at least, a qualifier.

I remember sitting through my own graduation, becoming a little anxious as I perceived that his record might be threatened, but aware too of the complacency and mutual satisfaction of parent, graduate and university, all secure in the knowledge of a job well done, of another generation disciplined and molded to suit the moods and needs of current society.

How different it is today when all three groups, I suspect, have their doubts, the parents wondering if their children have been intellectually or politically seduced, the students trying to decide if they have wasted all of their time or only a part of it, and the university itself perhaps feeling the deepest pain in knowing that it has satisfied neither of the other two.

It is natural that I, as a parent, should identify most with the parents who are here, those who have paid, not in money, but in the labor that produces money, who have traded part of their lives and a valuable part, for the education of children who have not been disciplined to the moods of society but who are rather disturbed, perhaps even angry, about the future that now lies ahead of them.

But I understand the students too, as much as a man of one generation can ever understand another, knowing that the young men, as well as the young women who love them, have lived under the shadow of the state which required of them academic success or military service. Nor was this choice as simple as some have assumed. These students, for the most part, were born after the defeat of the Fascist powers; they know only by report of the concentration camps, the genocide (a word coined in 1944), of the military efficiency and universal fear that these powers once inspired. Permit me, for a moment, to recapture those times from personal experience.

I was in Edinburgh in 1939 when the first Jewish refugees began to trickle in from Austria. At that time, a friend of mine, a medical student from New York City, asked me if I would like to meet some of them and hear their story. I said no. We all have moments we would like to relive: that is one of mine. But I was a young liberal then who had H. G. Wells account of how he had manufactured atrocity stories in World War I in order to create a national spirit favorable to the war; I had read an article "Arms and the Men," by the editors of Fortune magazine, scarcely a radical journal, which told how the munitions makers of Germany and France had cooperated with one another in prolonging World War I, in protecting the arsenals and factories of destruction while men were dying for what they had been told was a noble cause; I had exultantly agreed with the students of the Oxford Union who voted that never again would they serve King and Country in a war. My generation knew the brutality, the stupidity, the hypocrisy of war, and so I said No. I did not wish to hear any stories of atrocities. Perhaps I was afraid of what I would hear and what it would do to my position.

My friend looked at me with hopelessness and desperation. "I tell you, he said, 'as one human being to another, somebody has to listen. And so I did it, not out of decency, but in simple response to friendship. I never

forgot what I heard, and when I returned to America I volunteered for the Air Force. After that, in violation of every rule of military common sense, I volunteered repeatedly for combat against Germany, where I knew I had an undying grievance. I was sent, however, to the South Pacific where I was ordered to engage in the destruction of Japan, a nation whose people I had lived among briefly and for whom then as now, I felt a profound affection. Engaged in that destruction, I learned on my own pulses the meaning of existential absurdity; I learned also the helplessness of the individual whose moral integrity is torn into shreds by the impersonal demands of international warfare.

My own sons and these graduates had none of these experiences. Rather, as they grew up, they saw their country engaged in an undeclared war halfway around world. The reasons given for that war were often contradictory, confusing and always unsatisfying to most of them. They saw the resources of the nation turned toward destruction or toward defense against our own threatened destruction by others. Fantastically expensive weapons were constructed only to become obsolete before they were deployed, necessitating new and even more expensive weapons. There was not enough money, it was said, for the elimination of poverty, the re-building of the cities, for education and mass transportation, or for the redemption of the under privileged. National defense came first, but national defense was an insatiable monster. It could never be given enough to satisfy it, either of men or money. And so there grew in many of our young people the deep conviction that something was wrong, that the direction of things must be changed. They then began to attempt that change, only to find a strange new situation which had arisen not only in America but in the world.

It was not long ago, as history looks at time, that the average life expectancy was 36 years. A brilliant man of the English Renaissance, when he was 43, said that he had fallen into the winter of his life. An English poet, apparently without personal jeopardy, praised the "autumnal face" of a woman who was only 39. I should like to see him try it now.

Medical science has subtly altered the structure of all advanced societies. Previously, famine, virulent plagues and the accidents and chances of life had made continual opportunities for the young. After a brief adolescence, if they were gifted or fortunate, they moved into positions of powers; a few years decimated the ranks of older generations. But now how different it all is. The middle and older generations carry the elections, occupy the seats of power in corporations, in churches, in the universities and especially in government. For example, the median age of committee chairmen in the United States Senate is said to be close to 70. The lives of the younger generation are in escrow to men whose experiences they have not shared, whose orientations they cannot understand.

We are grateful that our lives have been lengthened because it is always our hope that more time will bring us the delight, the wisdom, the opportunity to achieve all those things we hoped for when we were young. But we were insensitive, we were intellectually irresponsible not to foresee these altered conditions in order that we might compensate for them.

Frustrated, the young people took the only courses that seemed open to them. In dress and appearance, they began to attack the styles of their elders. Consciously and unconsciously, they began to refuse to cooperate with customs and laws, sometimes with tragic consequences for themselves. They seemed to prefer self-destruction to acquiescence in that larger destruction they saw around them. It is inconceivable that we could ever have believed that a good scolding and a

haircut would somehow make it all right again. Yet that is what we thought, at first, and some, apparently, still nourish that delusion.

All of this has brought the new generation to a moral impasse. If they acquiesce in what they believe is wrong, their own moral integrity is destroyed. But if they evade, they see the burden of warfare carried by those who lack education, or who are culturally deprived or whose skins are black or brown, those who, for whatever reason, cannot find shelter in privileged sanctuaries of society of which the university is the principal one. Is it any wonder that many of them despise their sanctuary? Evasion strikes at their sense of their own worth, their manhood or womanhood; they need, as their fathers needed, to validate their own moral and physical courage. In such a situation what are they to do? What would you do? There is some ease to be found, as John Milton once remarked, in destroying; there is a different kind of ease to be found in the lotus land of drugs. For the less frustrated there is some ease in the secret, silent enjoyment of the spectacle of the powerful giant methodically destroying itself through the alienation of the young to whom, I scarcely need remind you, the future inevitably belongs. I am not so gloomy as to think that these categories now include all of our students. The majority are still struggling with some hope in the traditional ways but their numbers are being eroded and, recently, have been alarmingly eroded.

This moral dilemma must be removed. Society must adopt goals and methods into which the younger generation can wholeheartedly throw their imagination, their energies, their idealism. And the machinery of society must be so altered that the young may actually share in the processes of power. If that cannot be done, we shall be doomed by our own inflexibility.

Over three hundred years ago, a legend had grown up in England that her supernatural guardian, the warrior angel St. Michael, would appear in Cornwall if the nation faced destruction. Spain had been England's enemy for so long that an assumption had also grown up that St. Michael, when he appeared, would always look toward Spain. But Time falsifies fixed ideas and Spain, actually, had long since ceased to be England's principal enemy; rather, the peril now was from within, from growing anger and violence, from inflated rhetoric and lack of understanding, and a young poet, who knew this, believed that the Angel was now looking in the wrong direction. He tried to give England a new policy and he succeeded, at least, in giving her a great line of poetry when he wrote—Look homeward, Angel, now and melt with truth—that is, with pity, with compassion.

Historians, in a way, are lucky people. They look back and discover all the mistakes, rectify all the errors, write epitaphs and sometimes prognostications. If I were a future historian of America, this is what I would like to be able to write:

"Americans of the mid-twentieth century were large, loud and sensate; they had learned how to make and build and fight, all of which had been necessary. But a new American was needed, one who knew how to give, to feel and especially how to yield, how to harness and tame all that assertiveness, all that egoistic energy that strove to make the world over into its own image. The Americans had subdued nature, conquered disease and diminished space, but there was something unlovely in their method, something that lacked gentleness and silence. They needed a new and softer music of the inner life. At that time there arose a new generation which turned away from the jungles of Asia and the deserts of the moon. It was a generation which looked homeward—with compassion."

AIR FREIGHT THEFTS

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, Government and industry have recently increased efforts to curb mounting thefts and pilferage at the Nation's airports. The involvement of organized crime in these activities makes this a subject which is of concern to all Members of the House.

A recent article written by Leah Young and published in the Air Cargo magazine presents an interesting and informative view of this problem together with a description of the efforts to combat this crime at Kennedy Airport. The article is entitled "Air Freight Thefts Move To Stage Center" and of particular interest is the discussion of the activities of the Airport Security Council, and its distinguished executive director, Mario Noto. I am inserting the text of the article in the RECORD at this point:

AIR FREIGHT THEFTS MOVE TO STAGE CENTER
(By Leah Young)

Is the Mafia in control of air cargo at Kennedy airport?

Attorney General John Mitchell implied that this was so in a speech in February. There is speculation in Washington that the Justice Department is preparing indictments. But the airline industry's security officials are divided in their response.

Franklin Oelschlagel of the Air Transport Association's security committee in Washington points out that these same charges were made in 1968 by the New York State Investigation Commission. The airlines responded at that time by forming the Airport Security Council.

Asked if the Attorney General might have something concrete, Mr. Oelschlagel says, "As far as I can determine he is just getting into the act now."

But, says Mario Noto, Executive Director of the Airport Security Council: "There isn't any doubt about it."

Mr. Noto told the members of the security council in a memorandum dated Jan. 26, that Kennedy Airport's high level of thefts and pilferage of currency, precious metals, wearing apparel and watches has "indicated an extensive and close collusion in the perpetration of these crimes with airline employees who have had either direct or indirect knowledge concerning specific details of airline shipping movements and custody status of such items."

The difference in approach between the ATA and Mr. Noto goes beyond the natural airline inclination to be reluctant to admit the crime situation may be so serious it even includes the Mafia, and the security man's "accept it and let's get on with the prevention" attitude.

ATA president Stuart G. Tipton has testified before a Senate committee that "apprehension and prosecution of these violators is the most effective deterrent to crime."

Says Mr. Noto: "The most effective deterrent to crime is erecting impenetrable barriers between the criminal and the merchandise. The least is catching the thief. One manager with deterrent measures is more effective than many policemen. It doesn't do you any good to lock the barn door afterwards."

So, Mr. Noto is using the security council in New York to instigate preventive measures like requiring identification badges in

the cargo area and introducing a system for reporting thefts so he can discover where and for which commodities the cargo areas are vulnerable.

May, 1970.

The ATA says it's very pleased with what Mr. Noto is doing at Kennedy. But, it is assuring itself much more control over security groups forming at other airports by setting up a system under the ATA security committee in which sub-committees perform these functions instead of independent agencies such as the Airport Security Council.

John Steele of Trans World Airlines is chairman of the Airport Security Council and a member of the ATA security committee. He explains that the size of JFK requires a security council with a full-time staff, but other airports will find a part-time committee sufficient.

The airport security council is an amalgam of 43 airlines, both domestic and foreign based. It is a member of the Noto-promoted Metropolitan New York Air Cargo Theft Committee, an organization of truckers, marine underwriters, importers and the like who are trying to coordinate an industry wide attack on crime. It took a special agreement approved by the CAB to form the airport security council.

The 11 sub-committees planned for Miami, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Houston, Dallas, Chicago, Seattle, Boston, St. Louis, Atlanta and Detroit are strictly ATA groups. "The international airlines can always take part in our program," Mr. Oelschlagel explains.

Although the airlines tout the airport security council as their answer to crime in their cargo areas, and Mr. Noto is widely respected for his efforts, he has not been asked either by Mr. Steele, his own chairman, or the ATA to advise other airports how to establish a theft reporting system or to give ideas on securing cargo.

Mr. Noto gave a presentation to one ATA security committee meeting on his highly refined reporting system that for the first time tells airlines what and when and how they had losses, but he was not invited to attend the entire meeting.

Says Mr. Oelschlagel: "The ATA is made up of member airlines. These are the same lines that are in the New York project. I am reasonably sure that if they need his advice they'll get it."

Says Mr. Steele: "His duties are too demanding in New York for us to take his time elsewhere in the country except for something exceptional."

He explains that security problems "are not a question of expertise, but rather problems of administration and the ability to bear down in areas."

The Airport Security Council "has performed admirably under the direction of Mr. Noto," he says. "For the first time there is an impartial person to act as a central place for information, to conduct seminars. For the first time there is someone objectively surveying the situation and conducting reporting."

Mr. Noto's reporting system was a response to the N.Y. State Investigation Commission's observation that it was impossible to collect data regarding cargo thefts.

According to the reporting system, for the period March-December 1969 there were 569 cases of missing cargo with a value of \$2,936,963. Total cargo going through Kennedy for that period is estimated at 623,195 tons, valued at \$7,918,330,000.

Figures kept by the Port of New York Authority for that period total \$3,180,492, but these figures include non-airline losses like cargo hijacked from trucks. The Port's full year figures for 1969 are \$3,314,482 from 507 reports. In 1968, before Mr. Noto instituted his reporting system, the port was informed of only 216 thefts at a total of \$1,705,608.

Since it is obvious that the Port's figures reflect an increase in reporting rather than

an increase in crime, no one really knows if theft and pilferage has increased or decreased. What is known is that the value of the cargo shipped through Kennedy in 1969 is 83 per cent above that shipped the year before. Also, more cases of airline loss are being reported to Mr. Noto—569 for ten months compared to 507 for 12 months to the Port Authority.

Taking all these factors into consideration, Mr. Noto maintains that the measures instituted by the Airport Security Council have definitely cut down on airline losses and have made it more difficult for crimes to be committed.

Among the measures adopted by the council is a photograph identification badge system covering over 14,000 cargo employees and also non-airline personnel—truckers, customs brokers, service personnel—who need access to the cargo areas. Before this step anyone could enter cargo areas without identification.

Mechanical devices—ranging from locks and safes to closed circuit television and dual lens cameras had been installed by 69 per cent of the carriers as of Dec. 1969.

Other improvements include beefed up numbers of security guards, a standardized document for release of cargo information, strengthened central depositories for high value cargo, and cooperation between the carriers, law enforcement agencies and other private and public agencies. Employment applications have been revised, and channels of responsibility for handling cargo have been devised.

Mr. Noto holds seminars among airline personnel to discuss cargo problems and give security training. His staff is preparing a security manual.

The next move is up to the Justice Department or the Treasury Department, which is considering legislation dealing with airport and dock thefts. In the meantime, shippers can keep an eye on security at other airports.

And, says Mr. Noto, "if shippers would intensify containerization and intermodal transportation it would be a tremendous deterrent."

THE 18-YEAR-OLDS VOTING

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on March 31 the Arizona Republic outlined some valid objections to the proposal that the national voting age be lowered to 18 by congressional fiat.

Those objections are some of the reasons this legislation is opposed by many Congressmen and by the President.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial from the Arizona Republic entitled "A Bad Idea":

[From the Arizona Republic, Mar. 31, 1970]

A BAD IDEA

The move in the U.S. Senate to lower the voting age to 18 by legislative fiat is a bad one on several counts.

One could argue at length about the merits of reducing the age limits.

For the moment, however, that consideration can be set aside. A prior objection to the Senate's action concerns the assumption that voting standards across the nation should be changed simply by a decision of the national legislature.

Whether this is constitutionally permissible is itself a moot point. That it is philosophically unsound should be apparent to anyone who favors the federal idea of government.

One of the great strengths of the American system is that it permits diversity among the states, allowing them to establish the essential conditions under which the franchise is exercised.

Comparative results emerging from the variations give us a method of judging the value of one approach as contrasted with another, while the reservation of authority to the states undergirds their role in balancing off the central power.

In recent years there has been a headlong trend to homogenize the nation into a single unitary system, with the authorities in Washington dictating more and more to the several states.

This tendency has been particularly notable in the field of voting and representation, where a torrent of court decisions has pushed the states toward uniform adherence to liberal doctrines of total plebiscitary democracy.

Now the U.S. Senate, with some conservatives going along, seems to have caught the fever. It has acted on the assumption that the Congress can and should take over essential functions of determining the franchise in the several states, simply by legislative enactment.

The presumption behind the move tells us a great deal about the decay of the federal balance, and the reading is an unpleasant one.

On substantive and procedural grounds alike, therefore, we believe the Senate's action is mistaken. We hope the Senate-House conferees will act more responsibly, and move to strike the 18-year-old vote proposal from the voting rights bill.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Star last spring made the point that there "is nothing in the Constitution that says the Congress can usurp the powers of the States in setting up the qualifications for voting, as long as equal protection of the laws is applied."

This statement reflects the views of many Members of the Congress and the President of the United States. I insert the entire editorial from the Star of March 23 in the RECORD:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 23, 1970]

OLD ENOUGH TO?

The Senate has passed an amendment to the voting rights bill that would lower the voting age in Federal and other elections to 18. There were no vocal opponents to lowering the age to 18. Opposition centered around a constitutional issue.

The Constitution leaves the establishment of voting requirements to the states. For instance, Georgia has already lowered the voting age to 18 by state action.

It is interesting to note that Senators Kennedy and Goldwater both supported the move to lower the voting age to 18. The general tenor of their arguments was familiar—if you are old enough to fight or old enough to pay taxes, you are old enough to vote.

But this argument might be put in another way. If you pay taxes and fight for your country, you should be allowed to vote. Millions of 18, 19 and 20-year-old youths may be old enough under the law to pay taxes and serve in the armed services. Millions of them do not. There are 17-year-olds and 16-year-olds who pay taxes, but they would be denied the vote under the Senate bill. There are

17-year-olds and 16-year-olds who join the armed services, and they too would be denied the vote under the 18-year-old rule.

We believe that in order to change the voting age a constitutional amendment is necessary. There is nothing in the Constitution that says that Congress can usurp the powers of the states in setting the qualifications for voting, as long as equal protection of the laws is applied.

We are also inclined to ask why, if the criterion for voting should be the payment of taxes or service in the armed forces, should not attempts be made to limit voting rights to only those who do so?

THE EFFECT OF AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL VOTE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this body will soon have to decide whether or not it will risk passing a law giving 18-year-olds the right to vote. The risk involves the constitutionality of such a law and the effect of an unconstitutional vote in a national election.

As the Richmond News Leader of March 31 said, "Think of the cost. Draw a mental picture, if you can, of the mess."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the News Leader editorial of that date in the RECORD:

[From the Richmond News Leader, Mar. 31, 1970]

THE EFFECT OF AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL VOTE

Congressman Emanuel Celler reportedly has capitulated to superior pressure—if not to superior reason—and will not prevent the vote-18 issue from reaching the House floor. So it looks as though very soon the House will approve the vote-18 measure already passed by the Senate, and that Congress will give itself the authority to set the voting age at 18 nationally. Most likely it is too late to say anything more that might dissuade the House of Representatives from the folly it seems determined to commit [editorials February 24 and March 13]. But a few additional points deserve airing nevertheless.

Such vote-18 proponents as Senators Barry Goldwater and Edward Kennedy acknowledge that when the Founders wrote Article I of the Constitution in 1787, they unquestionably intended to leave voting age requirements to the States. Yet Senators Goldwater, Kennedy *et al* argue that the Founders did not write the Fourteenth Amendment, added to the Constitution 80 years later—the legal basis for their contention. But even the Fourteenth Amendment, the relevant section of which is quoted below, contains implicit recognition of 21 as the minimum acceptable voting age. The quoted section appears to render this argument of the vote-18 proponents beside the point.

Then, too, the nation is told that it must have an 18-year-old voting age, because to deny the vote to citizens between 18 and 21 on the grounds that they lack maturity and wisdom to vote, is invidious discrimination in violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. According to such reasoning, would it not be equally invidious to deny the vote to 17-year-olds or, for that matter, to 12-year-olds? Why does 18 hold more powerful magic than 21 or any other age?

Of course, many advocates of a lower voting age mouth that delightfully illogical maxim that if you're old enough to fight for your country you're old enough to vote. By the same logic, the reverse of the maxim would be true—i.e., that if you're too old to fight for your country, you're too old to vote. Moreover, the Constitution sets 25 as the minimum eligibility for Congressman, 30 for Senators, 35 for Presidents. By the same reasoning of the vote-18 aficionados such stipulations are absurd, for anyone old enough to be a Congressman is old enough to be a Senator, and anyone old enough to be a Senator is old enough to be President.

Perhaps the aspect of the vote-18 movement with the largest capacity for mischief, however, is this: Competent legal minds disagree about whether Congress has the power to set a national voting age—any national voting age. There is no doubt that a national voting age can be set by constitutional amendment; there is considerable doubt that Congress can do so by statute. What happens, then, if Congress establishes a national voting age and, after the 1972 elections, the Supreme Court finds that statutory provision to be unconstitutional? Do you nullify the electoral results? Do you hold elections again, disenfranchising 18-year-olds? Imagine the confusion and the bitterness. Think of the cost. Draw a mental picture, if you can, of the mess.

It used to be that Congress was a steady influence in American life: It acted deliberately and with studied care. Not any more. Congress too often acts as a revolutionizing agent. This vote-18 business is a case in point. The legal questions involved are complex and profound. Yet Congress seems determined to toss caution out the window and to jump aboard a bandwagon that the nation's college students care little about, if one can believe the results of a Virginia Education Association survey of undergraduate leaders at Virginia's colleges and universities. This is a contrived issue, an issue that carries within it the potential for extensive damage to the stability of the American system. Is it too late to hope that Congress will recover its senses, and leave the voting age to the States?

RELEVANT SECTION

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 2—Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 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 sadistic-

cally practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SEVEN-PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, last December, Congress repealed the 7-percent investment tax credit under which a part of the cost of new equipment could be subtracted from Federal income tax liability. An effort to retain the credit on a limited basis failed in the Senate-House conference. Citing the plight of small business and the farmer, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 16377, to restore the investment tax credit on investment up to \$15,000 in 1 year. Independent businessmen, voting through the National Federation of Independent Business, back this proposal with 82 percent in favor, 14 percent opposed, and 4 percent with no firm opinion.

I would like to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD the State breakdown of these figures as released by the National Federation of Independent Business. They are as follows:

STATE BREAKDOWN FIGURES TO AMEND TAX CODE TO RESTORE THE 7 PERCENT INVESTMENT CREDIT FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND FARMERS

State	Percent in favor	Percent against	Percent undecided
Alabama	88	11	1
Alaska	83	9	8
Arizona	86	10	4
Arkansas	80	15	5
California	81	15	4
Colorado	87	12	1
Connecticut	79	15	6
Delaware	84	16	4
Florida	82	14	4
Georgia	87	12	1
Hawaii	91	4	5
Idaho	86	12	2
Illinois	85	12	3
Indiana	82	15	3
Iowa	81	16	3
Kansas	81	16	3
Kentucky	84	14	2
Louisiana	87	11	2
Maine	72	21	7
Maryland	85	13	2
Massachusetts	81	14	5
Michigan	83	13	4
Minnesota	87	10	3
Mississippi	82	14	4
Missouri	80	16	4
Montana	87	11	2
Nebraska	83	15	2
Nevada	77	17	6
New Hampshire	90	10	1
New Jersey	83	14	3
New Mexico	87	10	3
New York	83	14	3
North Carolina	85	13	2
North Dakota	90	8	2
Ohio	83	14	3
Oklahoma	81	15	4
Oregon	77	15	8
Pennsylvania	84	14	2
Rhode Island	90	10	10
South Carolina	87	10	3
South Dakota	79	18	3
Tennessee	86	10	4
Texas	81	16	3
Utah	78	19	3
Vermont	82	14	4
Virginia	84	13	3
Washington	86	12	2
Washington, D.C. ¹			
West Virginia	79	16	5
Wisconsin	82	15	3
Wyoming	76	20	4

¹Returns incomplete.

JEANNETTE RANKIN'S BIRTHDAY DINNER

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening, June 11, some 200 friends and admirers gathered to wish Miss Jeannette Rankin a happy 90th birthday. There were numerous distinguished guests on hand that paid homage to this great lady and former Member of this body. For those who were unable to attend the dinner I am inserting the accounts that the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star published, along with two telegrams that were read at the dinner:

[From the Washington Post]

ORIGINAL DOVE OF PEACE

(By Margaret Crimmins)

This country may be on a youth kick, but it was the over-50s who were rapping about peace last night.

The "Happy Birthday, Jeannette Rankin" celebration at the Rayburn House Office Building had many of the older peaceniks there.

Miss Rankin, who marked her 90th birthday yesterday, is, of course, the original peacenik. As the nation's first congresswoman, she voted against entry of the United States in both World War I and World War II. She cast the lone negative vote on the World War II question.

Among those paying tribute to the indomitable Montana woman were former Alaskan Sen. Ernest Gruening, who was one of the lone dissenters on the Tonkin Gulf resolution, and Senate Democratic Leader, Mike Mansfield, who played a major role in yesterday's defeat of the Byrd Amendment.

"Let us not merely praise Jeannette, but let us follow in her footsteps" . . . said Gruening.

Sen. Margaret Chase Smith (R-Me.), the only woman in the Senate, said she "owes a large debt to Jeannette Rankin. She broke the way for me by being elected in 1916.

"I salute her for being the original dove in Congress. Senate doves shot down the Byrd amendment. Even I voted against it. Perhaps it was Miss Rankin's influence on such a stubborn hawk as I have been known to be."

Sen. Mansfield put a hand on Miss Rankin's shoulder and looked down at her affectionately: "Jeannette, the difference between your days and ours is that in your day they used to give Congress a chance to declare wars."

Sen. Mansfield, asked for a comment on the defeat of the Byrd amendment, which would have authorized President Nixon to send U.S. troops back into Cambodia without seeking advance consent of Congress after July 1, had three terse words:

"We were lucky."

Rep. Arnold Olsen (D-Mont.) said, "You look at the record now. We're voting your way, Jeannette."

Miss Rankin, wearing the ash blond wig she wears most of the time and is not shy in talking about it, answered the emotional tributes to her and her leadership in peace and women suffrage by saying:

"After 90 years, I am old enough. My skull is so thick I won't take all you've said too seriously."

"As a child I always wanted to live during the time of the American Revolution. It was a very tame time compared to what is going on today. I have never left Congress. When Sens. Morse and Gruening voted

against the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, I voted with them."

Miss Rankin said she is constantly telling women they should write their congressmen.

"If you don't get an answer, keep writing. I do warn them, however, not to write oftener than once a week."

Some 200 birthday celebrants joined in singing "Happy Birthday, dear Jeannette" and toasted her with champagne. Her fans came from as far away as California. One professor from the University of New Hampshire said he came because he knew Miss Rankin was an editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal around 1917.

"I had to be here," he said. "Miss Rankin was 50 years ahead of her time. She has been a shining light to everyone who believes in peace and women's rights all these years."

Among other guests was a minister from Watkinsville, Ga., the Rev. Ted Harris, who is writing a doctoral thesis on Miss Rankin, entitled "Jeannette Rankin: Warring Pacifist."

"She keeps apologizing for taking my time," said Harris.

The salty and grandly chic woman, described by one guest as "quite a vamp when she gets all dressed up in black and serves sherry," lives most of the time now in Watkinsville, where she is crusading now for a "direct preferential vote for president," in which the voter would express first, second, third, fourth and fifth choices for President. Her house has pressed dirt flowers, covered with rugs.

Miss Rankin, who broke her hip in April, when she was preparing for an American Civil Liberties Union trip to Russia, seems out of place in a wheelchair.

"I slipped and fell because I didn't have a good man beside me to hold me up," she said.

Her wheelchair is marked with a small adhesive tape tag, scrawled "J. Rankin." The name was larger and more impressive than that last night.

A prayer written by Miss Rankin's great-nephew, Eric Ronhovde, of the State Department, expressed part of the feeling:

"The whole world may feel and see that things that were cast down are being raised up, and things which had grown old are being made new . . ."

Miss Rankin, still modest after all of the national attention she has received for starting crusades which now have become "in" with the youth in this country, said simply "I hope I haven't burdened you too much from either speaking or from living too long. You can go on now from where I leave off."

[From the Washington Star]

PACIFIST "QUEEN" GIVEN TRIBUTE

(By Mary Anne Dolan)

"I salute her for being the original dove in the Senate . . . she now has quite a covey of doves . . . if you doubt this, look at how her Senate doves shot down the Byrd amendment today."—Sen. Margaret Chase Smith.

Jeannette Rankin, dowager queen of pacifists and ranking prophet of the Women's Liberation Movement, came to her 90th birthday party last night in a wheelchair.

But even after a long dinner, eight tribute speeches, roses and a champagne toast she stood up at the podium like a stumping politician and spoke for more than 30 minutes.

The spritely native Montanan who now lives in Athens, Ga., was honored at the reception and banquet by a host of sponsors including Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Sen. Lee Metcalf and honorary patron, Mrs. Martin Luther King.

"You all talk of me being the first woman in Congress," Miss Rankin said. "But I don't think you know I started being a congressman long before I was elected, and have remained one ever since."

Famed as one of 56 members of Congress to vote against American involvement in World War I and the sole dissenting voice in the vote for World War II, Miss Rankin chided that, "when Wayne Morse and Sen. Gruening voted against the Tonkin amendment, I voted with them."

She is perpetually on the campaign trail, speaking as clearly as in the days when she fought for women's suffrage. She said last night:

"The first thing in changing a habit is making up your mind. War is a habit and when an emergency comes, they fall back on it."

"We can get a President out of office but we can't elect one . . . we must go back to letting people choose and live by their choice."

"Half the people are women and half the people aren't expressing themselves, because they've been told for so long to keep quiet and to be good."

Broken hip notwithstanding, Miss Rankin spoke articulately last night and with great intensity about many of the same issues she faced as a two term Republican member of the House from Montana (1917-1919, 1941-1943).

"The only difference between the time you served in Congress and the time we served," Sen. Mansfield said, "is that in your day they used to declare war and give Congress a chance."

In her review last night of her most heartfelt concerns, many of the guests said they were hearing echoes of speeches of a woman elected to Congress before other women even had the vote.

Sen. Lee Metcalf was prompted to comment, "She is young at heart . . . has survived a generation gap, jumped over several other generations and stands shoulder to shoulder with the youth of today."

Among others who spoke glowingly and personally were Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, who served with Miss Rankin in the 1941 session, and former Senators Burton Wheeler and Gerald Nye.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 12, 1970.

MISS JEANNETTE RANKIN,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on being young at 90 and for always having had the conviction of being an advocate for what you have believed.

Ghandi once said, a "no" uttered from deepest conviction is better and greater than a "yes" merely uttered to please or what is worse, to avoid trouble.

You have said "no" when it was difficult to what you believed wrong and yes to what you believed right.

I have been honored to work with you these past years and know we will continue to work together in the future.

BIRCH BAYH,
U.S. Senator.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
June 12, 1970.

JEANNETTE RANKIN,
Rayburn House Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Best wishes and congratulations on your 90th birthday unable to be with you on this important occasion. Love,

MAE RANKIN.

FLAG DAY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend our colleague

JACK BROOKS from Texas for a very stirring program which appropriately gives us an opportunity to rededicate our personal devotion of the all-important values of freedom and human rights. As the gentleman from Texas has eloquently pointed out to us today, our flag is a symbol of hope, opportunity and promise to all who value freedom as a way of life.

We must emphasize that the promise of equality of opportunity, freedom and justice is truly a promise to all people regardless of their origin, race, creed, or social, or economic background. None of us are so short-sighted that we do not realize that in our history there have been times when these promises were not kept for all our people. There are some today who say that they are not being kept now. I would pose only this thought—that the mere fact that these deficiencies in the equality of opportunity are recognized and that people are speaking out vigorously to correct these deficiencies is probably the most dramatic proof that we do truly have a democratic freedom to speak our mind and work to correct what we feel is wrong. I feel that in this system of ours that is not only a freedom, but an obligation of good citizenship. These are the principles for which this country and its flag stand, and in the words of Jack Brooks, may I call on all Americans "to rededicate their energies to the construction of a society in which the democratic values of liberty and freedom may take root and flourish for the benefit of generations to come."

INSIDE NORTH VIETNAM

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the last in a series of articles on North Vietnam written by Robert S. Boyd, Washington Bureau Chief of the Knight Newspapers. I would like to insert this final article for everyone to read:

BOTH VIETNAMS CLAIM TIME IS ON THEIR SIDE

(By Robert S. Boyd)

Both North and South Vietnam claim father time is on their side.

Hanoi is counting on time to wear out American patience and interest in the war, and let Hanoi gobble up South Vietnam.

Saigon is counting on time to let her build her strength to the point where she can hold off the Communists alone, with the help of Americans arms and dollars but not American fighting men.

After visiting North Vietnam last month and learning how the other side analyzes the situation, I went to South Vietnam to listen to the Allied story.

The view from Saigon turned out to be almost diametrically opposite to the view from Hanoi.

Here's how the opposing arguments stack up:

North Vietnam's leaders assert that the war is essentially between them and the United States. In their public statements, if not in their secret plans, they dismiss the Thieu-Ky regime in Saigon as a negligible force. They claim the South will plop into their lap

like an overripe plum once the Americans are gone.

Thus the immediate aim of the North Vietnamese is to get U.S. forces out of South Vietnam.

Conditions are turning in their favor, they say.

As President Nixon pulls out more American troops, the Allied side will become progressively weaker, they contend.

"You cannot achieve without 500,000 soldiers what you could not achieve with them," one official in Hanoi said, echoing some American critics of Mr. Nixon's policy.

Meanwhile, the war is putting a heavy strain on the U.S. economy, the North Vietnamese say, but their own economic system is so primitive and flexible that it can endure a prolonged war on even a renewal of U.S. bombing.

American public opinion is also growing increasingly war-weary, but the North Vietnamese say their people are still determined to carry on the struggle against what they consider foreign "aggression."

Authorities in Hanoi did not mention it, of course, but public opinion, if it were disenchanted with the war, carried little weight in a tightly controlled communist society like North Vietnam.

Furthermore, my impression was that one of the side effects of U.S. bombing has been to heighten North Vietnamese hostility toward America and rally people around their government.

(The Defense Department was asked if it wished to comment on the effect of the bombing, as described in an earlier article in this series. Assistant Secretary Daniel Z. Henkin said the department would have no comment.)

A thousand miles south in Saigon, the official outlook is quite different.

While many Americans there have private doubts, in public they assert that the President's program is working and has a reasonable chance of success.

The South Vietnamese, they say, are finally developing the muscle they previously lacked to handle their own defense.

It wasn't until after the great turning point of TET 1968, officials note, that the United States began to equip the South Vietnamese army with weapons as good as the communists enjoyed.

And it wasn't until after Mr. Nixon announced his first troop pullout, just a year ago, that the South Vietnamese were convinced that they were going to have to stand on their own feet.

Officials concede that optimistic claims and statistics have proved illusory in the past, but insist that at last we're on the right track.

One senior official said he has absolutely no doubt at all that Saigon's army will be able to handle the communists' military threat by a year from now, when the United States is supposed to have ended its combat role.

As for Hanoi's claim that the Thieu-Ky regime will collapse as soon as U.S. support is gone, officials in Saigon assert that the government is displaying political skill and stability.

Dissident students, Buddhists and war veterans have stirred up trouble, but have been unable to shake the regime seriously.

Unless inflation undercuts his support in the army, the civil service and the Catholic minority, President Thieu should be able to hold out, the argument goes.

The real weak spot, in the official view, is not the military situation or the political divisions in South Vietnam, but the economy.

As the United States pulls out, the South Vietnamese will have to tighten their belts, give up their motorcycles and TV sets and other luxuries, and struggle to support their swollen army.

Officials concede that public opinion in South Vietnam is divided. But they insist that a "lot of people" are not willing to accept communist rule, and will fight to prevent it.

And so the argument goes on and on. Hanoi puts out its line, and Saigon counters with its own.

A reporter can discover some evidence which seems to support one side of the argument, and some the other. But he realizes that his knowledge is limited, and that judgments based on partial information can be dangerous.

Only time will eventually tell which side has the better case.

TIMES NOTES CAMPAIGN REFORM

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, this morning's editorial—June 15, 1970—in the New York Times entitled "Campaign Equality," presents an excellent summary of the recently released Twentieth Century Fund report on reform of congressional campaign financing.

Before the report's publication on June 8, 1970, I had the opportunity to go over it in detail. Although I did not agree with it on a point-by-point basis I felt the proposals to be both imaginative and realistic, and, made arrangements to have the report printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members of this body.

The trustees of the Twentieth Century Fund and fund director M. J. Rossant exercised a great deal of leadership and initiative in putting the report together. As noted in the Times editorial:

Its personnel represents a wider political spectrum than is usually the case—Republican and Democrat, black and white, business and labor, experience and youth.

In my judgment this is a valuable contribution. There is nearly unanimous agreement that reform is needed. Actual reform has moved very slowly though because of the very differences of party, race, age, and experience. This report should do much to lessen the concern because it was put together on such a broad basis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Times editorial of June 15, 1970, be inserted at this point for the benefit of those who have not had the time to read the complete report which the gentleman from Idaho (Congressman HANSEN) assisted me in having inserted in the RECORD of June 8.

CAMPAIGN EQUALITY

Once again a committee of distinguished citizens has looked into the financing of political campaigns in this country and found the picture deplorable. A task force of the Twentieth Century Fund, concentrating wholly on Congressional campaigning, differs little from other recent investigating bodies, though its personnel represents a wider political spectrum than is usually the case—Republican and Democrat, black and white, business and labor, experience and youth.

In its chief recommendation the task force points up the distance that experts have

moved from the days when they still hoped that limitation on contributions and expenditures would be effective if only the amounts were made realistic. Rather than bewail the costs of campaigning and attempt to limit them, the report bluntly proposes spending "more money more wisely" to the end of achieving "fair competitive Congressional elections."

Seeking to give the poor candidate a fighting chance against the rich one, to offset the incumbent's advantages over the challenger, the Twentieth Century Fund group wants ceilings not made less absurd but removed altogether. Certainly it can be demonstrated that fixed limits have never kept pace for long with the rising costs of campaigning. The results has been that the law invites the grossest evasions and ultimately no more respect than was accorded to Prohibition. Better to put all the emphasis of law on guaranteeing full and pre-Election Day disclosure by all candidates of the amounts they receive and their sources, a point made years ago by Senator Gore of Tennessee in his inquiry into the subject.

The problem is not only to let the public know where a candidate's funds are coming from, but to cut down the span between the financial resources of, say, a Kennedy and a Humphrey—or, to come closer to home, between an Ottinger and a McCarthy. Disclosure on this score is good but not enough.

The task force recommendations would try to equalize finances by providing a tax credit for small contributions, by offsetting an incumbent's frank with a free mailing for his opponent, by making registration a government responsibility rather than letting it remain a financial burden on parties and candidates, and, above all, by bringing television within easier financial reach. All Congressional candidates would be guaranteed access to radio and television at 50 per cent of the lowest commercial rate prevailing for the desired time—with the broadcasters allowed to deduct the discount from their income tax.

The recommendations do not go so far as to propose outright Government subsidy for election campaigns, as urged by political reformers as long as a half-century or more ago. The present rather mild proposals would certainly not bring about a Utopian equality; but they would help to bring some equity into an area of American life that is becoming alarmingly the province of the rich.

A CONCERNED AMERICAN

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I receive many letters from young people expressing their views on some of the critical issues facing our Nation, but one of the finest I have received is one from Miss Barbara Jean Denny of Oak Harbor, Ohio, which I would like to share with my colleagues. It is with pride that I include it in the RECORD at this point:

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA,
House of Representatives,
Fifth District, Ohio,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LATTA: I am only 21 years of age, but I am a concerned American. Up to the point of my 21st birthday and my privilege of voting, I have been one of the "silent majority", to borrow a popular term. I will no longer be silent. I love this great country of mine, and it makes me feel so sad to see fellow neighbors and other individuals disagreeing with the subversive

movement in our country, but doing nothing about it. Why? They express their opinions to their family and close friends, and they actually believe in America and its ideals, but are afraid to write articles to newspapers, express their opinions to the general public, or write to their Congressmen. A sad day is coming for our nation if these people don't stop worrying about "what people will think", but act. They don't seem to realize that three-fourths of the people around them already agree with them.

I was really stirred last night when I saw on TV over 150,000 American workmen in New York City parading for our country and showing their patriotism. It gave me chills up and down my spine to see them and hear them, because this hasn't happened lately in our country. Is it old hat to believe in America, our country? Why are certain people in our country allowed to tear down the flag, trample on it, and disavow the heritage of our country? Isn't this treason? If so, why aren't they punished? I realize this is a free country, but aren't a lot of the ideas this subversive element is pushing, against our freedoms and the good of our country? I concur that freedom is wonderful, and I also don't think anyone in any group can deny that we have far more freedoms in this country than a lot of other countries permit. Preventing the destruction of public property by policemen and National Guardsmen is not denying a freedom, it is preserving it. It all goes back to the old saying, "Give me an inch, and I'll take a mile." Allowing students (kids my own age) to run this country or the colleges and universities is calling for chaos. I believe it is good to have a few student representatives in Government because it provides experience for them in running the country—which they will do in a few short years, but a complete takeover policy for students is not wise. Many students are intelligent scholastically, but they lack the common sense and wisdom that age and experience has over them in running the government and schools. How could students be capable of choosing a certain teacher to teach a subject, when they themselves are not familiar with that subject? It just doesn't make sense. I believe you will find a real problem in this country when this war is over and the soldiers return to the states. If radical students make unpatriotic remarks to the soldiers when they return, there is going to be more violence—only this time between the same generation. Will the people stand behind the radicals, or will they back the soldiers who fought for our country? I wonder.

I am, indeed, part of the younger generation, but I do not feel I am the only one who feels this way—it was proven at a meeting in our town last night. There was a meeting of adults and college students, and I believe as an end result of the meeting, some of the students "grew up." There was a Freshman boy there from Toledo University, and he stated he was against the rioting certain students are engaged in. He also stated there were two busloads of kids brought onto the campus to stir up rioting. He definitely believes they are not students, but a subversive element. Fortunately, he said, they were booted off campus. He also mentioned there were several students there from Kent State University who were trying to cause trouble. He said he couldn't understand why they were there at TU trying to cause trouble, instead of staying on their own campus where they belong. He, like I, believes that the arson and destruction this small element is engaged in is standing in the way of the freedom of the students. If students wish to take ROTC, it is their privilege, and not compulsory. Why should that privilege be interrupted by certain students who are allowed to burn these buildings and inter-

fer with the rights of other students who wish to use these facilities?

Also, I believe that if you speak peace, act it. The main college speaker at last night's meeting is a future minister. He was trying to relate a parallel between what the students are doing and the ideals of Jesus Christ. How dare he draw any comparison in that instance? Everyone knows that Jesus not only preached peace and love in God and his fellowman, but he also practiced it. He did not yell obscenities nor did he throw rocks, bottles, or railroad spikes at the individuals who disagreed with what he preached—he knew that would accomplish nothing. How can honest comparisons be made between Christ and the recent demonstrations? If students advocate peace, they can always join the Peace Corps or any other nonviolent group that will aid the peace—not destroy it.

It was also brought out by a majority of the people last night that no matter what politics we are, we should support our President. We elected him and he is making an honest effort to end the war. He did not make the decision to go into Cambodia in a few minutes, but considered it very thoroughly and for the good of our men in service presently there. How can one man be blamed for the crisis this country is in now? He did not start inflation, pollution, or the racial problem in this country, nor did he start the war in Viet Nam. He did not send the first troops over. How can you condemn a man for trying to aid our soldiers, but say nothing about the men who first started the conflict there by sending American boys over? No one likes the war, but the McGovern-Church Amendment To End The War is not the answer. It shows a lack of confidence in our President, which, for the respect of our country by other countries is unwise. I am pleading with you in this letter, asking you not to support that vicious amendment. It portrays our President to be untrustworthy and a martyr, and he is indeed neither of those two. I realize I am just one small person, but I know I reflect the views of a majority of the people.

I believe a lot of the Congressmen and Senators are "scared stiff" to stand up for the good of the country, because there will be an election this fall, and they are afraid they won't be re-elected. What a foolish mistake they are making, because most people respect honesty, and supporting radicals who intend to destroy our form of government, will only aid in a lack of votes to the Congressmen and Senators by the majority.

I am enclosing a clipping of the letter I wrote to one of the local newspapers, and also a clipping that was in several days later. I have received a lot of favorable remarks about my letter from people who said, "That is exactly how we feel, but we didn't have the nerve to say it!"

How about a patriotic plunge to end the threat of communism in this country instead of aiding it and the overthrow of our government? I believe it would be a far more profitable effort.

Certain radical students don't seem to realize how lucky they are to be able to go to the best schools in the country and major in the fields of their choice, and to voice their opinions openly. Behind the iron curtain that is not likely, as voicing one's opinion might result in assassination. This country is truly the greatest, and if the American people will use their freedoms wisely and not abuse them, this wonderful land of ours will be here for centuries to come. If people don't stand up for America but sit idly by, our freedoms will eventually be destroyed.

Please, Mr. Latta—support our America and our President!

Respectfully,

Miss BARBARA JEAN DENNY.

ISAAC DON LEVINE'S TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDER KERENSKY, PREMIER OF DEMOCRATIC RUSSIA IN 1917, AT MEMORIAL SERVICES JUNE 14, 1970

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Isaac Don Levine, the Russian born author and editor who came to the United States in 1911, and whom I have known for more than 25 years, delivered the only English portion of the eulogy at the funeral service for Alexander Kerensky, who led Russia in the brief interval between czarism and communism in 1917.

Mr. Levine is one of the most articulate and knowledgeable men on the subject of Russia. He has written 10 books about the country and its revolution in addition to being a columnist, editor, and foreign correspondent in his journalism profession.

He is a veteran fighter of communism who knew Kerensky since 1927 when the latter made his first visit to the United States.

Mr. Levine's tribute to Kerensky is of interest to all of us, and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

LEVINE'S TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDER KERENSKY

Among the various contributions to humanity for which history will honor the memory of Alexander Kerensky, there are four great legacies which will endure as long as civilization survives on this planet.

First, was his love of Russia. Only those who were close to him knew how profound was his devotion to the land of his birth whose great cultural heritage was his inspiration and pride, whose tragic struggle through the ages to achieve freedom was his lifelong obsession, and whose very soil was sacred to him. Many of his colleagues, ministers and ambassadors of the Provisional Government, when they escaped abroad after the Soviet Revolution, became citizens of foreign countries. Not Alexander Kerensky. He travelled for more than half a century all over the globe, crossing the Atlantic scores of times, on a little tattered identification paper, a so-called Nansen passport, which described him as stateless. This document will some day be framed in a Russian national museum as a testimonial to his undying patriotism.

The second legacy was his living challenge for 52 years to the conspiracy that had, under Lenin and Trotsky, usurped the power of a democratic parliamentary government and established a despotic dictatorship of a new ruling class. To the illegitimate dictatorship Kerensky's presence was a thorn, and to the outside world a constant reminder of a glorious spring in the wintry life of his country. The Kerensky era and the 34 weeks of the existence of the Provisional Government in 1917 were and are and will forever remain indissoluble in history. From the moment he became Minister of Justice upon the abdication of the Tsar to the November 7th coup d'état, Kerensky personified the only spring of freedom in a thousand years to dawn upon tormented Russia, a spring which wilted under the cruel blasts of the first world war. Today, when the decaying oligarchy in the Kremlin is being challenged by a new generation of freedom fighters, it is well to remember that it was during Kerensky's administration that the Russian masses enjoy-

ing universal suffrage for the first and last time elected a Constituent Assembly, to realize the dream of generations. This dream was shattered by Lenin with the bayonets of a mob of thugs, but the future free Russia will enshrine Kerensky's name as its dedicated champion and architect.

The third legacy goes to the heart of Kerensky's mission and activity abroad. Since the summer of 1918, it was his all-consuming passion to build a bridge between the West and the libertarian and progressive Russians. He came out of the underground in 1918 with the mission of reaching the Allied heads at the Versailles Conference and of enlightening them as to the true character of the scourge which descended upon Russia. In the belief that liberty is indivisible, that its destruction in one area will infect the entire body of the Western world, Kerensky pleaded for an understanding by Western leaders and the public of the phenomenon of Bolshevism. For 52 years he watched with dismay one international crisis after another, the rise of one generation after another, floundering in the mythology of the Moscow school of falsification of history which Lenin founded and which to this day has the West befuddled and starry-eyed. But a new generation within Russia has now arisen to vindicate Kerensky's mission and spell out for all mankind the message: "Know your enemy, and that knowledge shall make you free."

The fourth legacy left by Kerensky is to be found in his deeds and his vision in the field of racial strife, of ethnic division, of the oppression of minorities by dominant majorities. In this metropolitan area, where two million Jews, half a million Poles and perhaps a hundred thousand Armenians, stemming from the former Russian empire now live, it can never be forgotten that it was under Kerensky's influence in 1917 that the Jews were fully emancipated and that the Pale of Settlement was abolished, that the sovereign rights of Poland were recognized, that the rights of the Armenians, Georgians, Estonians, Ukrainians and other minorities to self-determination were declared to be inalienable. Kerensky's dream was a voluntary confederation of all the races of that former Czarist empire, a dream which humanity, to survive, will some day have to convert into reality.

When these legacies of Kerensky are compared with those of his powerful contemporaries, his stature in history assumed a dimension of the first magnitude. When one thinks of the statesmen who brought about the liquidation of the British Empire, of the Kaiser and his successors who brought untold disasters upon Germany; of the leaders of France whose Maginot Line minds led to the nation's catastrophe; of the Roosevelt diplomacy of Teheran and Yalta which has left the United States, 25 years after the last war, with nearly a million men under arms in Europe and Asia, then the legacies of Kerensky take on an enduring glow. They were love of country, love of humanity, and the greatest of them all, love of freedom.

MR. BOYLE'S ADMONITION TO THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, President W. A. Boyle of the United Mine Workers of America sent a telegram to the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert H. Finch, calling for

the appointment of an advisory committee on coal mine health research. You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that such a committee is provided for in section 102 (b) (1) of the recently enacted Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. Further, Mr. Speaker, such a committee was to have been appointed no later than March 30, 1970.

This delay is intolerable to American coal miners and to their families. I believe that Mr. Boyle's admonishment to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is worthy of the attention of Congress and I am, therefore, inserting it in the RECORD:

JUNE 8, 1970.

HON. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.:

The Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 section 102(b) (1) directs you to appoint an advisory committee on coal mine health research. As provided in section 509, the appointment of the committee was to be announced within ninety days following enactment of the law which should have been no later than March 30.

The American coal miners have waited patiently for action by you on the committee's appointment. The victims of coal workers' pneumoconiosis are desperately worried over every day of delay. Further delay seriously threatens the criteria developed by your department and endangers the availability of funds essential for the extensive research necessary for control and prevention of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. The United Mine Workers of America urges you to announce immediately the appointment of the advisory committee.

W. A. BOYLE,
President, United Mine Workers of America.

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on May 2 the New Republic, a magazine not noted for its conservative views or strict constructionist approach to the Constitution editorialized against Congress attempting to legislate the vote for 18-year-olds. The New Republic warns of the confusion that would follow if the Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional after a national election. This confusion is one reason the President has expressed his open opposition to legislating the 18-year-old vote and his approval of passing a constitutional amendment to obtain this vote.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the New Republic editorial:

[From the New Republic, May 2, 1970]

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD VOTE

As a crucial bill extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965 moved through the Senate toward passage earlier this month, a group of liberals attached a rider to it which would extend the franchise to 18-year-olds in local, state and federal elections. Giving them that right won't revolutionize American politics; remarkably few of the young exercise it. But there is broad, bipartisan agreement (Nixon to Kennedy) they should be given it; the question is, how? Legislation by rider is not

a practice that most of the liberal senators approve of in their soberer moments, and its use in this instance illustrates its vices.

While there are constitutional lawyers who believe that under recent Court decisions, Congress is authorized to take over from the states their traditional function of setting age and other qualifications for voting, there is equally persuasive and learned opinion to the contrary. The Senate's rider is thus of dubious constitutionality. The issue of the 18-year-old vote, as now presented, exerts what Justice Holmes once referred to as "hydraulic pressure." Should the Supreme Court uphold the constitutionality of the Senate rider under this pressure, it would launch a doctrine whose radiations are unpredictable, and in many applications quite possibly disadvantageous to the interests that sponsors of the rider care most about. The Court will have worked an historically significant shift in the balance of functions between the state and federal government. It has done so before; it may do so again. But the outcome is in doubt, and the wisdom at this time of requiring the Court to decide is questionable.

On the other hand, should the Court withstand the "hydraulic pressure" and declare the Senate rider unconstitutional, it would expose itself to the wrath of all those whose expectations it would defeat, and in the bargain cause confusion about the results of elections that may already have been held under the provisions of the rider.

These are the problems to which the proposal for legislative enfranchisement of 18-year-olds give rise. They could be bypassed by traveling instead, and as rapidly as possible, the route of a constitutional amendment—the route that was taken to guarantee suffrage to women (the 19th Amendment), to permit District of Columbia residents to vote for President (the 23rd) and to abolish the poll tax in federal elections (the 24th). Unfortunately, the decision now to go this route creates new perplexities. For any effort by the House to detach the Senate rider from the Voting Rights Bill will require sending that bill to a Senate-House conference committee (chaired in all probability by Sen. Eastland of Mississippi) and thereafter at some point to the Senate floor. That in turn would open an opportunity for a Southern filibuster, which previously was avoided by making a vote on the Carswell nomination conditional on a prior Senate vote on the Voting Rights Bill.

Extension of the Voting Rights Act is of paramount importance, especially to still-disenfranchised blacks in the South. One must therefore ask whether it was worth the risk to insist on giving 18-year-olds the vote by a questionable legislative method, rather than waiting, and it need not be a long wait, for the enactment of a constitutional amendment. The constitutional dilemma is real, and if the risks to the Voting Rights Bill do materialize, the responsibility will not be that of a group of Senate liberals alone, but their share of it will be a heavy one.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, despite rumors to the contrary the President has not changed his position regarding the 18-year-old vote. While not opposed to 18-year-olds voting, the President believes that this must be accomplished by a constitutional amendment.

Last month the Washington Post in an editorial explained why this is the better way.

The editorial is entitled "The Right Road Toward Voting at 18." I insert it in the RECORD at this time:

THE RIGHT ROAD TOWARD VOTING AT 18

It is most unfortunate that the voting rights bill and the proposal to lower the voting age to 18 years have become entangled in a political controversy. In our view, both are important. Both should be enacted on their own merits. But there is no logic in tying them together, and the President has made a formidable argument in his letter to Speaker McCormack that a uniform voting age can be fixed only by constitutional amendment.

Chairman Celler of the House Judiciary Committee fears that extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 may fall unless the House accepts the Senate bill with the voting-age rider attached. The answer to that is that Congress must not permit it to fail. But Congress should accept the bill for what it is. Logic becomes very twisted when the House leadership argues that a Senate rider of doubtful constitutionality should be accepted for the sake of presenting a more popular package.

The difficulty with the assumption that Congress has authority to fix the minimum age for voting is that it flies into the face of some rather specific provisions of the Constitution. Article I, Section 2, says that voters who elect members of the House shall have those qualifications fixed by the States for choice of their own legislators. The Seventeenth Amendment says the same in regard to electing senators. Whatever right Congress may have to change this is derived from the Fourteenth Amendment which forbids the denial of "equal protection of the laws."

But is a voting age of 21 years a denial of equal protection? Can it really be said to involve "invidious discrimination" against the young, to use the phrase the Supreme Court applied in its so-called one-man-one-vote decisions? Apparently the authors and ratifiers of the Fourteenth Amendment did not think so, for they specifically recognized the voting age limit of 21 years to be the correct one. In Section 2 of that amendment they provided that a state's representatives in Congress should be reduced if it should deny or abridge voting rights of male citizens over 21.

The only ground on which the sponsors of a voting-age change by statute have to stand is the Supreme Court's decision in the Morgan case. The court upheld a provision in the 1965 Voting Rights Act enfranchising Puerto Rican children in New York who were literate in Spanish but not in English. The state had made ability to read and write English the test, thus discriminating against an ethnic minority. It is, as the President noted a, giant leap to go from this well founded conclusion to the flimsy assumption that denial of the vote to youths of 18, 19 and 20 is discriminatory in a constitutional sense, when the Fourteenth Amendment itself clearly indicates that it is not.

In the face of this strong evidence that a statute intended to give 18-year-olds the vote would not accomplish its purpose, the risk should not be taken. Congress should not put the Supreme Court in the position of having to go along with an unconstitutional statute or risk disappointing millions of young people for reasons many would not understand. Nor should it subject the country to the potential chaos that might result from many local, state and national elections in which eligibility to vote would be open to wide question. The Senate bill makes provision for an early test of constitutionality in the courts, but there could be no assurance that the issue would be finally resolved even for the 1972 presidential election.

The President is open to criticism for not

having pushed his proposed voting-age amendment months ago, although his views have been well known since the 1968 campaign and an amendment for the purpose is already before the Senate, with the endorsement of two-thirds of its members. If this were promptly passed by both houses, it could be ratified in time for the 1972 election. The women's suffrage amendment required only 15 months for ratification.

It is highly probable that, if Congress acts promptly, a new amendment would be in effect in less time than would be required for a definitive constitutional test under the statutory procedure proposed by the Senate. And that procedure is likely to prove futile in the end. We urge Congress to take the right road toward a worthy objective without further bickering.

U.S. POW'S, MIA'S FAMILIES ARE PAWNS OF THE COMMUNISTS

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, William McGaffin, a writer for the Washington Bureau of the Chicago Daily News has written an article which ought to be read by every citizen of the United States and the free world.

Contrary to all agreements, treaties, rules, and basic humanitarianism, the Communists are mistreating our prisoners and tormenting their families as a policy of war.

Worldwide public opinion needs to be mobilized to help prisoners of the Asian Communists.

I commend the following article which appeared in the June 10, 1970, issue of the Chicago Daily News.

The newspaper is to be commended for reporting the story of our neglected and forgotten citizens. If every newspaper would publicize this extraordinary tragedy, perhaps the plight and torment could be alleviated.

The article follows:

YANK PW'S: PAWNS OF THE REDS—TWO WARS HAVE SHOWN US THAT ASIAN COMMUNISTS REGARD PRISONER LISTS, LETTERS, TORTURE AS TOOLS TO GAIN VICTORY

(By William McGaffin)

WASHINGTON.—Miserable food, poor medical care, solitary confinement and no word to your anxious family back home that you're a prisoner.

There is a tragically familiar ring to the accounts of how Americans taken prisoner in the Vietnam War are being treated by their Communist captors.

At the Pentagon, it brings back bitter memories of what happened to American prisoners during the Korean War.

Pentagon officials frankly acknowledge they have found no solution to the prisoner of war problem that developed during the last two wars the United States has fought in the Pacific.

Their only consolation is that the number of Americans held in Communist prison camps is far smaller this time than in the war with North Korea, which broke out 20 years ago. As of May 9, there were 1,440 missing in the Indochina war.

Almost 800 of these were Air Force and Navy airmen shot down in North Vietnam, according to Pentagon records, while 450 were lost in South Vietnam and nearly 200 in Laos.

Of the 1,440, 452 are believed to have been captured. Until they are repatriated, there

can be no certain knowledge how many died while prisoners.

In North Korea, there were 7,140 American prisoners taken and 38 per cent of these—2,701—died in prison camps. Not since the Revolutionary War had there been such a high death rate among war prisoners.

Some critics contended after the war that many Americans died because they were soft products of a decadent generation and simply gave up instead of fighting to stay alive. But the defense advisory committee on prisoners of war concluded, after an investigation, that probably the greatest single reason for the high death rate was the death marches.

Many died during the bitter winter of 1950 when they were forced to march 300 miles from temporary prisons to permanent camps along the Yalu River.

"The North Koreans frequently tied a prisoner's hands behind his back or bound his arms with wire," said the committee report. "Wounded prisoners were jammed into trucks that jolted, dripping blood, along broken roads. Many of the wounded received no medical attention until they reached the camp."

"The marching prisoners were liable to be beaten or kicked to their feet if they fell. A number of the North Korean officers were bullwhip barbarians, products of a semi-primitive environment. Probably they had never heard of the Geneva Convention or any other code of war. The worst of this breed were responsible for the murder of men who staggered out of line or collapsed at roadside."

While fewer Americans have been captured in the Vietnam War, some of them have had to endure the grim lot of prison life longer than in any other war in our history. The longest any were held by the North Koreans was about three years. In the Vietnam war, however, some of our men have been prisoners for more than five years.

The principal charge against the enemy now, as during the Korean War, is that our prisoners are being given inhumane treatment.

"The provision for the treatment of prisoners of war is prescribed in the Geneva Convention of 1949, which has been signed by more than 120 nations, including the United States, South Vietnam and North Vietnam," says Richard G. Capen Jr., legislative affairs assistant to the secretary of defense.

"These humanitarian standards spelled out in that document call for the immediate release of sick and injured prisoners, impartial inspections of prisoner facilities and the complete identification of men held, and allows prisoners to correspond freely with their families."

The only one of these provisions honored in the slightest in either war is the prisoners' mail privilege. There have been precious few letters in this war. "In the five years our men have been held captive, only about 175 have been allowed to write," says Capen. "Their families have received about 1,100 letters."

During the Korean War, more than 29,000 letters were received in the United States. This larger volume then did not by any means indicate that the Chinese Communists, who were running the prison camps, were more endowed with humanitarian instincts than the North Vietnamese today.

It simply reflected a difference in techniques. It suited the purpose of the Chinese to permit a larger flow of mail to inject a steady stream of Communist propaganda into American homes.

The North Vietnamese, on the other hand, have been withholding mail rights for a definite purpose, in the judgment of Pentagon officials.

They regard it as still another Communist way of trying to bring down the U.S. government. For, by declining to let letters get out, and by refusing to issue a full list of

prisoners in their hands, the Communists know they must be increasing the anguish of relatives who do not know whether their missing men are dead or alive. The Communists apparently hope this will make the controversial war even more unpopular.

TORTURE AND MURDER

Torture? It is a tactic that has not gone out of style. The only difference is that the North Vietnamese use it for different reasons than those that motivated the North Koreans and Chinese Communists.

During the Korean War, the goal was sometimes to force the American captives to sign germ warfare confessions. There were reports of bamboo splinters being driven under the fingernails and even, in one case, of an airman with gangrene being refused medical attention while his rotting fingers fell off.

More often, the goal was to try to convert the captured Americans to communism. Those who went along, or at least seemed to, were given better treatment and better food than the basic diet of rice and cold soup that caused dysentery. Those who refused could end up being thrown into solitary confinement in caves, without blankets or latrine facilities, with their food being thrown at them.

With the North Vietnamese, torture is a method used to extract military information from their prisoners or to punish them for having bombed North Vietnam or to make them sign statements that they have received humane treatment.

"The North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have repeatedly indicated that they are providing humane treatment for our men," says Capen. "But the contrary is true. Our men have been held in isolation for prolonged periods of time. There have been instances of broken bones being rebroken, fingernails removed, medical attention denied and proper diets ignored.

"In addition, we are aware of at least 19 American prisoners who have been murdered by the enemy or allowed to die from malnutrition and disease."

NO POW INFORMATION

Whether all of our prisoners are having a generally awful experience or whether conditions may vary some between the camps run by the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong is something that cannot be stated definitely, according to some Pentagon sources.

They say that most of what they know about the prison camps has been supplied by the 9 American prisoners released by North Vietnam and the 21 released by the Viet Cong.

They acknowledge that some of the men who were held by the Viet Cong returned to our lines saying they were treated so well that they could never fight the Viet Cong again.

There has been more publicity put out by the Pentagon about the prisoners in the last year. This was done on orders of Sec. of Defense Melvin R. Laird. He felt that the previous policy of keeping quiet about the prisoners had gotten us nowhere.

Laird hoped that this new policy would get results by bringing world opinion to bear on the North Vietnamese.

They have not yielded, however. If our North Korean experience is any guide, the prisoner problem will not be resolved until the war is over.

THE DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I used to think it was only a cat that had nine lives

but it appears now that the Dickey-Lincoln School Federal hydroelectric project in Maine is also in that category.

As the famous keynote speaker once said: "How long, oh Lord, how long will this go on?" It is hoped that the House Appropriations Committee will not allow funds for this patently absurd Dickey project, which is becoming an annual event similar to the Kentucky Derby, the World Series, or the Super Bowl.

I am certain that the Members of the House, in a sense of fair play, do not mind taking a second look or even a third look at any project. But when it becomes a ninth or 10th look we are clearly being asked not only to waste millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money on these projects, but in addition we are wasting the valuable time of the House in debate, rollcalls and time-consuming reporting of all these events. The facts remain just as clear now as they did 6 years ago when this project was first seriously proposed:

First. The projects will waste close to one-half billion of taxpayers' money;

Second. It would produce power for only 2 hours a day at an exorbitant cost and located over 400 miles from where the power is needed;

Third. It would be highly destructive to the natural beauty of the St. Johns River and is actively opposed by a multitude of conservation groups.

The Dickey project is clearly a lifeless lemon that has been squeezed out of the budget by this House innumerable times. We should do so again and the quicker the better.

A PROGRAM OF PRIORITIES FOR THE SEVENTIES

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, recently addressed the annual forum of National Conference on Social Welfare. Currently serving as dean of the School of Education, University of Michigan, Mr. Cohen gave a most thoughtful and provoking speech on "A Program of Priorities for the Seventies."

Mr. Cohen's address painted with broad strokes, some of the problems and some remedies for our domestic problems. I have been especially concerned with a problem that is raised in this paper: The casual assumption that with the termination of the Vietnam conflict our energies will be directed to solving our pressing domestic problems. I agree with Mr. Cohen that this casual assumption must be challenged. To alleviate the inequities in our society requires concrete planning and determined effort.

I feel that Mr. Cohen's paper provides some directions that should be considered and acted upon. I commend this statement to the readers of this RECORD:

A PROGRAM OF PRIORITIES FOR THE SEVENTIES
(By Wilbur J. Cohen)

We meet at our 1970 Conference at a critical time in our Nation's history.

Our country is in a grave crisis. There is a growing divisiveness and frustration which grips the nation. There is a lack of understanding in high places of our needs and priorities. There is a lack of leadership at the Federal, State, and local levels. There is often rhetoric when it is least helpful.

The gigantic problems facing us mount: the war, poverty, race relations, the cities, slums, unemployment, inflation, pollution—in the face of affluence, inequalities, inequities, and the great capacity of the country for meeting the basic needs of all its people.

We need leadership and intelligent action to end the war. We must continue to press the President and the Congress to end the war. Not only to end this war but to end all wars. Escalation of military expenditures must be ended. We must oppose the ABM system and the SST. These are unnecessary and undesirable expenditures.

But it is clear that the withdrawal of armed forces from Vietnam will not solve our domestic problems automatically. To redirect our priorities will take time, effort and statesmanship. We must begin this task immediately.

There are still among our fellow-citizens many who believe that poverty is inevitable, that segregation is desirable, that increased unemployment is healthy, that poor people are lazy, that more and bigger automobiles are a sign of economic growth, that long hair is a sign of radicalism, and that problems on the college campus can be solved by replacing the college President. There are those who believe that all taxes paid in the public sector are bad but any price paid in the private sector is acceptable and that the Federal Government is an evil worse than any foreign totalitarianism.

We must continue to point out that these simplistic notions are out-of-date in a complex economy. But most of all we must strive to elect men and women to public office who have the insight and the courage to counter these views which retard our progress and inhibit the reordering of priorities to meet the needs of our people.

The social welfare community has a special responsibility to draw attention to our compelling needs and potentialities. That is one of the values of this Annual Forum—to tell of our convictions and our programs for making the United States of America a more perfect Union.

The right to vote is an inalienable right and should be guaranteed and protected. Residence laws for receipt of welfare payments have been held invalid by the Supreme Court of the United States. Residence requirements for national elections are an equally unsound policy. Every otherwise eligible individual should be entitled to vote in national elections for Congressmen, Senators, and President. And we must encourage everyone to do so.

The right to education, medical services, a job, and a home, without regard to discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, or sex must be assured. There is no ethical distinction that can be justified between de jure and de facto segregation or discrimination. Our political leaders must not hide behind constitutional niceties but must take the moral leadership to help eradicate the cancer of discrimination and racism from the body politic. The elimination of racial discrimination would increase incomes by some \$15 billion a year and would aid in the reduction of poverty and in the increase in productivity and the enhancement of individual dignity, and self-reliance.

Poverty is a blight upon our nation. It is clear that we could eradicate poverty from the length and breadth of this land of ours. We have the resources. We have the institutional mechanisms. We lack the insight, the determination, and the leadership.

Yet, much has happened in the last several years to give us hope that we are on our way to reducing the extent of poverty. The

report of the Commission headed by Ben Heineman and the report of the Committee on Economic Development show an increasing awareness by business and community leaders that we can and must conquer poverty. I believe we should make the elimination of poverty one of our urgent national goals—now.

A broad and comprehensive income supplement program is necessary. It must be broader and much more adequate than the Family Assistance Program now pending in the Senate. Not only must the levels of payment be increased but a commitment must be made that the Federal government finance and administer the system. We should support the amendments in the Senate toward these objectives.

Social security benefits should be substantially increased. In addition to the 15 percent increase in social security benefits which took place this year we must increase social security benefits another 35 percent to bring them up to a minimum level of adequacy. The 12 percent increase in benefits which recently passed the House of Representatives is a good second installment payment but it can and should be improved in the Senate.

An increase in social security payments will benefit not only the aged, but the disabled and widows and dependent children.

The disabled and the widows and children receiving social security benefits should be included in the medicare program. Their incomes are low and their needs are great. They should have health insurance protection which should include coverage of prescription drugs for them as well as the aged.

There are some 40 million persons in the United States who have no health insurance coverage. Millions of others have incomplete or inadequate coverage. A national health insurance program covering everyone in the Nation is necessary—and inevitable.

There are many persons who believe we must wait for a complete restructuring of our health system before we extend health insurance to the millions who have no protection. Certainly, we need a basic reorganization of our health services. We need incentives to economical and efficient delivery of services. But the poor and the disadvantaged should not be asked to wait for full access to health services until the perfect solution of a national health delivery system is in effect.

We must take some steps now in the direction of both extending health insurance coverage, and reorganization of services.

Neighborhood health centers should be established in all major metropolitan areas; maternal and child health services should be available to inner city residents including family planning services on a voluntary basis; and a broad training program for persons living in the inner cities should be carried out for new careers in medical care.

We must take steps to eradicate hunger and malnutrition in the Nation. As one step in this effort, the amendment sponsored in the Senate by Senator McGovern to the welfare reform bill should be adopted. It provides for automatic delivery of food stamps to each welfare recipient without the advance payment now required. It would substantially reduce the administrative cost of the present cumbersome plan and make food stamps available to millions of persons who do not now receive them.

Our unemployment insurance system requires major improvement. While the Congress enacted legislation this year to extend the coverage of the program, much more fundamental changes are needed. While many unemployed individuals receive inadequate weekly payments and other unemployed individuals exhaust their benefits, there is \$12 billion in unemployment insurance reserves. It is clear that the funds are actually avail-

able to substantially improve the amount and duration of benefits.

It is a striking anomaly that the welfare reform legislation provides for minimum Federal benefit standards which is endorsed by the Administration and the House Committee on Ways and Means but minimum Federal benefit standards are opposed by both as far as unemployment insurance is concerned. I can see no difference in principle. As a matter of fact Congress approved Federal standards in unemployment insurance this year relating to various policies affecting benefits. We must continue to press for Federal minimum benefit standards in unemployment insurance relating to the amount and duration of benefits. Since the President recommended Federal minimum benefit standards in Welfare, we must press him to recommend such standards in unemployment insurance as part of an immediate attack on our growing unemployment problem.

Farm employees should be covered under unemployment insurance. In addition, farm employees should be covered under the National Labor Relations Act so that they will have the rights and protection to bargain collectively.

Several recent Supreme Court decisions have clearly established the applicability of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution to welfare payments and procedures. The Constitutional guarantees of equal protection of the laws and due process must be assured to every person, rich or poor, black or white, student or adult. Continued support should be given to the program of legal aid to the poor and lawyers should be encouraged to handle cases which contest the validity of any law which transgresses the constitutional guarantees including any legislation which invades the home by authorizing "no-knock" entry by the police.

State laws relating to abortion must be changed and liberalized. State programs relating to the protection of women and children must be reexamined and brought up to date. States must strengthen their services to children, the aged, and other groups requiring special help, such as the mentally retarded and the mentally ill.

To accomplish the social objectives that are necessary during this decade we must obtain increased revenues. Some additional funds can be obtained from substantial reductions in military expenditures, from elimination of waste and inefficiency in existing programs, and from reduction in unnecessary agricultural subsidies, particularly in tobacco.

But in addition we must close the existing loopholes in the Federal and State tax structures. There are still several States without a State income tax law. No State can provide the services necessary for its people today without an income tax.

To expand education and to provide the disadvantaged with appropriate educational services, there must be a significant increase in funds for education during the decade of the seventies. The property tax on homes which is a basic source of revenue for elementary and secondary education is no longer a sound and dynamic source for the financing of schools. The property tax on homes must be reduced, and eventually eliminated, as a basis for financing schools. State and Federal income taxes must provide the major source of revenues for the schools of the future.

Our educational system must be made more relevant to the needs and aspirations of our young people. Vocational education should be broadened and extended. Early childhood education should be available in every community. The advantages of the Head Start program should be available to all children. Parents and the community should be involved in the educational system.

Our higher educational institutions must

enroll more individuals from minority groups. Schools of social work and schools of education have been leading the way and should further accelerate their efforts in this area. Student financial aid, institutional aid for tutorial services, and for expansion of recruitment and job placement.

We view with great concern the failure of the Administration to recommend additional Federal appropriations for existing education and health programs. We urge the Congress to take affirmative action to increase the appropriations for programs of importance to the disadvantaged, the poor, and minority groups.

Those of us in social welfare who believe that the public sector must take a greater role in improving social conditions are frequently criticized for this advocacy on the grounds that it weakens individual, family, and private responsibility. The fact of the matter is that increased public responsibility is necessary because of the inability or failure of private action.

There is much that the private sector can and must do and we should bend every effort to make the private sector take a more effective role in promoting human welfare. Among the significant steps that could be taken are: elimination of any kind of discrimination in employment or promotion; on-the-job training for the disadvantaged with emphasis on new careers; extension of credit to welfare recipients; and addition of minority group representatives on boards of directors of corporations, foundations and educational institutions.

I believe that important changes are necessary in our existing economic, political, and social system. I believe our political system permits these changes to be made in a way in which the establishment can and will accept them, namely, through the ballot box. Let us work toward changes which will be constructive and useful.

We need at this moment of history the determination to make changes and to chart a course in a new direction of social policy. We can do so if we work together.

There are many people today who are frustrated, alienated, and depressed about our ability to move ahead in a constructive manner. I do not share this view. There are vast opportunities today for men and women of good will to lead the way to changing our institutions. There are opportunities all around if we would but take advantage of them—in your neighborhood, in your community, at the city and State level, in Congress, and in urging the National Administration to change policies.

We have had grave crises in our national life before. We will have others in the future. Let us show a determination now to move ahead in social welfare. I believe we can and must chart new priorities for the nineteen seventies.

NEW EVIDENCE SHOWS NEED FOR STRONG DOMESTIC PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the June 1967 war between Israel and the Arab States there was some doubt as to whether the Soviet Union would continue to play an active role in the Middle East. The presence of Soviet pilots, latest model surface-to-air missiles, and a strong naval presence in

the Mediterranean today leaves no doubt that the Soviet Union is heavily committed to continue her influence in this strategic area.

Early this year the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Imports recommended that the quota system of controlling imports of foreign oil into the United States should be replaced by a preferential tariff system designed to cut the well-head price of a barrel of oil by 50 to 80 cents. In short the task force majority recommended that by 1980 the United States should rely on foreign petroleum producers for between 40 and 50 percent of its total demand.

To some there is no connection between these two events. To me, however, there is a very strong connection between the Soviet presence in the Middle East and the task force report. Both threaten the national security of the United States.

The Soviet interest in the Middle East goes far beyond its traditional aspirations for a warm water outlet to the high seas. Soviet presence in the area goes beyond its ideological desires of wanting to downgrade Western influence among the peoples of the area.

The Soviet challenge is designed to deny Middle East oil to Europe and North America and, beyond that, to provide sure supplies of Middle East oil to the Soviet Union and other Communist bloc nations.

On March 24, 1970, the New York Times reported:

Western diplomats believe the possibility must be faced that the Russians will seek one way or another to take over the oil supplies in North Africa, Iran, Iraq, and the Persian Gulf area.

Soviet actions since then show that they seem willing to take very high risks to achieve that goal.

This morning—June 16, 1970—issue of the Christian Science Monitor contains a revealing story by Eric Bourne of some of the motivation behind the Soviet Union's efforts. In Mr. Bourne's words:

The background is the way in which Russia's traditional oil centers are leveling off against the spurting consumption demands of its own economy and the economies in its orbit.

I insert the article by Mr. Bourne, entitled "Thirst for Oil Jumbles East-Bloc Patterns," at this point:

THRIST FOR OIL JUMBLES EAST-BLOC PATTERNS

(By Eric Bourne)

BELGRADE.—Oil, oil, oil.

Few economic topics are more important or more frequently in the news in the European Communist area now.

And the pursuit of it is not only establishing a highly significant pattern of "oil diplomacy."

It is also cutting across old ties and barriers. It is forging new commercial links between Russia and Western Europe and between Russia's East European allies and Middle East sources hitherto monopolized by the West.

The background is the way in which Russia's traditional oil centers are leveling off against the spurting consumption demands of its own economy and the countries in its orbit.

Soviet output is inevitably shifting eastward to central and northern Siberia which

contain untold riches in oil and gas. But because of harsh winter conditions, these sources present formidable technical problems which will take some years to overcome.

OUTPUT ESTIMATED

Meanwhile, the East Europeans—thus far able to depend on the Soviets exclusively—have been told the Soviet Union will not be able to meet the kind of needs they themselves anticipate in the 1980's.

If present aims are realized, Soviet output will top 500 million tons by 1975. Not more than one-fifth reportedly will be available for export.

According to one Soviet expert on internal bloc economic affairs, East European needs now are mounting much faster than foreseen. Within a decade they could reach nearly 250 million tons, more than five times their present level.

Even a second Friendship pipeline, due to open in 1972 and adjunct to that which has piped Urals oil to Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany since the '60's, cannot be expected to cope.

AUTO "EXPLOSION" COMING

The plain fact of Russia's relatively declining oil export surplus compels East Europe to look elsewhere to meet increasing industrial needs and an automobile "explosion" which is only a few years off.

Russia, for its part, has signed 20-year agreements with West Germany and Italy to supply vast quantities of gas in return for cold-resistant, large-diameter pipes required for its new oil fields.

The East Europeans, notably Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Romania, have negotiated oil agreements with Iran and Iraq. They are parties also to several pipeline projects—quite apart from the Friendship lines—to solve the problems of transportation.

Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland too are interested in the Yugoslav plan to bring Arab-Middle East oil into the north Adriatic port of Rijeka and pipe it north from there.

The original scheme has been enlarged because of ever keener East European interest. The line will have an annual capacity of 20 million tons.

SWITCH IN ENERGY BASE

Both the Romanians and the Yugoslavs have their special interest in this project. The former hope to tanker some of the Middle East oil to Rijeka from a pipeline terminal on the Turkish coast.

The Yugoslavs still import oil from Russia. But Middle East supplies could replace that and, furthermore, provide more oil for their rapidly developing refining industry.

The Friendship 2 pipeline will ultimately double Hungary's intake from the Soviet Union. But current plans to switch the country's energy basis from coal to oil and natural gas will call for supplies beyond Soviet capacity to provide.

Hungary, anticipating a need approaching 10 million tons by 1980, is planning a big expansion of production at its Alygoe natural gas and oil fields in the south.

These, discovered only five years ago, are reputed to be the richest reserves in Middle Europe. It is anticipated that in a few years these will account for nearly 50 percent of Hungary's domestic oil output.

One of Europe's largest refineries is being built at Szaszhalombatta which will be linked both to Alygoe and to the Friendship pipelines and the new line envisaged from Rijeka.

It may be a matter of only a few years before Middle (West Germany and Austria), Southern (Italy), and Eastern Europe will be on the same oil "wave lengths" via pipelines reaching westward across the continent from Siberia and from the Middle East to the Adriatic.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the United States must accept the Soviet challenge

in the Middle East. Our interests there are too vital for us to do otherwise. In making this commitment, however, we should retain a flexible strategy designed to avoid the threat of more violence and conflict in the area. Nonetheless the lesson since 1947 is clear—the Soviet Union halts only when confronted with superior force.

There is another equally or even more important lesson to be taken from the events in the Middle East. The United States must not become dependent on foreign sources of petroleum. Becoming reliant on foreign sources of petroleum at a time when the Soviet Union threatens to be able to control them could, in my judgment, prove catastrophic to the United States. Hence we must reject the recommendations of the task force and, instead, create a policy that will insure domestic self-sufficiency of petroleum.

Throughout March and April of this year, following issuance of the task force report, the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Interior Committee held hearings on the impact of adoption of the task force's recommendations. In my capacity as a member of the committee I was able to question experts in every phase of the petroleum industry and in the Government of the United States.

The overall conclusions that were drawn from the hearings is that the basic quota system should be continued.

Our domestic energy needs are great and increasing at a rapid pace. This year the United States will consume nearly 15 million barrels of oil and 58 billion cubic feet of gas every day. That amounts to 8 billion barrels of oil and 21 trillion cubic feet of natural gas annually. Conservative estimates indicate that by 1985, the daily U.S. requirements will be 22 million barrels of oil and 90 billion cubic feet of gas.

I contend that unless we change our present short-sighted policies, we will experience a severe shortage of petroleum prior to 1985. In short we will be subject to "petroleum blackmail" unless we devise and implement a national energy policy designed to insure the Nation adequate domestic supplies of petroleum.

The Nation has ample energy fuels resources. They must, however, be explored, developed, and marketed. To do so, we must pursue policies that will provide the incentive for high levels of oil and natural gas exploration. We must follow programs to develop our vast deposits of oil shales. We must find economic ways of converting coal to synthetic petroleum fuels. In short we must put ourselves in a position where we will never be subjected to "petroleum blackmail" by the Soviet Union or any other nation.

NOW IS THE TIME TO WAGE PEACE

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 31, 1970, commencement exercises for the graduating class at King's College in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., were held. The

commencement address was delivered by the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and former Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission. It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to insert in today's RECORD the impressive address given on that occasion by Mr. Macy.

The address follows:

NOW IS THE TIME TO WAGE PEACE

President Kilburn, directors, faculty, students and friends of King's College, and most important of all, the men and women of the graduating class of 1970.

Commencement in 1970. A different time. An uncertain hour. Traditional forms and ceremonies have been altered or eliminated. Many colleges and universities have seen the academic serenity of the season shattered by discord and violence. The strains of alienation have drowned out the new hope that has customarily flowed as a new rising generation commences its contribution to American life. A remote and unpopular war has shaken the confidence of the student generation in its leadership and its institutions. The relevance of scholarship and the value of education have become targets of dissent. In such a climate the revolutionaries of the right and left have found new followers for the causes of revolution and repression.

Against the backdrop of realities what is the role of a commencement speaker at King's College with its Catholic character deriving "from a shared respect by members of the college community for the Catholic faith in the role of brotherhood" and where the dedication is to Christ the King? Is his role another vestige of traditional past now without meaning? Can he in a few brief moments of rhetoric provide even a tiny millimeter of enrichment to the academic experience just concluded? Certainly, he should not be so brazen as to offer even corroborating or endorsing footnotes to the teaching of this fine faculty. The national scene provides him with an ample supply of sombre colors with which to paint a landscape of gloomy prospects. The violent behavior of a tiny percentage of other college students can constitute a license for a sermon on the true and forsaken values. Or if he is a descendant of Pollyanna he can view 1970 as a brief aberration in the psychological evaluation of American society and point to a future of peace and prosperity which can be obtained without effort or sacrifice.

None of these roles appeal to me. Instead I come to you this afternoon as a future colleague in a vital, demanding, public-spirited, Christian based mission: to wage peace for all mankind. Now let us wage peace together. The war must end. Domestic violence must be converted into a new form of brotherhood. But that is not enough. Just like law and order is not enough. Just like well-intentioned statements in support of equality, the abolition of poverty, the availability of education, the rebuilding of cities, the preservation of environment are not enough. There is need to set a more difficult course which involves thought and communication, action and sacrifice.

But you will say, those are words, they are mere exhortation, no one can dispute these goals, but what can we, a new generation of college graduates really contribute to the waging of peace?

You are right. Force me to be specific. You are entitled to more than verbs. You should have the courses of action which lead from that.

Armed with the values and the knowledge gained in your home and in this fine institution you are equipped to make your contribution to this mission within the structures of contemporary institutions. These insti-

tutions will respond to new expectations. It is not necessary to destroy in order to rebuild. The response to the necessity of change has been laggard in the past but the tardiness has been more attributable to public apathy than to leadership venality or defense of the status quo. The majority has been silent too long. Not only silent, it has not participated in charting the direction of change, in communicating the choices available, in expressing a willingness to participate in the available processes leading to change.

You will notice I placed "thought" as my first step. Each individual and each group must draw upon its values and knowledge, must study and analyze, must make the difficult choices and lay out considered plans as the rational basis for action. There is a limitless array of targets to attack in waging peace. Too many targets to aim at simultaneously. Select a manageable number. Acquire as thorough an understanding as possible of their characteristics. Weigh the consequences of proposed changes or courses of action. Become the well informed advocate for the position you believe merits significant action.

In these times of tension and alienation the anguished cry has gone up for more and better communication, between individuals, between groups, between races and generations and nations. It is an irony that in a time when technology has bestowed upon us virtually limitless capacity for communication man seems to find communication with fellow man so difficult. Through television, radio, telephone, records, tapes, pictures and sounds are transmitted in fractions of seconds to millions of places within the country and through the miracle of satellites to points around the world. In the period between now and your tenth reunion at King's there will be the means for the simultaneous delivery of sound and picture to the 3 billion people of the globe. The technology will be there. But what will be the message delivered over that system which will deny the obstacle of ocean and mountain and even man-made national boundaries and ideologies? It may well be that the nation most effective in communicating affirmatively to other peoples via this system can assert the leadership for peace on this small planet. Yet our communicating goals need not be so planetary. They can and should be directed to community or neighborhood. Every possible means of communication should be used to communicate the need for change and action in areas which breed conflict—lack of food, unemployment or underemployment, deteriorating housing, inadequate education, costly delivery of health care, insensitivity of government. While our urbanization may have submerged the New England town meeting, there are still neighborhoods with men and women concerned not only about their own family but about their fellow Americans within walking and talking distance. And the mass media must respond to these public needs by offering television and radio time for the communication of ideas for betterment whether popular or unpopular. The public service of the media which some of us are endeavoring to establish in a more responsive and comprehensive form should offer the forum for the presentation of ideas, for the conduct of debate and for the stimulation of action.

Yes, you can be active in this cause. Public service everywhere is reaching out for talent committed to the solution of public problems all the way from the inner precinct to the outer space. Participation in the political process is the most direct form of action. Elected officials are those who represent the collective wills of the voting public in our system. All too many self-appointed critics abuse their political leaders while investing none of their own time or resources in the

political process. Young people demonstrated in the national campaigns of 1968 the significant impact they could bring to bear on traditional practices. But has that effort been sustained? Perhaps negative reaction to the Cambodian incursion has regenerated these pressures in recent days. But these are critical problems on the peace front which call for sustained political involvement from the local committee to the nation's capital. The new generation of voters, and I hope it will include the 18, 19 and 20-year olds, must stimulate that most basic participation—action at the polls. Voting statistics show that even in 1968 with the war issue at the forefront a smaller percentage of the youngest age bracket cast ballots than the middle-agers or the senior citizens. And run for office as soon as the minimum age and qualifications have been reached. Test those thoughts in the crucible of local politics. Carry your idealism and your energy into the homes and meetingplaces of your fellow citizens.

There are countless outlets for public service at all levels of government and in distant countries overseas. All of these services will be deprived and inadequate if they do not receive an infusion of new talent from this rising generation. Certainly bureaucracy is rigid and difficult to change. Certainly an individual with a cause may find his superiors hard of hearing or impatient with dissent. Certainly public life imposes higher standards of ethics and personal conduct and restricts the financial return for one's labor. But the purpose of the work in the public interest transcends these handicaps and a sufficient number of pragmatic idealists will hasten the day of change and improvement. Although productive and satisfying careers may be committed to public causes, more and more there are those who devote more limited periods of professional time to serve the needs of city or nation. In recent times the volunteer has enrolled to help in a distant barrio or a nearby ghetto in achieving a higher standard of life for others. American culture has long been enriched by the part played by voluntary organizations such as the Red Cross, the health agencies, the community service organizations and the like. We must not forget the longstanding leadership of the church in its outreach near and far in behalf of peace. May you enlist, full time or part time, at home or abroad, in the peace forces of public service to apply thoughtful and skillful action in the solution of our long agenda of human problems.

But I mentioned "sacrifice." Must that become a condition in the fight for peace? Yes, I believe so. We have had our nation demand and receive sacrifice in time of war. The ultimate sacrifice on the part of some, a much more limited sacrifice in the form of reduced standard of living, greater individual effort, and higher taxes on the part of others. The task of waging peace is more difficult and more costly. It is generally agreed today that our planet faces an environmental crisis. Our rate of population growth will consume resources beyond our capacity for replenishment. Our industrial and consumer practices are poisoning our air, polluting our streams, destroying our open space, imbalancing our ecology. Even with heavy investment to reverse existing trends, we can only hope to preserve a status quo which is less than entirely satisfactory. To reverse this deterioration it will be necessary to change existing practices with the resultant economic effect of higher prices, less convenient packaging, and perhaps even a reduced supply of consumer goods. The sacrifice may well have to be more than economic. We may have to impose upon ourselves certain social and behavioral disciplines which we have not previously deemed necessary in a free, democratic society.

If we are to root out the causes of poverty and segregation, we must be willing to pay

the price of higher taxes to construct far better housing for the urban and rural poor, to provide quality education in the school and in the home from pre-school to post-graduate, to offer meaningful and beneficial employment for those on the margin of the labor-force, to deliver health services which relieve pain and eradicate illness, to assure equality and justice for all of our citizens. Hopefully, these goals of social progress can be sought through action by the private sector as well as by government, but we cannot expect that they can ever be achieved without a willingness on the part of us all to make our contribution to the total good.

In this commitment to improve conditions at home we cannot forget how small this globe has become. Technology has collapsed time and distance as physical gulfs between the peoples of the world. This collapse closes off any desired retreat into isolationism after the disillusionment of Indo-China. New and more constructive forms of international collaboration must be designed in the years ahead. This is the year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, to date man's most advanced reach toward international collaboration. Imperfect as it is, it must be extended and expanded in the next twenty-five years to bring mankind closer together not only physically but in terms of human objectives. The United States must be an active and creative leader in pursuing this purpose. While 6 percent of the world's population, we are consuming 50 percent of its resources. Our standard of living, even with its pockets of disadvantage, outstrips even our most advanced and developed countries in other portions of the northern slope of the globe. But we are only 6 percent and it is difficult to comprehend the true dimension of humankind. I find it helps me to appreciate our relative position in this human mass by taking a small sample. That sample is the number of infants born on the planet in the last 60 seconds. They total 200,160 were non-white. Half of the 200 will die before they reach their first birthday. Two-thirds of those who survive will spend the balance of their estimated life span of 30 years undernourished, uneducated and in hard labor. These figures constitute the forceful argument against isolationism and place in sharp focus the imperative for continued and expanded American assistance to the rest of the world in the crusade for peace.

Contrary to the tradition of commencement speakers, I am not passing the torch to light this mission to you alone but rather seeking the association of your skill, wisdom and idealism in partnership with those of us who will continue to seek these goals with the utmost in our own capacity. May all of you join with us, each in his or her way, and may we advance together in waging peace for the benefit of all mankind.

**NEW YORK STATE DEMOCRATIC
COMMITTEE'S CONVOCATION
SUPPORTS THE AMENDMENT TO
END THE WAR**

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1970, the New York State Democratic Committee sponsored a convocation of concerned Democrats from throughout the State. The convocation adopted a very significant resolution, based on the aims of making the American system

work successfully, making our Government and the Democratic Party responsive to our people's needs, restoring the dialog essential to democracy, ending the violence at home and abroad, and making the Democratic Party of New York an instrument to restore domestic tranquility and to end the war in Indochina.

The convocation pledged its support for the amendment to end the war—the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, of which I am a cosponsor in the House. It similarly endorsed several other positions, all of which I commend to my colleagues. The resolution calls "for the end—now—to a war that has no national purpose and that is morally, politically, economically and militarily wrong."

The resolution of the New York Democratic Convocation follows:

RESOLUTIONS FOR THE NEW YORK DEMOCRATIC CONVOCATION

MAY 20, 1970.

We Democrats, assembled in this special convocation to consider the crisis of expanded American involvement in Southeast Asia, proclaim our determination to make the American system work successfully, to make our government and the Democratic Party responsive to our people's needs, to restore the dialogue essential to democracy's well-being, to move by every legal and effective means to end the violence at home and abroad, and to make the Democratic Party of New York a powerful instrument to restore domestic tranquility and to end the war in Indochina.

To accomplish these objectives:

1. We unequivocally denounce the invasion of Cambodia, the under-cover war in Laos, and the resumption of bombing in North Viet-Nam. We call upon the President and the Congress to announce that all United States forces will be removed immediately from any combat role anywhere in Indochina, and that all United States military personnel will be out of Indochina by the end of 1971, appropriate provision having been made for their safe withdrawal and the release of prisoners of war.

2. We pledge our full support to the enactment of the Church-Cooper and McGovern-Hatfield amendments in the Senate and the adoption of their counterpart, H.R. 1000, in the House of Representatives; we ask that the Democratic members of the New York Congressional Delegation publicly commit themselves to the support of H.R. 1000 and other appropriate legislative efforts to end the war; and we call upon the Congress to reassert its constitutional mandate to control American involvement in foreign wars.

3. We call upon the Government of the United States to demand the release of and offer immediate sanctuary to the hundreds of prisoners now languishing in the dungeons of South Viet-Nam whose only crime has been support of a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese war.

4. We call for the appointment of a Chief United States negotiator at the Paris Peace Conference who will have the confidence of the Congressional Foreign Relations Committees so that Americans may be assured that their view of an honorable agreement is being explored to end the war.

5. We welcome the young, both as members and critics of our Party. We welcome their creative dissent, the honesty of their dissatisfaction, and their commitment of personal energy to the election of candidates who reflect their hopes and ideals. We endorse The National Petition Drive organized by student groups throughout the State and urge all Democratic candidates, leaders, and organizations, to support actively this effort.

6. We ask for an honest effort by all citizens and groups to hear the opinions and

arguments that divide us, to avoid violence against person and property, and to avoid the use of the flag as a partisan symbol representing the superior patriotism of either side.

7. We recognize the heroic valor of the Armed Forces of the United States in the Indochina war, and we call upon the Federal and State governments to provide generously for the support of the bereaved families of the dead, and for the medical care of the wounded and disabled; and we further ask that the elected representatives of the Democratic Party make regular periodic visits to veterans' installations where the American wounded are cared for to make certain that the Nation's obligation to these victims of the war is fulfilled.

8. We believe that international commitments that directly affect the security and national interests of the United States are seriously undermined by our involvement in Indochina. In calling for the immediate end to American military involvement in Indochina, we reject the counsel of isolationism and reaffirm our legitimate international commitments.

9. We call upon government on every level to recognize the increasing despair of millions of Americans as their pleas for social justice are met with attitudes of benign neglect and violent repression; and we demand that the Democratic Party of New York, in the voice and action of its office holders, candidates, and leaders place the imperative of social justice at the top of the American agenda.

The Democratic Party and its national leadership have a major responsibility for the tragic American involvement in Viet-Nam. We will not fulfill our responsibility to the future of our Nation, to our Party or to ourselves by rationalizing past mistakes or tolerating their repetition. We speak today as Democrats to make our political institutions respond to the urgent need for peace in our land. We speak today as Americans in calling for the end—now—to a war that has no national purpose and that is morally, politically, economically and militarily wrong.

BALTIC STATES

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in commemorating a sad month in the history of the three Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. In June 1940, these countries were invaded and occupied by Soviet armies. Shortly after occupation, these territories were annexed into the Soviet Union despite the fact that only 20 years before the Soviet Union had signed treaties with all three countries granting them recognition and acknowledging their independence from Russia.

Following annexation, the Baltic States were subjected to a brutal period of occupation. Thousands of citizens from these nations were exiled, imprisoned in Soviet labor camps, and murdered. The horror of this occupation is made apparent by the fact that the Baltic States have lost more than a quarter of their population over the last 30 years. Throughout these years of enslavement, these people have continually fought against oppression. At first they fought

openly in organized resistance movements against the Communists. More recently their opposition has been expressed by passive resistance.

During this anniversary week, it is particularly appropriate that we reaffirm our support for the cause of peace and freedom in the Baltic States. Despite many years of hardships, the Baltic peoples' spirit and dedication to the principles of freedom and democratic government have endured and prevailed. It is our fervent hope that these years of suffering will soon end and that democratic government will be restored to Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

THE ARMS TRADE—PART XIV

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, last August 13, I pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that our Government has had the lamentable habit of first imposing an arms embargo on a nation and then turning around and covertly breaking the ban. At that time, I noted that we had broken—and, for the fact, are still breaking—our arms embargo against Pakistan, imposed after her war with India in 1965. Now I see we are doing it again, in this particular case with Greece.

I do not wish to dwell here on the reasons why certain countries have been embargoed and why others have not. Nor do I wish to argue the merits of imposing embargoes as a policy tactic. Both questions are worthy of separate and extensive examination.

What bothers me here, Mr. Speaker, is that once our Government decides to impose an embargo, it then does not stick to it. Our Government seems to impose these arms restrictions solely to appease public opinion—not to curb the threat of violence, to dampen down actual violence, or to encourage the embargoed nation to change its course. Then, to make matters worse, the moment the world's attention has been diverted to some other matter, Washington begins to subvert its own embargo by secretly supplying arms to the embargoed.

No amount of breast beating and excuses by our Government can hide the fact that we have broken our embargoes against Pakistan, South Africa, imposed in 1963; Egypt, imposed in 1967, and now Greece, imposed also in 1967. In fact, there has not been one post-World War II American embargo that our Government has not promptly broken.

I can only say that such behavior detracts from the credibility of our Government and does nothing to bring about a net reduction in tensions throughout the world. The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1970]

ATHENS GIVEN U.S. ARMS DESPITE BAN

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Despite the embargo on heavy arms to Greece, the United States has quietly given jet fighter-interceptors, medium tanks and

155-millimeter howitzers to the colonels' regime in Athens.

The deliveries were described yesterday by officials as a "one time only" breach of the prohibition, a breach inspired by the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.

At the same time, it was learned, the Nixon administration has decided in principle to scrap the embargo entirely. Knowledgeable sources disclosed that the ban has been reviewed by the National Security Council and that body has determined that the embargo has outlived its usefulness. A public announcement to this effect, however, is being delayed until a more receptive climate at home and abroad is ensured.

The ban on heavy arms shipments was imposed after the colonels overthrew Greece's constitutional government in April 1967. Sales and gifts of small arms like automatic weapons, rifles and mortars have continued, however.

From time to time, officials have hinted that the embargo has been relaxed but details have not been available until now. Last summer, Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco, in a little-noticed statement, said that "delivery of a portion of the suspended items" was approved by President Johnson Oct. 18, 1968.

The shipment apparently began late in that year and continued through 1969. Mr. Johnson approved the delivery of 22 F-102s, 92 medium tanks and an undisclosed number of howitzers.

Officials have now revealed that all 22 planes were given to Greece. But how many tanks and howitzers were shipped could not be determined.

These deliveries explain what up until now has been a puzzling jump in arms shipments to Athens. For the budget year ending June 30, 1968, Greece received arms estimated at \$51 million in value. The next year's total jumped to \$93.2 million.

However, this understates the amount of the increase. The Pentagon values items it considers surplus at about one-fourth of their cost. Thus, if these totals are adjusted to reflect the original cost of the arms shipped, Greece received \$58.5 million in fiscal 1968 and a whopping \$170.0 million the next year. All but a small portion of both figures were gifts rather than sales.

Officials said the embargo was breached because the Czechoslovakian invasion heightened the importance of maintaining belief in NATO's ability to deter an aggressor.

Officials also said that leaders from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee were consulted about the relaxation of the ban.

However, Chairman J. W. Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said yesterday he had not been consulted and did not know the embargo had been broken.

Staff members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee said they knew of no consultation either. Chairman Thomas Morgan (D-Pa.) was unavailable for comment.

The disclosure is likely to touch off a fresh Senate outcry against any arms for Greece. Last year, an amendment to cut off these shipments was narrowly beaten, 45 to 38. This year, Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) is sponsoring a similar ban.

The Nixon Administration decision to junk the embargo entirely rests on a belief that the ban will not influence the colonels. The argument runs that they are firmly in the saddle, can turn to the French and other sources for major weapons and any continued prohibition only weakens American influence in Athens.

However, the unimpeded resumption of heavy-arms shipments will probably be delayed until the congressional temper, inflamed by Cambodia, is cooler. In addition, Washington is being held back by the opposition of Denmark, Norway and Italy, where criticism of the junta is exceptionally strong.

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 1970]

UNITED STATES DENIES LIFTING BAN ON GREEK ARMS

The White House and State Department denied yesterday that any decision had been made to lift the so-called "selective embargo" on shipment of major weapons to Greece.

A story in yesterday's editions of The Washington Post, which described shipments of planes, tanks and howitzers last year under an October 1968 decision by President Johnson and which said the Nixon administration had decided "in principle" to lift the three-year-old embargo entirely, was described as "misleading" by State Department spokesman John F. King.

King said "some aircraft"—he would not give their type or number—and minesweepers had been sent under the Johnson decision, which he noted had been announced by the State Department in Oct.

But other officials denied flatly that any tanks had been authorized or sent, and said they knew of no shipment of howitzers. The Washington Post story said 92 medium tanks and an unknown number of 155-millimeter howitzers were included in the Johnson decision, which was justified as needed to strengthen Greece's North Atlantic Treaty Organization capabilities in the wake of the August 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Other sources have indicated that Greece this year has been seeking to buy intermediaries. The United States must approve even a third-country sale of such major items, and approval has been withheld pending formal announcement that the "selective embargo" has been lifted.

The embargo, which does not apply to small arms, spare parts or communications equipment, was imposed by the Johnson administration "soon after the (April 1967) coup in Athens to demonstrate our concern for the extraconstitutional assumption of power by the present Greek regime," King said. Asked whether the Nixon administration shares this concern, King paused and then answered "Yes."

WHY SST?

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Delaware Valley Advance published an editorial opposing the SST. It is an excellent editorial and I bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

WHY SST?

In 1963, when he initiated the supersonic transport development program, President Kennedy assured the nation that federal funds allocated for this purpose would never exceed \$750,000. Last week the House raised the ante to more than a billion dollars. At least \$300,000 more will be needed to complete two SST prototypes by 1973.

If the SST ever becomes a reality we shall have created a monster which can never fly over inhabited land because of the sonic boom, which will produce sideline noise at takeoff 50 times greater than the noise of a jumbo jet takeoff, which may pollute the upper atmosphere with irreducible water vapor and the danger of a permanent cloud cover.

In addition to these major environmental problems is the anticipated need of super runways requiring air terminals so far from population centers that any time saved by supersonic flight will be exceeded by the additional time needed to travel to and from the airports.

The vote in the House was 176 to 163, remarkable for the fact that this sort of extravagant "progress" is at least facing a challenge. Hopefully the Senate may take a more conservative view and realize that our major transportation problems are on the ground. They will never be solved by diverting more millions to the headaches of SST.

**YOUNG PEOPLE LEAD THE WAY
IN FIGHTING POLLUTION**

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have not generally chosen to burden the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the lengthy writings of others. When in the future, however, historians may examine the events of Earth Day, 1970, I believe they will need to recognize the tremendous input of the thinking of our young people and students who are insisting on new priorities for America.

The only writing engraved in our chambers are the words of Daniel Webster, including his suggestion, "Let us develop the resources of our land." On Earth Day, April 22, 1970, nearly the entire younger generation spoke to us with a different suggestion: "Let us conserve our environment and preserve, recycle and reuse our resources."

After 181 years of national goals and policy favoring the development of land, extraction of resources, the increasing of our standard of living, we now turn to new goals, the preservation of the quality of our life in the earth's environment, and a concerted and determined attack on further pollution of air, water, and open space.

Our young people are leading the way, both conceptually and practically, in these new priorities, and I therefore take the liberty of placing in the RECORD at this point 20 letters from elementary and high school students of San Mateo County, Calif., which I feel are the best and most representative of over 5,000 letters transmitted to me by students as a result of their days and weeks of study prior to last April 22.

The letters follow:

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
February 27, 1970.

Congressman PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.,
House of Representatives, Congress of the
United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Several weeks ago you wrote a letter to the principal of Borel Middle School, Mr. Kramer, in San Mateo. It asked that we, the students, express our opinions about solving the problems of pollution in our country. In response to your letter I have made an outline containing some ideas.

I. POLLUTION EDUCATION

- A. Programs in all public schools:
 1. On conservation, birth control, etc.;
 2. Possibly include birth control as part of sex education courses; and
 3. Have elective discussion and action classes at junior high and high school levels.
- B. Local programs:
 1. Neighborhood groups and clubs;
 2. Community involved efforts; and
 3. Participation by students, housewives, businessmen, everyone.

II. INDUSTRY

- A. Have strict inspections made of all new businesses so they aren't allowed to begin polluting.
- B. Thorough investigations of all industrial projects that could prove harmful to environment beforehand.
- C. Publish statistics showing main polluters of the area.
- D. Industries polluting now should be forced to clean up or pay high fines (Senator Proxmire's plan).

III. PRESERVING LIFE

- A. Shorter hunting seasons and more laws protecting rare animals.
- B. Ban harmful insecticides and market safer ones.
- C. Establish more game preserves and national parks, especially along coast and in mountains.
- D. Limit number of automobiles in parks, public and recreation facilities.

IV. WASTE AND LITTER

- A. Disposals and garbage cans conveniently located in parks, along highways, etc.
- B. Have more projects like the waste clean-up on the South shore of Lake Tahoe.
- C. Research on reusable and more compact food packaging.
- D. Cans and plastic containers that decompose.
- E. More desalinization and waste treatment plants in operation.
- F. Run polls to determine whether people will willingly pay higher taxes for conservation use.
- G. Step up urban renewal and poverty programs:
 1. Poverty is a major cause of pollution; and
 2. If people take more pride in surroundings, they are less likely to pollute.
- H. Prohibit backyard and private burning.
- I. Enforce litter laws, where violators are fined for littering.

V. AUTOMOBILES

- A. Major car companies research electric and steam engine cars.
- B. Develop an inexpensive and practical model.
- C. More local transit and subway systems.
- D. Ban use of combustion engine by 1975.
- E. Possibly develop a car run by light or heat energy.
- F. Melt down old cars, etc. for building materials.

VI. MAKE THE PEOPLE AWARE!

I'm hoping some of these ideas can possibly be of some help. I realize almost all of them have already been proposed and are either under consideration or have been voted down, but I feel it is important to speak out anyway. It is only through increasing knowledge and genuine concern that the problem of pollution can be solved.

Sincerely yours,
LINDA DeBUSK.

February 2, 1970.

DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: We are writing in concern of the broadening pollution problem.

We have seen an ad for a "Trash-Masher" put out by Whirlpool Company. (We are enclosing the article for you to read.)

One idea for the disposal of the remaining products of the "Trash-Masher," is to invent an engine that would burn up the trash cube in such a way that the smoke or exhaust could be filtered clean. This engine could be used to compress air for an air car.

You probably have receive some letters from students in other schools, clubs and most likely from our own class. We hope that these ideas might come true, if not, we hope they will, give you some ideas of your own!

Sincerely,
SUSAN THOMPSON,
SHERYL REINKE,
Eighth Grade Borel Students.

January 29, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCLOSKEY: We have been doing some research on pollution and this is what we came up with.

In 1968, according to the Public Health Service, the worst ten cities in the United States that have polluted air are New York City; Chicago, Illinois; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Los Angeles-Long Beach, California; Cleveland, Ohio; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Boston, Massachusetts; Newark, New Jersey; Detroit, Michigan; St. Louis, Missouri.

Air pollution is linked to a number of respiratory diseases and afflictions. Deaths from emphysema, a progressive breakdown of the lungs' air sacs, have increased more than five times since 1950. Cigarette smoking—a kind of do-it-yourself air pollution has often been blamed for this rise; but non-smoking emphysema patients also show marked improvement when they are protected from "natural" air pollution. Lung cancer is another disease where both smoking and air pollution have been implicated. The incidence of chronic bronchitis, asthma, pneumonia, and the common cold also rises as air pollution gets worse.

Severe air pollution multiplies the death rate, as it did in the little town of Donora, Pennsylvania in 1948; as it did in London in 1952; as it did in New York in 1953 and 1962; as it inevitably will again. This is a poem written for air pollution to suggest we don't want bad images like this.

If you visit American city,
You will find it very pretty.
Just two things you must beware;
Don't drink the water—don't breathe the air.

Pollution, pollution,
They got smog and sewage and mud,
Turn on your tap and get hot and cold running crud.

See the halibuts and the sturgeons,
Being wiped out by detergents.

Fish gotta swim and birds gotta fly,
But they don't last eons if they try.
Pollution, pollution,
You can use the latest toothpaste,
And then rinse your mouth with industrial waste.

Just go out for a breath of air,
And you'll be ready for Medicare.

The city streets are really quite a thrill,
If the hoods don't get you, the monoxide will.
Pollution, pollution,
Wear a gas mask and a veil.

Then you can breathe, long as you don't inhale.

Lots of things there that you can drink,
But stay away from the kitchen sink.

Throw out your breakfast garbage, and I've got a hunch
That the folks downstream will drink it for lunch.

So go to the city, see the crazy people there.
Like lambs to the slaughter
They're drinking the water
And breathing the air.

We feel that there should be more strict laws on car exhausts and more laws for litter. They should also put better smog devices to control smog on airplanes. If this pollution keeps up we will have engines running on pollution.

Sincerely,
JIM TRUMBULL,
MARK SCHLOSSER,
7th Grade, Borel Middle School.

WILLARD R. ENGVALL SCHOOL,
SAN BRUNO, CALIF.,
January 26, 1970.

PAUL M. McCLOSKEY, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: As pollution is increasing ever more rapidly than before, I feel some definite solutions are necessary. First

of all—no more cans! People will have to make their own soup, squeeze their own oranges, but—no more cans! Metal has to be mined just to make the cans. Strip mines ruin our natural resources such as trees and pollute the air because the machines used to mine the ore, refine the ore, form the cans produce smoke and soot that goes to the air and eventually terminates in our lungs. Cans and then junked, then dumped on the edge of the bay and used for bayfill. This pollutes our bay which has been a landmark so long. If the bay is filled it will back up the Sacramento River until the salt ruins all of the farmland anywhere near the mouth. Cans pollute air, land and water. If people refuse to squeeze their own oranges and make their own soup, they could be put in returnable deposit bottles or other such containers. Maybe a container could be made that would dissolve in certain solutions.

Another great problem is the use of paper. Although quite necessary to write on, paper napkins, paper plates, paper towels and other such ridiculous items are totally unnecessary. For the small amount of water we would pollute by washing these items (not in paper form) is so small compared to the air pollution it causes to burn unnecessary paper or land and water pollution caused by dumping it.

A great pollution crisis is automobiles. Strip mining used to obtain metal does exactly what it does when it is for cans.

Exhaust from cars pollutes the air, and junked cars are eyesores and land pollution. Bikes take much less metal, they are good for your health and don't pollute the air. Oil drilling needed to provide gas and oil for cars is polluting the water off of your California coast.

These, as you know, are only a few of the drastic problems periling our nation's future and I feel I am doing what I can to stop it, but it is going to take the support of everyone!

Respectfully,

JEAN BULLIS.

BURLINGAME HIGH SCHOOL,
BURLINGAME, CALIF.,

January 30, 1970.

Congressman PAUL N. McCLOSKEY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCLOSKEY: In response to your request for concrete, thoughtful proposals to solve the problem of environmental pollution, I have a three point plan to reduce air pollution.

As you no doubt already know, the major causes of air pollution are the various modes of transportation in use today (autos, aircraft, buses, trucks). Responsible for the greater part of this amount is the automobile. Therefore, my plan deals mainly with the transportation industry, and with automobiles in particular. First, I propose the rationing of gasoline by way of issuing gas stamps, similar to actions taken during World War II. Included under this would be a provision by which leaded gas would be made illegal. My second proposal would be an FAA regulation prohibiting any jet aircraft from leaving the ground that is not equipped with the new smog control combustor cans. These devices drastically reduce the amount of pollutants released by the aircraft by making the engines combust the fuel more completely. Thirdly, to provide a means of transportation for those people who had used all their gas stamps, I would propose that the federal government divert all highway funds and gas taxes to subsidize mass transit systems.

From 1940 to 1965, passenger cars registered in the U.S. increased from 27,372,000 to 74,904,000 while electric railway (elevated, surface and subway) and trolley coach routes of the transit industry decreased from 21,527

miles to 2,939 miles. Re-establishing the superiority of the mass transit system over the automobile would not only ease the air pollution problem, but it would also ease urban traffic congestion. For example, in one hour, an expressway lane accommodates 3,250 auto passengers or 6,750 bus passengers, while a single rail line can handle 48,000 commuters.

The oil industry is financially stable enough to withstand gas rationing with all the tax breaks they now receive. Besides, less than half the material refined from crude oil is gasoline. Also the Richfield Oil Company has developed an anti-knock additive to replace lead and is already distributing it in the Los Angeles area. The airline industry already has the new combustor cans and is waiting for the old ones to wear out before they install them. I live directly under the approach to San Francisco airport, and every night when the air is still, a sickening thick odor of kerosene settles on my house, and the windows and doors must be closed to keep it out. I don't believe the airlines industry should be allowed to wait any longer. In addition to the millions of tons of air pollutants poured into the air every year, millions of acres of open land are paved over for freeways. For these reasons, it is imperative that freeway expenditures be diverted to mass transit systems for the preservation of both clean air and open spaces.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL JOSEPH SOUZA.

ALTA LOMA JR. HIGH SCHOOL,
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

January 26, 1970.

HON. MR. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: As you well know, our world is being over populated and polluted. I have some suggestions for the solutions.

As for the garbage problem, I suggest pressing it into bricks, as done in Japan. This will make a useful product. It will also save land for homes instead of city dumps.

I've also heard that scientists have come up with a substance to wrap food that dissolves in water. This is also a great idea because they have come up with a solution for litter. Since it dissolves, the chemicals break up and can do no harm to the water which flows into the seas.

Air pollution is another problem which must be solved. I really don't think it can be solved completely, but some things can be done to help it. Some factors are, filters for factories, smog control for cars, and chemicals for gasoline, to make it bio-degradable after use. Also peace in the world, because bomb dropping is causing radiation and air pollution.

Over population is also a problem. It is hard to decide what to do, but I think abortion should be legalized, but only with parental consent.

Since food and land for cultivating is scarce, I believe farming underwater is a good idea. It produces better food and has more protein in it.

Respectfully yours,

DENISE MERCIER.

SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

January 23, 1970.

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been thinking about the problems of pollution and the population explosion. I would like to share my ideas with you.

To stop the pollution:

(A) Ban fireplace burning and barbecuing.

(B) Develop electric cars, and ration them.

(C) Find a different way of disposing of our garbage, such as making blocks for building purposes.

(D) Shut factories allowing steam and smoke to escape, find other ways of making the products, and make the factories pay a stiff fine if they continue polluting the air.

(E) Develop more and better rapid transit systems.

(F) Ban smoking.

(G) Find scientific ways to purify air and water now which are practical and inexpensive.

Some ways to control the population:

(A) Legalize abortion.

(B) Sterilize men and women after having a second child, but allow them to adopt unwanted children.

(C) Develop a kind of birth control with no ill effects.

I would further suggest the following to help solve the problem of the surplus population already here:

(A) Farm the ocean.

(B) Conserve more land by building more apartments.

(C) Develop more food which would yield a higher amount of protein to a smaller amount of land.

I hope that this letter may help in some small way.

Respectfully yours,

SHARON HAMMON.

HILLVIEW SCHOOL,
ATHERTON, CALIF.,

January 30, 1970.

PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCLOSKEY: As the number of automobiles on the road increases, the smog problem from these cars increases. Not only is it a California problem, but one facing the entire country. Thus, I feel a need for California's smog control law to become a nationwide one. Even though our state has this law, it has not been enforced strongly enough. Although all cars are required to have a smog device, not all are functioning properly. Police check only to see if your car has a smog device but not if it's working. I feel that there should be road stops to check out each car for their device. They could do this and/or set out to develop a machine capable of checking on the effectiveness of each one. Slowly but surely this would help cut down on the smog in the air.

Thank you,

MARK J. BALESTRA.

MILLBRAE, CALIF.,

January 28, 1970.

Congressman PETE McCLOSKEY,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am a student at Taylor Intermediate School in Millbrae, California. My science class has studied the matter of population-explosion. We saw various films on the subject before writing this letter. After giving this matter much consideration, I have a suggestion that I think might help.

Education:

We must use the mass media to educate people to the horrors of over-population, but to also show the blessings we can attain by living in a beautiful, bountiful and healthful country that is regulated in population size. There should be a goal set, but along with it a knowledge of how to reach this goal.

Assistance:

All men and women should be able to choose their method of achieving this limited family society. Help should be available whether it be to teach a religious method, advise on the best contraceptive for the individual or to direct them for help when there is an abortion to be had. Most people need di-

rection after they have made their decision and it is necessary to make known to them where they can get such direction. It would be wonderful to be able to offer the nearest church as a place to come for help even in a matter such as this.

I thank you for all you have contributed toward this problem in the past and feel assured that you will do even more in the future.

Very truly yours,

JACK E. SAUM.

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
January 28, 1970.

HON. PAUL McCLOSKEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Concerning the problems of pollution in our country today, I'd like to share some thoughts with you and hope that the following ideas will be given some consideration:

(1) A return to reusable containers for beverages, etc. This would eliminate the littering of beaches, parks, streets, etc., with beer and soda pop cans. If the reusable containers were unbreakable, we'd stop the mess made by broken bottles.

(2) Immediate control and treatment of raw sewage being pumped into the oceans, rivers, lakes and streams.

(3) Immediate control of all toxic exhaust gases being emitted from cars and factories which are fouling the air we are breathing, and killing birds and trees.

(4) A National effort to provide exhaust-free public transportation of such high quality that people would give up driving their cars short distances.

(5) Very strict laws and penalties, with strict enforcement, for littering, dumping, oil leaks, and all polluting of the planet—at least, our part of it.

(6) An organization, such as NASA, should be formed to get our country on a crash program, similar to the space program, which would make cleaning up our environment a dedicated effort by the best brains in the country, supported by a concerned Congress and people.

I am 13 years old. I go to Hillview School which is a few blocks from your Mother's house. (I see her often at the Safeway.) When you come to Menlo Park next time I'd sure like it if you'd come by our school for a visit. I know all my 8th grade classmates—and the whole school—would be more than happy to meet you.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

SUSAN L. PAAR.

CABRILLO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
CRESPI AND LADERA,
Pacifica, Calif., January 30, 1970.

PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCLOSKEY: This letter is in reply to your request for student proposals to solve environmental pollution. The following list is a composite, made from three eighth grade history classes at Cabrillo Elementary School in Pacifica.

In dealing with cleaner air, the students said that the federal government should subsidize any company doing research and testing on a non-gasoline burning engine. Also, all factories should be required to use some kind of filter system similar to the smog devices on automobiles, with those factories not complying with the law being heavily fined. In addition, the government should encourage factories to use nuclear energy as a power source to eliminate the smoke causing smog.

Factory waste should not be dumped into rivers and lakes, but rather into a large pond with an underground pipe at the bottom of the pond, leading the sewage far under-

ground and spreading it thinly so that it has a chance to deteriorate. Once again, the government would have to encourage such a system, but it need not be financially. Instead, government support could take the form of a positive advertising program, similar to the NRA Blue Eagle of the early 1930's, for those businesses actively seeking to unpollute the earth.

Along similar lines, a company could be aided to come up with a machine to compress garbage into bricks which could then be used in a positive way. The amount of garbage could be decreased by encouraging various companies to sell their products, such as soda pop, in re-usable glass or non-breakable plastic containers.

Our forests can be saved by a method to make paper re-usable. This involves a machine which removes the print from newspapers so that trees would not have to be cut down for the purpose of manufacturing paper.

Lastly, we plead with you to use your powers to stop the off-shore oil drilling, which as you know, is ruining our California beaches and wildlife.

If it is at all possible, the classes involved in making these suggestions have asked me to ask you if they could hear what steps your Conservation Subcommittee has taken. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MISS GAYLE STEWART.

BELMONT, CALIF.,
February 3, 1970.

HON. PAUL McCLOSKEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My apologies for the delay in sending these, but illness has kept me from doing so. I'm sure you would still appreciate having them. I have also enclosed a sheet with compiled statistics gathered from these same students concerning the President's State of the Union speech.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUSTUS R. CACCIOTTI.

SAN BRUNO, CALIF.,
January 26, 1970.

PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: I am writing in response to your letter to our school. I am honored that you have the faith in us to try to solve these problems. As for pollution, I will try to form a solution for each type; air, water, land.

In air pollution the factories and cars do the most damage. I think that if we switched to propane it would reduce the smog problem drastically. Whoever thought of using propane was great. So I think that problem is solved (almost). As for factories, I think it should be mandatory for the smoke to be recycled and burnt until it is reduced to carbon dioxide, water vapor and re-usable solids. This would stop most air pollution. As for buses, just discontinue the use of diesel engines and put those on propane too. As for planes, switch their fuel to something that doesn't create so much smog.

As for water pollution, you would have to clean the water before it enters the streams, bays, etc. This would require a six step process. 1. First, you must grind up the solids and let them sedimentate. 2. Then pump diffused oxygen for the bacteria to eat the sewage. Then cook the sludge that remains. There is no smoke or ash from the incinerator. This is where conventional treatment stops. This is where the stuff still smells and is muddy brown. 3. Then add lime to remove the phosphorus. 4. Then sediment this. 5. Then pump this (the water) through a nitrogen tower to remove ammonia. Then add carbon dioxide to lower the PH factor. Then filter the last solids. 6. Pump through charcoal to remove smell

and color, besides other organic items. Then Chlorinate and you have delicious, flat, water. This process is already being used in the Diamond Valley of California and in Pretoria, South Africa. As for cleaning up what we've already done, take the river water and pump it through these plants, and have people get to work and pick up the solid wastes.

As for the land pollution, there are several types. Scrap metal, such as tin cans, automobile hulks, old appliances, etc. They can be easily melted down. As they are all steel or steel with something else, they would all be reusable. But for future needs, I think we should stop production of cans entirely and use decomposable containers. They, if thrown away, could simply be taken to an enclosed dumping place and allowed to decompose. After three days, no more garbage! As for other garbage, all burnable could be decomposed by oxygen-free heating. This would break down the paper into carbon, hydrogen, and nitrogen, among traces of decomposed ink.

Most of all, I think that the people have to get up and help. Legislation alone won't help.

Sincerely,

ROBBIE PEPPER.
WILLARD R. ENGVALL.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
January 30, 1970.

To the Honorable Representative McCloskey:

These are some ideas on how to reduce some pollution: Public leaders, federal, state and local, should express goals of high standards of environmental quality and encourage all citizens to strive toward these goals by commending efforts of individuals and groups such as, Scouts leaving outdoor areas cleaner than they found them, and industries making no pollution. Offer tax breaks to installers of anti-pollution devices.

A good way to start people thinking about this is to ask the public for detailed ideas like you are doing now.

WHERE TO GET THE MONEY

Study revenue sources arising from depletion of natural resources which originally belonged to the whole country. Tax such things as the following:

Soil nutrients not replaced by farmers;
Trees not replaced by lumbering firms;
Minerals not replaced by miners (petroleum);

Water not replaced by manufacturers;
Oxygen not replaced by motorists (cars gulp down huge volumes of air);

Soil Erosion and Vegetation loss from developers;

Animals destroyed by damaging natural habitat; and

People smoking when someone else has to breathe it or if they toss it out the window of a car and start forest fires, etc.

Public leaders will have to keep constantly reminding people with the aid of newspapers, TV, radio, and their own speeches and letters, until every citizen becomes responsible for the good of everyone.

Sincerely,

WAYNE STOWELL,
Student, Kennedy Jr. High School.

ATHERTON, CALIF.,
January 25, 1970.

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: Thank you for your letter addressed to La Entrada School that invited us students to suggest aids for and solutions to our environmental crisis.

My suggestions deal mainly with the population explosion and air pollution in the United States.

In dealing with the population explosion, I think an indirect but efficient control should be put into effect: If a family has one

June 16, 1970

or two children, they should be allowed to exempt a certain amount of money for each child from their income tax returns, as is the present system. If a family has more than two children, it should only be allowed to exempt money for two children, and no deductions could be made for other children in the family.

This law shall only apply to children conceived after the date the law is put into effect. Families with more than two children, all conceived before the date the law is put into effect, should deduct for all the children, as is the present system.

Air pollution is already confronting us in huge proportions. It is something that needs to be handled quickly and proficiently, therefore fairly radically. The major cause of air pollution is mostly attributed to the millions of cars that cram our highways, so I shall offer suggestions in order to curb automobile air pollution.

Powerful cars with big engines use a lot of gasoline and therefore emit much exhaust fumes. A tax could be applied to cars with engines exceeding a certain number of cubic inches or engines that don't meet a certain fuel burning efficiency level. (Engines that don't completely burn fuel in the cylinder during the explosion stroke of the piston emit a lot of fumes.) The burning efficiency can be tested by examining the contents and amount of the exhaust.

The gasoline tax could be raised therefore "guiding" people to buy cars that don't use much gas.

I hope you have taken an interest in my suggestions. I have tried to make them as clear and as complete as I can.

Respectfully,

PETE ARNSTEIN.

ATHERTON, CALIF.,
January 27, 1970.

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to your letter addressed to Hillview School concerning air pollution, my suggestions are as follows:

First, although it is the law at this time that all vehicles be equipped with anti-smog devices, there is no individual inspection to ascertain that they are equipped with such devices and that the devices are effective. My suggestion would be to make such inspection mandatory and to require vehicles to carry an annual inspection sticker as they have in many states.

Secondly, I would propose that those companies or industries, which despite warnings, continue to pollute the air be penalized on a monthly basis in proportion to the amount of pollution which they produce. As soon as it became economic to stop polluting the air, they would cease to do so.

Third, and finally, I suggest that hydroelectric plants be run by nuclear power rather than coal or petroleum.

Sincerely,

KAREN FOSTER.

McKINLEY SCHOOL,
REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
February 4, 1970.

Mr. PAUL McCLOSKEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: We are students at McKinley Junior High School in Redwood City and we were informed that you were interested in learning about student's solutions to various environmental pollution problems.

Several suggestions for land and water pollution are:

1. Pass on the message of pollution through television by showing a series of pictures of polluted land and water and playing back-

ground music such as "America the Beautiful." At the end of this the people should be informed as to what they can do.

2. Have our scientists discover some chemical which could dissolve garbage and rubbish. We could give this chemical to all our factories and they could use this instead of burning and dumping the garbage into our streams and rivers.

3. More chemical plants like the one at the Indian Creek Reservoir which changes the raw sewage into good, drinkable water.

4. The manufacturers could reduce garbage and debris into ashes by using atomic energy.

5. People should start the reuse of tin, aluminum cans, glass, cardboard and paper. Tin, glass and aluminum cans could be remelted and reused. This would mean less air and water pollution because less ore would be smelted. This would also ease up the strain on our diminishing resources of minerals.

Paper and cardboard could be made into pulp and reused. This would help save the forests.

A small deposit could be offered or the community could be urged to support drives to collect these articles.

Several suggestions were made about air pollution:

1. Invent cars and other types of transportation which run on steam or air pressure instead of gasoline and oil.

2. Instead of smoking fireplaces we could have natural gas burning fireplaces. We would still be able to have fireplaces, but install gas furnaces.

3. Build rapid transit systems in metropolitan areas. Pay heavy tolls or taxes on highways and little or no fare on the transit systems. People will be forced to use the systems. This would lessen automobiles which are polluting the air. For example: Raise the Bay Bridge toll to \$2.00 or more and make the fare on B.A.R.T. or buses about 20c.

4. Natural gas would be cheaper than other fuel used for heating and would not emit nearly as many impurities in the air.

In addition, heating natural gas is also a solution to the gasoline combustion engine. Converting a regular gasoline engine to natural gas engines would not be a great problem and it is also rather inexpensive.

5. Get something like a giant cigarette filter which, when placed over a smoke stack, would sort of soak up the smoke. Naturally, this filter would have to be changed frequently.

6. Search for a different type of engine such as steam or electric.

We also had a suggestion on the population explosion:

Put a heavier tax on families with three or more children rather than making children tax deductible.

We should have more laws on pollution and we should also enforce them just as strong as any other law or more so!

Thank you for asking us to contribute our ideas to you.

We hope our ideas will be taken into consideration. We are sure that if you do use some of our suggestions and enforce more pollution laws we would all breathe easier.

We, the 8th grade students of Mrs. Tilford's 4th period class, thank you again.

Sincerely,

CATHY GLAHN.

JANUARY 29, 1970.

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr.,
Belmont, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: We feel that to keep down the population of this Nation, people should adopt children instead of having their own there are many children who have been orphaned in wars and accidents. It is difficult to place many of these children

because of their age, race, and unfortunate defects. We know that these children need the love and affection that a real family can give them.

To promote the public's interest in this problem, billboards and posters with pictures of the most needy children can be put up across the nation instead of billboards advertising various commercial products.

Yours very truly,

KATHLEEN COLEMAN,
BECKY PECCHENINO.

PORTOLA VALLEY, CALIF.,
January 30, 1970.

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY,
Belmont, Calif.

OUR DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: Enclosed are our ideas for preventing overpopulation and air pollution.

The pill is a good idea except there is a theory that it causes cancer. If a new contraceptive was invented that was pre-tested for safety, this might solve the problem.

Our second idea is to pass a law that would impose a tax upon parents who have more than two children. This would be so because there would be a law limiting two children per couple. Poor, uneducated people cannot curb this problem with ease so contraceptives could be provided to them with no cost.

To nip overpopulation in the bud there could be a school educational program that teaches children the dangers of an overpopulated society. If they were taught when they were young, this program would inform them of this problem when they are at a susceptible age.

Turning to the subject of air pollution, the car, of course, is the main problem. One idea of ours is for Congress to pass a bill where by a certain date, if the auto and oil industries have not put forth money in research into the production of a better car, the taxes on these industries would rise substantially. The goal of this bill would be to develop a non-polluting car that had either a different type of engine, fuel or both.

Another idea of ours would be for Congress to set up a non-partisan investigating committee that would find out exactly who are the factories that are depositing considerable amounts of pollutants into the air. The next thing this committee would do would be to expose them to the public and ask them to cut down their pollution to a standard percentage or else.

Airplanes also cause a substantial amount of pollution. First of all the number of flights should be reduced which would also help the air traffic controllers. The airlines should be required by F.A.A. to equip the planes with better equipment to stop pollution than they have now. They might also try to develop better fuels.

Finally, we think that a bill should be passed by the National Congress that would prohibit all types of outdoor burning.

We would greatly appreciate it if you would take into consideration our ideas.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE C. ALWAY,
BRAIN H. JAFFE.

Menlo Park, Calif.,
January 30, 1970.

PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McCLOSKEY: The technical problems of smog and air pollution due to gasoline engines, have already been solved. Working equipment has been tested and proven in automobiles many times. If you really would like to do something about this problem you could pass and enforce a law using these new smog control devices called fuel-injectors.

They are run by computers that measure just the right amount of gas that your engine requires and no more. This also would save people more money on gasoline and they would get more power and no smog, for their money's worth. This would cut inflation by not making gas cost so much per gallon. Also including the fact that they could be installed in every car across the country in one year for \$300,000.

I have another suggestion that could help this operation get started.

A. When people buy these cars they would have no fee for registration and licensing their new car.

B. If either you or the California legislators could work it out so that there would be no toll for bridges on cars with these new devices.

C. Make or suggest a bill to make it illegal to drive a car without this new device.

I have been studying and listening to people's various ways and ideas over the last 6 months on smog control, and I have formed several different views on pollution and how to prevent it. I am very happy that your letter has given me an opportunity to express my views. I wish you the best of luck in finding a good solution to this terribly-nerve-racking problem in California as well as all over the United States.

Sincerely yours,

KATHY HUBBELL.

P.S.—If you wish to know actual names of the fuel-injector devices, people and/or see the 50,000 mile test results I will be glad to furnish them to you.

GLENDALE SERVICE CLUBS YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, BRIEF HISTORY AND STATISTICS

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, Glendale Service Clubs Youth Employment Service was formed in August 1967, by interested service and civic organizations, to continue the youth employment service started in 1951 by the Sertoma Club of Glendale.

Mrs. Frances Grigsby has been director of YES since 1954. She is highly qualified and dedicated to this service.

The Glendale YES is known throughout the country, and hardly a month goes by that we do not receive a request for assistance in setting up a service of this kind in other areas.

Each year the number of placements has increased, to approximately 2,000 last year.

This is a service to the community in many ways. It puts money into the hands of youngsters who in turn spend it in Glendale to aid the economy. It is a service to the Glendale citizenry who need a babysitter, a yardboy, a part-time office girl, stockboy, delivery boy, hospital service personnel, et cetera. It keeps our young people, our potential labor market, in Glendale. It relieves the schools of supplying employment services to the students, but, more important, it teaches young people responsibility to an employer, and makes for better future full-time employees. It has been attributed to the Glendale Police Department

that YES is "the best deterrent to juvenile delinquency in Glendale."

Our budget of \$4,500 is met through volunteer donations, basically service clubs, individuals, and now recently the Glendale Key Merchants Fashion Show.

The service does not provide any funds in the way of fees. Our only expenses are for the meager salary we pay our director, Mrs. Frances Grigsby, the telephone and the answering service. Office space is donated by one of our merchants.

Keeping the doors of YES open has not been easy, but with the support of our local townspeople who hope to continue our youth employment service for many years in the future.

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us want peace in the Middle East and security for the nation of Israel. Presently, the Arab world, with a population of 51 million, is waging a war of attrition against Israel, a country of 2.8 million people. The consequences of the Arab strategy seem to be evident as illustrated by the May casualty list. In May, 61 Israel soldiers and civilians were killed—the heaviest monthly toll since the 1967 war.

In order to defend themselves, the Israelis must depend heavily on air superiority. Without the threat and the reality of air strikes against strategic locations and massing Arab forces, the possibility of an Arab land invasion may become a stunning reality.

In order to aid the Egyptians, Russia has sent thousands of military personnel and advisers. In addition, Russia has armed the Egyptians with sophisticated anti-aircraft missiles, advanced Mig's and Soviet pilots to man them.

Mr. Speaker, the Israelis are fighting for their very existence. They cannot afford to lose. While working for peace in every way, we must provide Israel with the strength to deter any Russian-Arab intentions of eliminating Israel.

In order to restore the balance of power, Israel has requested additional jets. Thus far, the administration has not taken firm action on the sale of supersonic jets to Israel. I believe that we should, first, urge the Russians to withdraw their forces from the Middle East and, second, aid Israel and allow her to keep an effective and valid deterrent. We can best prevent the outbreak of full-scale hostilities by approving the sale of supersonic jet aircraft requested by Israel in order to help restore the balance of power in the Middle East.

In this regard, I have joined with my colleagues in writing the President urging an affirmative decision on the sale of jets to Israel. These planes are vital to the preservation of the balance and peace in the Middle East.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS— JUNE 15, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

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

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

The stubborn problem of inflation is pushing a reluctant President towards some kind of wage and price restraint, other than the monetary and fiscal policies of the past. The spiral of wages and prices just hasn't responded to the old remedies of making less money available and tightening the government's budgets.

The President had expected to trim the price increase rate to about 3 percent in 1969, as compared to a rate of more than 4 percent in 1968. But the Administration ended up with a 6.2 percent increase in 1969 and a comparable increase in prices early this year. In addition, unemployment is running at about 5 percent this year, well above the 3.5 percent of a year ago.

The appeal for patience to give the present policies a chance to work is wearing thin. Yet, the search for alternative approaches to restrain wages and prices has yet to turn up a policy which is effective.

Even though several distinguished economists have concluded that only mandatory wage and price controls will stop inflation's spiral, this extreme approach is not being considered seriously at present. An appeal for a temporary, voluntary freeze apparently has been set aside because it could be shattered by the automobile labor negotiations coming up this summer. The revival or percentage guidelines as a test of inflation in wages and prices appears to be the most definite possibility.

This approach, often called incomes policy, is a supplement to the primary anti-inflation weapons of credit, tax, and spending policy. The idea is to muster public opinion against the decisions of companies and unions that press for higher prices and wages.

Congress has shown an interest in an incomes policy. The House Banking Committee voted to support legislation which would give the President authority to control wages, prices and rents, though he would not be required to use such authority. Another Committee has approved legislation which would reinstate the voluntary guidelines, setting limits for wage increases and price changes. In the latter case, the President would be urged to use every persuasion to keep wage and price levels within acceptable limits.

Support for the incomes policy approach comes from several sources. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and former adviser to the President, and Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, managing director of the International Monetary Fund are backers of the policy. Additional support comes from the presidents of Prudential Insurance Co., Chase Manhattan Board, Fortune Magazine, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and from many members of Congress, both Republican and Democrat. Even the Treasury Department's head economist has suggested that it is time for the President to consider some type of incomes policy to curb excessive wage and price increases.

While no one expects complete success, the sentiment is growing that wage and price guidelines should at least be tried. They

have worked reasonably well in the past, but they have not been uniformly successful. They are invariably discriminatory and inequitable because pressure is brought to bear on a few prominent industries while scores of other enterprises go unscathed.

One form of a wage and price restraint policy might be to appoint a watchdog commission to bring to light excessive wage and price decisions. The commission, which would include representatives of business, labor and consumer interests, could publish an analysis of key price and wage developments each month. The incomes policy plan can't do any harm, and it could even slow things down a little. It might help to brake the inflationary psychology which is a chief factor in rising prices today.

Many persons, including myself, have come to believe that we ought to try an incomes policy to help avert an economic crunch which might come from a severe application of economic monetary and fiscal policy. While it might be distasteful, and at best would have only modest success, it is preferable to direct control, it is also apparent that present policies have not stopped the rate of inflation and something more is needed.

HORTON REMEMBERS TRAGIC ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC STATES

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the grim anniversary of the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia is being commemorated this week.

This week marks the 30th anniversary of the Soviet invasion and their imposition of terror on these freedom-loving countries.

Between June 14 and June 17, 1940, the Soviets invaded Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and incorporated them into the Soviet regime. Within the year, thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were deported to the Soviet Union, mainly the dreaded Siberia.

The seizure of the Baltic States has been a subject of serious discussion for some time. Four years ago, the House and Senate passed a resolution supporting the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence. The resolution urged the President of the United States to direct world opinion at the United Nations to the denial of the right of self-determination of the Baltic peoples, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on restoration of these rights.

I feel particularly close to this problem because I have many constituents who have escaped Communist rule and I have personally heard of their terrible experiences.

I feel that by renewing our support of these brave people of the Baltic States, we show our renewed devotion to the hopes of all people for liberty.

I support these people who continually endure and strive for freedom. I salute their spirit and commend them for their courage.

They were brutally crushed by the Soviets, and yet their courage in the face

of such oppression is striking. They deserve our respect and commemoration.

Mr. Speaker, in our day-to-day concerns, we sometimes lose sight of the great tragedy suffered by the citizens of the Baltic States. On this sad anniversary let us again remember and renew our support for the self-determination of these oppressed people.

"TWO STEPS AT ONCE"

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as we draw closer to that important day—the day the House votes on the Voting Rights Act and the 18-year-old vote—it seems to me that we should reflect on the significance that each of our votes will have on the course this Nation takes in the coming years.

The impact of the original Voting Rights Act cannot be denied—one need only look to the recent primary election in Alabama to note that black voters played a significant role, and a role that they might not even have been able to play were it not for the Voting Rights Act. But certainly we have not reached the millennium in this regard and, therefore, the extension of the act is a necessity, and the same procedures will continue to be necessary until the day our racial prejudices dissipate to the degree that such legislation is superfluous.

Similarly, if our common counsel to students and young people to "work within the system" is to have any meaning whatsoever, we must give them the opportunity to have access to that system. We have the opportunity before us now to turn our rhetoric into reality by granting the franchise to young people across the Nation.

As each member considers the way that his vote shall be cast, I offer the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of June 8, 1970, which I believe eloquently yet concisely describes the issue before us:

TWO STEPS AT ONCE

The House of Representatives will shortly have the chance, in a single vote on extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965, of taking at least two steps toward greater national unity.

Many black Americans—more than a million of them—have been brought into the electoral process by the 1965 bill, which is due to expire in August. The original bill waived literacy tests in states in which fewer than half of all eligible voters registered or voted in the 1964 election. Federal registrars were also sent into the seven Southern states to which the bill applied.

The Senate in March voted to renew the 1965 act. And it added significant amendments. The literacy test ban would be applied to the whole nation. Residency requirements would be also banned nationwide for presidential elections. Given the political need to make civil-rights action seem less an instrument of provocation to the South, and the fact that the mobility of the population disenfranchises many voters under residency laws—as well as simple fairness—these amendments make sense.

So does yet another amendment to the original 1965 act—giving the vote to 18-year-olds.

Granted that this moment in history is seeing something of a backlash against young protestors, as witnessed by the turn-down of a 19-year-old vote referendum by the citizens of Oregon recently. Granted that the House itself may have mixed feelings at the moment about the implications of the youth movement, and its own history of little interest in enfranchising the young (the House has never even debated the issue, in committee or on the floor). Granted that the constitutionality of the measure is not yet certain.

Nonetheless, this is a moment when, more than ever before, it is necessary to bring youth into the democratic electoral process. They are being wooed by extremists who believe that the orderly elective process of change is too slow, is in the hands of an evil-minded "establishment," and that the system must be overthrown, not worked within.

Apart from this negative reason, there is also a greater desire among the young today to influence constructively the course of the nation's events. The intensive youth lobbying effort in Washington going on at the moment is one sign of this.

The black community, too, is being wooed by forget-the-system, if not destroy-the-system advocates. There is no point in conceding the ground to the other side. The House should vote to extend the 1965 act, with the Senate amendments.

BABE RUTH BASEBALL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the importance of baseball to today's youth cannot be overlooked. During the last 101 years, baseball has become an integral part of our summers, acquiring the nickname of our "national pastime." Many famous men have gained prominence through baseball, among them—Ty Cobb, Cy Young, Lou Gehrig, Willie Mays, and our Washington Senators' manager, Ted Williams. Perhaps the most famous of all is the immortal Babe Ruth.

That the baseball organization, founded in 1951, bears the name of Babe Ruth—a pitcher who could hit, converted to an outfielder, and the holder of many, many hitting records, for example his 714 home runs—is a tribute to a great player. Young boys in the United States and around the world are exposed to the sport loved by this outstanding American.

In this light the necessity of Babe Ruth Baseball is vital to the youth of our country. Through Babe Ruth Baseball we build our young men physically; it also presents the fundamentals of democracy, competition and sportsmanship. These fundamentals, which are presented through all sports activity, instill pride in these boys, and stimulate their desire to succeed in education, in sports, and in jobs, thereby creating better citizens. With the life and achievements of Babe Ruth as a guide for them, participation in Babe Ruth Baseball is one of the best experiences available to the young men of our country.

BOB HOPE: THE SPIRIT OF THE
FOURTH OF JULY

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, Bob Hope is leading the way again. He is spearheading the greatest Fourth of July celebration in American history, and it will be right here in Washington.

Most of us in Congress will be back home with our neighbors for this traditional occasion. July 4 will be a program of prayer, of honor for our flag, and climaxed when we pause with humility and respect to recall the greatness of the inception of our Republic. But these are our hometowns—Grassroots, U.S.A.

And thank the good Lord, Bob Hope is bringing this same patriotic spirit into the city of Washington. Washington, more than any city in our Nation, needs the rejuvenation.

Down in Texas we list our heroes at every opportunity. They are all Texans of years gone by including Houston, Austin, Travis, and Crockett. But today we have a contemporary Texan whom we consider the lone star in our Lone Star flag. He is Bob Hope. He was not born in Texas. He has never lived there. He does not vote there. But Hope is as much of Texas as the hot sun in the summer and the north wind in the winter. Bob Hope is always with us in spirit—he is all-American and in Texas we rate him the champ.

All of this to say that I read an excellent editorial in the Dallas Times Herald of June 10, written by the editor, Felix R. McKnight, which sums up how Texans feel about Bob Hope.

The editorial follows:

On the Fourth of July, a citizen named Bob Hope will stand alongside the Washington Monument and ask his brothers to cool their differences and act like Americans.

It used to be done every Fourth of July—all over the land.

Somehow, it went out of style. And we haven't been the same since.

But Bob Hope, who has earned his credentials, will use the same hallowed slope that has been available to war dissenters to rally his distressed nation around its flag.

He wants a half-million persons to crowd the monument grounds and he wants every television viewer in the 50 states to tune in on an "Honor America Day." It's his idea, and a superb one, to show the world that we are not the total suckers they prattle about.

Corny? Maybe, by a few of today's standards. But beautiful to most Americans—if they will get up their guts, shake their timidity about national pride and sing out.

This is no pro or con matter with Bob Hope. It is not a rebuttal to antiwar elements.

"We're trying to keep the war out of this; to make this a celebration instead of a demonstration," Hope said. "We want this to be the biggest celebration in American history."

It will be an all-day affair, like an old Fourth family outing, and it will be staged by another group of all-Americans, Walt Disney's crowd.

Besides Hope will be another alternate emcee, Billy Graham, and other famed personalities who want to publicly acknowledge

their faith in a battered, but magnificent, nation of free people.

Along toward the end of the day, Hope hinted, a featured "speaker" might be the President of the United States.

It will be a day for all Americans, and that includes reasoning dissenters. It won't be a place for counter demonstrations—and the greatest of all shows of strength could come if it goes off without a marring incident.

Bob Hope deserves that—whether some are opposed to national policy. He respects their right to their bag, but he loathes violence. He should have their respect.

It's something another man of 35 years ago might have done.

Sadly, very few of the immediate younger generations ever heard of a man named Will Rogers.

He was a Claremore, Okla., cowhand who twirled a lariat, brushed back a wayward cowlick, squinted one eye—and said a lot of wise things.

Will Rogers twitted presidents in homey, spontaneous humor. He could take the heaviest national issues and iron them out in plain language that all could understand. He had wisdom—like you get from living with plain folk and just listening.

He loved his country and he tried to keep it on a straight path with his daily little two-paragraph gems that most newspapers published on the front page. He kidded and he poked fun—but the last sentence of every column was always frosted in horse sense.

He was sort of a national referee. His rulings were always fair and he didn't need brick or bottles or firebombs to dissent. He used only words; words of depth, reason, compassion and understanding.

Will Rogers died long before his time in an Alaskan plane crash. Million of Americans who knew him have said millions of times these days: . . . "If we only had a Will Rogers these days . . ."

The closest we'll come to a Will Rogers is Bob Hope. He has the national image and respect. He has the same intense love for his country, and he has the guts to stand up to any heckling hippie.

It would be fairly safe to say that next to the presidency, Bob Hope probably carries as much national respect as any man. He has given many years of his life to building that confidence.

He takes Christmas to battlefields. He has been doing it for years. He is a solid humanitarian. He is a funny man, all right, but he also has the sincerity and believability that made Will Rogers before him.

Bob Hope practices what he preaches. He is no fair weather American. He is just the fellow to be standing by the Washington Monument on July 4th.

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
INVASION OF THE THREE BALTIC
REPUBLICS BY THE SOVIET UNION

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States will soon observe the 194th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. During the almost two centuries that have elapsed since July 4, 1776, our Nation has been an inspiration to peoples all over the world. Many of them have obtained their own independence since the Founding Fathers severed the ties that previously bound us to the British Empire.

Unfortunately, while most of the nations of Latin America and Europe during the 19th century and many countries of Africa and Asia during the 20th were gaining their freedom from colonialism, other lands were being deprived of their independence, among these are the three Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Yesterday was the 30th anniversary of the invasion of these small nations by the Soviet Union. It was on June 15, 1940, when the Communists, who, along with National Socialist Germany, had but a short time before taken over Poland, seized Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Independence Day with oratory, music, and other activities, let us remember to offer up prayers that the peoples of the Baltic Republic will soon be able to resume their honored places among the free nations of the world.

MAYOR SIMS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in the public service, there are occasions when a person of extraordinary quality and dedication appears on the scene to fulfill a high calling.

For over 32 years, the city of Euclid in the 22d district has had the invaluable service of Mayor Kenneth J. Sims who will retire on June 19th. The Sims administration has been a model of good government for over 3 decades; nonpartisan, reformist, efficient, and respected.

Mayor Sims has had the support of a coalition of citizens who believed in good government. The strength of this coalition grew in every successive term. The high standards of public administration which have characterized his work insure that Euclid will be well-governed. The citizens are accustomed to these standards. They will not settle for less.

Life in the city of Euclid is a warm, satisfying experience. People care about each other—as the city cares about its people. This is part of the Sims heritage.

Although the city of Euclid has grown in the Sims administration from 13,000 to over 80,000, the citizens are still treated as special people by their mayor.

In a quiet, modest and dignified way, Mayor Sims has administered public affairs in the highest traditions of the public service.

As a grateful resident of the city of Euclid, I join with my fellow citizens in saying "Well done, Mr. Mayor." May you and Mrs. Sims have many happy and healthy years in a well-deserved retirement.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the following editorial from the Cleveland Press of June 12, 1970:

SIMS OF EUCLID IS A MODEL MAYOR

The ideal public official should be a dynamic individual of absolute integrity, enor-

mous energy, and total dedication to the community he serves.

Few men live up to such high standards. But one who always has is Kenneth J. Sims, 68, stepping down next week after 32 years as mayor of Euclid.

The dean of this area's top officials was elected in 1937 as head of a coalition ticket after a Press expose of gambling and slot machine operations in what then was a modest-size community on the lake. He vowed to clean up the city and make it a bigger and better one, and he did.

Under Sims' guidance, Euclid has achieved a rare and highly enviable suburban mix of single residents, towering apartments lining Lake Erie, giant industries, successful commercial developments, pleasant recreation areas, and a school system to match.

Ken Sims' career is a lesson in public service. He has earned all the honors he has received—and will receive—from the community he has been part of for so many years.

AUSTEN D. WARBURTON HONORED

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the city of Santa Clara tomorrow will honor one of its outstanding citizens, Austen D. Warburton, whose name is synonymous with public service in that community. His achievements on behalf of youth, conservation, and the preservation of local history and culture have been outstanding. A native of Santa Clara, descendant of a local pioneer family, attorney, and former law professor, Mr. Warburton has served as city councilman and vice mayor of Santa Clara and was chairman of the board of freeholders that drafted the present city charter. He was founder of the city's parks and recreation department and served on the parks and recreation commission in addition to the civil service, planning, and historic landmarks commissions. Because of his great interest in youth, he established the Santa Clara Juvenile Justice Commission and served on the county's first delinquency prevention commission. He is permanent chairman of the Santa Clara Juvenile Advisory Council, which he established 15 years ago to work with first-time juvenile offenders. He is a longtime member of the Governor's Conference on Youth, president of the Santa Clara Youth Center, and serves or has served on the boards of Eastfield, YMCA, the Adult Guidance Clinic, Brandon House, Valley Village Retirement Home, and the Santa Clara County Council of the Boy Scouts. He is also vice president of the Central Area United Fund and chairman of the fund's allocations committee.

His interest in history, culture, and Indian folklore led to his appointment as the city's first curator, a title created especially for him. His contributions to the preservation of local history and culture are both personal and civic. Author of a book called "Indian Lore of the Northern California Coast," he owns a prizewinning collection of early California art. His shows of Indian art and artifacts have long been a source of com-

munity pride. He initiated the annual heritage tours of Santa Clara and recently established, with other leading citizens, the Santa Clara Foundation to promote the historic preservation of the city. For the past 6 years he has judged and participated in the Santa Clara Past and Present Art Show which has provided the nucleus for a civic art collection through its purchase awards. He is also a patron and legal counsel for the Santa Clara Philharmonic Orchestra.

Such far-ranging and faithful community service is rare and precious and roundly deserves recognition and thanks. I would like to join here, for the RECORD, in congratulating Austen D. Warburton for his outstanding contributions to a grateful community.

A TRIBUTE TO SIDNEY LICHTMAN

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the memory of a friend, Assemblyman Sidney Lichtman. His sudden and untimely death was a deep shock. Along with his dear wife, Beverly, and his two sons, Jay and Steven, and other members of his family, I deeply mourn his passing.

If I were asked to describe the way I best remember Sidney, it would be as a fighter for what he believed right and just. He stood out because he brought dedication and tenacity of purpose to all his many endeavors. When the odds were against him, he fought the hardest. Odds did not mean a thing to Sidney, and he was proven right every time. Yet, along with those he also brought the most important characteristic—compassion.

As an assistant district attorney for Kings County and as an assemblyman from the 44th assembly district, he left an indelible mark. His all too brief years in the assembly from the 44th—the district that we both had the honor of successively representing—demonstrated his outstanding grasp of the important problems and issues confronting the citizens of our State and community.

Sidney's colleagues on both sides of the aisle recognized his expertise in the area of criminal law and procedure. He was a most progressive legislator in the area of criminal procedure—demonstrating his deep concern with criminal rehabilitation and jury trials for misdemeanor cases in New York City.

He was involved and active in the areas of electoral reform, increasing the minimum wage, and lowering the voting age to 18.

I remember Sidney as kind, gracious, and thoughtful. We all remember him as having high regard for his fellow man. His service to the community in official and unofficial capacities is testimony enough to that fact. He served as a member of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies' Speakers Bureau, as vice president of the Kings County Lodge of B'nai B'rith, a member of the policemen's

honor league, the Kings County Criminal Bar Association—and the list could continue.

It is not easy for me to speak about a colleague with whom I had worked so closely for so many years. Encomiums do not really tell the story. Rather, I would like to single out two of Sidney's many attributes for special mention.

The first is the great love that he had for his wife, Beverly. Theirs was a true marital partnership, and they were a wonderful team.

The second, I think, was his stick-to-itiveness, his doggedness in overcoming what sometimes seemed to be overwhelming and insurmountable. Sidney made others who came in contact with him respect, admire, and love him. Because of this, he had the marks of a truly great man.

His deeds and his many friendships are ample testimony to the type of man he was. While it is with sadness that we pay tribute to his memory, we must remember that he accomplished what few men ever do: He made a true contribution to the life of his fellow man.

In summary, I think that we can describe Sidney's life with the following creed:

You walk through this life but once. All the good you can do to your fellow man, do it now. Do not defer it nor deter it, for you may not pass this way again.

BALTIC STATES FREEDOM

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we noted the 30th anniversary of the deportation of thousands of citizens of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. At that time, I inserted, with my comments, the text of the House Concurrent Resolution 416, which was passed by the 89th Congress.

Today, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial by the respected columnist David Lawrence dealing with this same subject. This editorial appeared in the Asbury Park, N.J., Press, of June 11, 1970, and I believe is an excellent discussion of the need for attention toward the unfortunate peoples of the Baltic nations.

The editorial follows:

BOTH SIDES OF MAJOR WAR PAID DIVIDENDS
FOR RUSSIA

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—It isn't often that a nation fights on both sides of a major war and comes out with a big prize derived from each adversary.

The younger generation of today wasn't even born when it all happened. For on the 15th of this month, a tragic anniversary will be recorded. On that day in 1940 the Soviet Union—then an ally of Nazi Germany—annexed Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, which the Red Army had invaded and occupied after the conquest of Poland. Later on, when Hitler turned on the Russians in June 1941, America came to their aid, and, as a consequence of the victory of the Western Allies, the Soviet Union was able to secure domi-

nant control over the so-called independent governments in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and East Germany.

Without Hitler's help, the Russians wouldn't have acquired the Baltic states. Without America's aid, they wouldn't have won control of the "captive nations" of Eastern Europe.

The seizure of the Baltic states—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—has for many years been the subject of discussion in the United States, and efforts have been made in the United Nations to persuade the Russians to liberate the three countries. The United States government has over the past 30 years maintained a policy of non-recognition of the occupation of the Baltic states. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has again and again expressed disapproval of the Soviet course.

Just four years ago, the House and Senate, each by unanimous vote, adopted a concurrent resolution urging the President of the United States "to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples." The resolution says:

"The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation . . .

"All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development. . . .

"The Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the government of the Soviet Union."

An organization called "Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States" was formed a few years ago, and Richard M. Nixon has been a member of its honorary committee since 1967.

There are a large number of descendants and relatives of natives of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia residing in America today, but many citizens with no ethnic connections have also been sympathetic with the movement to terminate the enslavement of the Baltic states by the Soviet Union and to restore their independence.

The occupation of the Baltic states since 1940 has been called one of the most brutal of all times. The three countries have lost more than one fourth of their entire population. During the period between 1940 and 1952, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters were killed in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. Cessation in 1952 of armed guerrilla warfare didn't end the protest against Soviet domination, and passive resistance has continued, while efforts to present the case of the Baltic states have proceeded in different parts of the world.

At a time when Western powers have been granting freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, Asia and other areas, liberation of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia has not had the widespread support it deserves. Attempts are being made to get a supplementary resolution passed by Congress soon to reaffirm that all people have the right to self-determination, which means the right freely to choose their own government and to pursue their own development. The objective is to persuade the administration here to bring the issue of the Baltic states before the United Nations and to present again to the world the case for complete withdrawal of the Soviets from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 16061, to amend section 15(d) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase the amount of bonds which may be issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

This is legislation which I feel is vitally needed as I know how important TVA services are to Tennessee and surrounding States.

Recently, Mr. J. D. Brown, Washington representative of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, gave his "Washington Report" at the 24th TVPPA annual meeting at Jekyll Island, Ga.

In his remarks, Mr. Brown dwells considerably on the subject of TVA bond ceilings. His views on this legislation are enlightening and I feel they should be made available to readers of the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(Remarks by J. D. Brown)

It is a real pleasure to join with TVA's Manager of Power, Jim Watson, at what will surely be classed as one of the most successful of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association's 24 annual meetings.

My assignment at this meeting is to discuss the Washington scene.

Last year I told you that the main features of the Washington scene for the Tennessee Valley were the departure of Lister Hill of Alabama from the U.S. Senate—a fact that today still has not-insignificant repercussions for TVA—the fact that a vacancy existed on the TVA Board, and that Red Wagner was the obvious choice—a vacancy which, to the Administration's credit, has been filled by Mr. Wagner . . . and that within a few months TVA would necessarily ask the Congress for an increase in the ceiling on TVA's authority to issue revenue bonds and notes to finance power supply expansion in the Valley.

THE BOND CEILING

The bulk of my remarks today will deal with the major TVA issue in the Congress today: the proposal to increase TVA's revenue bond authority.

Why is this revenue bond ceiling important? What does it really mean to the Tennessee Valley?

The plain fact is that a ceiling on TVA's authority to borrow money is more than a dollar ceiling; it is, indeed, a ceiling on the growth and progress of the Tennessee Valley. It is a ceiling on the commercial, industrial, and farm growth necessary to a thriving region of the United States.

It was in 1959 that the Congress first authorized TVA to issue revenue bonds, notes, "and other evidences of indebtedness," with a ceiling of \$750 million on the amount of bonds and notes that TVA could have outstanding at any one time. While everyone realized that the \$750 million ceiling would soon have to be raised, it was seven years before TVA had to come back to the Congress to lift the ceiling.

It is significant to keep in mind that, when the initial revenue bond bill was before Congress, the Bureau of the Budget recommended a ceiling of only \$200 million—enough borrowing authority to last TVA for only a couple of years. This was under a

Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, who signed the revenue bond bill, with its \$750 million ceiling, into law in August, 1959.

Comes 1966, and the need to raise that ceiling. On the Hill the key figure in the House is Congressman Bob Jones of Alabama, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee which considered TVA bond legislation. Congressman Jones had been a co-author and stalwart in the 1959 fight to obtain revenue bond authority.

In the Senate in 1966, the top Valley supporters are two Republicans—ranking members of the Senate Public Works Committee—Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky and Senator Howard Baker of Tennessee.

What is the problem in 1966? The Bureau of the Budget. Mind you, there's a Democratic President now, Lyndon Johnson. But it matters not to the Bureau of the Budget; the goal apparently is to put such restrictions on TVA that it will have to come to the Budget Bureau every other year for more bonding authority. The Budget Bureau recommends an increase in TVA's bond ceiling of only \$250 million—to a total of \$1 billion.

But TVA's Congressional friends would not stand still for such a small increase in the borrowing limit. After many agonizing weeks of negotiation, President Johnson finally agreed to recommend to the Congress that the ceiling on TVA's borrowing authority be raised to \$1.75 billion—an increase of \$1 billion, or more than double the initial ceiling of \$750 million.

The bill to accomplish this passed both Houses rather quickly, and was signed into law, with flourishes, by President Johnson in 1966.

This brings us to 1970. The bond ceiling must be raised again. This time only four years has elapsed since TVA was before the Congress for a higher bond ceiling.

Let's trace what has happened this year. In January, Congressman Bob Jones of Alabama addressed the Legislative and Resolutions Committee of the American Public Power Association in Washington, D.C. He called for "an increase in TVA's borrowing authority to at least \$5 billion." Said Congressman Jones: "Within the next 10 years, the TVA must install as much electric generating capacity as has been installed during the previous 35 years of the system's existence." He mentioned the time lag of up to six years in delivery of major generating equipment.

About one month later—on February 19—seventeen members of the House introduced H.R. 16061, a bill to raise the ceiling on TVA's revenue bond authority from \$1.75 billion to \$5 billion.

These seventeen House members were: Alabama: Walter Flowers, fifth district; Tom Bevill, seventh; and Robert E. Jones, eighth district.

Georgia: John W. Davis, seventh district. Kentucky: Frank Stubblefield, first; and Tim Lee Carter, fifth district.

Mississippi: Thomas Abernethy, first; and Jamie Whitten, second district.

Tennessee: James Quillen, first; John Duncan, second; William Brock, third; Joe L. Evins, fourth; Richard Fulton, fifth; William Anderson, sixth; Ray Blanton, seventh; Edward Jones, eighth; and Dan Kuykendall, ninth district.

Virginia: William Wampler, ninth district. As a routine matter, a bill such as this is referred to a committee, in this case to the House Public Works Committee, which includes two Tennessee Valley leaders, Congressman Bob Jones, and Congressman John Duncan of Knoxville. When this bill reaches the committee, the chairman of the committee normally sends out a letter to affected Federal agencies asking for their views or comments.

In the first part of March, TVA submitted

a letter to the House Public Works Committee stating that it supported the bill proposing to raise the bond ceiling to \$5 billion.

Apparently officials in the Budget Bureau and White House were disturbed because the Tennessee Valley Congressmen had introduced legislation on TVA bond authority before the Administration sent up its own bill; and because TVA had forwarded its views to the House Public Works Committee without clearing it with the Administration.

But the Valley Congressmen did not feel bound to wait for the Administration to make up its mind about the bond ceiling. And TVA apparently submitted its views to the House Public Works Committee in the interests of moving the legislation along as rapidly as possible.

On March 28 the Budget Bureau delivered the bad news to the House Public Works Committee, in comments on the bill to raise the ceiling to \$5 billion.

Said the Budget Bureau, presenting the Administration's position:

1. "The Administration recognizes TVA's need to prepare in advance for future power needs in its marketing area. Much has been accomplished by TVA in its power program since 1959 when its bonding authority was first enacted." Thus, said the Administration, we recognize the need for long-range power supply planning.

2. "Because of the tenuous nature of projecting growth of power demand in the Valley coupled with the uncertainty of AEC's future power needs, we believe that an increase as large as \$3.25 billion should not be made at this time." Said the Administration in effect: we don't know whether loads will grow as fast as TVA has said they will, so we will gamble that they won't.

3. "However, because of the importance of TVA's power program and in recognition of the financial flexibility that a corporation must have, particularly in our nuclear age, we believe that a substantial increase could be utilized now to meet future program commitments.

"Accordingly, we recommend a doubling of TVA's present bonding authority to a total \$3.5 billion."

To its credit, the Budget Bureau is recommending an increase of \$1.75 billion in TVA's revenue bond authority—a much larger increase, in dollars and percentage, than that recommended by the Budget Bureau on the two earlier pieces of bond legislation, in 1959 and 1966.

But once you give the Budget Bureau credit for an improved attitude, the Bureau's recommendation for a \$3.5 billion ceiling, rather than a \$5 billion ceiling, falls short of realism.

The Budget Bureau, in its letter to the House Public Works Committee, says:

a. Bonding authority of \$3.5 billion "will enable TVA, according to its plans and maximum projections, to initiate construction of plants to meet power demands through fiscal year 1978."

b. "... a further reevaluation of future power demands and TVA's bonding authority will be required in fiscal year 1973."

This means that TVA will have to come back in 1973—and some predictions are for 1972—to obtain another increase in its bond ceiling. In less than three years, TVA will have used up its bond authority, and will not be able to place orders for future generating capacity—not until it again goes through the slow process of obtaining Budget Bureau and Congressional approval of added borrowing authority.

Even a \$5 billion ceiling would mean that TVA must return in five years or less for an increase in that ceiling.

What is the difference between the \$3.5 billion bond ceiling favored by the Administration, and the \$5 billion ceiling advocated by the 17 House members who introduced legislation on this subject?

The main factor is time. For how many years will TVA be able to plan ahead on power supply, knowing that when it gets ready to order new generating equipment, it will not have to delay for months pending action in Washington, D.C.? How often should TVA come back to the Congress, for a review of how it has exercised its bonding authority? The first time frame was seven years, from 1959 to 1966; the second, four years, from 1966 to 1970; now the Budget Bureau is recommending what amounts to a two-year to three-year time span between bond ceiling increases.

Why, at a time when the nation is power-short, should TVA be limited to two to three years in its effective power supply planning?

Today many parts of the Nation are facing an electric power crisis.

As Red Wagner put it in a speech in Memphis last month, "The public should be aware that a horse race is on between power supply and power demand nearly everywhere in the United States . . . The race will not end soon. I include the Tennessee Valley in this assessment. The Number One problem of the electric industry today—nationally and in the Tennessee Valley—is to meet the loads which now exist and those which will mount tomorrow and next year and the year after."

The power supply crisis is real. Obviously, then, an agency with a peak load of some 16 million kilowatts, and with loads doubling every ten years or sooner, should be able to plan far ahead for its power supply—which, indeed, your power supply. TVA has 20 million kilowatts of generating capacity on the line now, another 10 million kilowatts under construction, and another 5 million kilowatts ready for orders. It is the nation's largest integrated power network. To say that it cannot look more than two or three years ahead for financing seems not only short-sighted but perhaps even dangerous.

In today's United States power picture, it is no longer possible to look at, for example, power supply in the Tennessee Valley in isolation from power supply in the rest of the nation.

TVA is interconnected at 26 points with neighboring power systems, for economical exchange of power, and to further safeguard the reliability of power supply. TVA exchanges nearly two million kilowatts, on a seasonal basis, with utilities in the Southwest; it will soon be able to exchange about 1.5 million kilowatts with the American Electric Power Company system; it has executed or is negotiating reliability and coordination agreements with the Southern Company, Middle South Utilities, and other private power companies around the Valley.

Thus, TVA, as a significant part of the nation's total power supply, needs to be able to plan ahead not only to meet the Tennessee Valley's needs, but to be ready to aid its neighbors who may be power-short. A major TVA generator in east Tennessee may have an effect on the voltage level of electric service to an air conditioner in the offices of the Budget Bureau in Washington, D.C., where, incidentally, voltage was cut 5% this month, well ahead of the summer peak problems.

How far ahead should the nation's electric systems plan for power supply? The Federal Power Commission is now urging the nation's electric utilities to plan ten years ahead on power supply. Even the \$5 billion ceiling on TVA's bonding authority would not permit TVA to finance power expansion that far ahead.

But if the Federal government through the Federal Power Commission is telling private power to plan ten years ahead, how is it that the Budget Bureau is telling TVA to come back in two or three years for more revenue bond authority?

I think it is time for action on the power supply crisis—and not for the kind of approach that a timid, cautious accountant might take.

The fact is that—from the standpoint of our national budget, and our national fiscal policies—the level of TVA revenue bond authority has little or no impact. Is the Bureau of the Budget concerned because TVA's borrowing increases the national debt? No: TVA's bonds are not a part of the national debt; they are paid off from the money your consumers pay for electric service. Will the amount of the ceiling on TVA bonds have an effect on our overall fiscal policy?

Not one whit. TVA will obviously issue bonds only when it needs to. And by the same token, TVA will not be able to cut back on its capital spending, because when the power demand is there, it must be met.

It would make no difference whether TVA's bond ceiling were \$3.5 billion or \$5 billion, so far as budgetary and fiscal policies of the Federal government are concerned.

What is the reason for the rather low ceiling on TVA's bonding authority, then? Basically, control. The Budget Bureau wants to keep as much control over TVA as possible, even though Congress created TVA as a so-called independent government corporation. And the Congress feels some sort of obligation to review TVA's bond authority every few years.

But from a national power policy standpoint, it would make better sense to raise TVA's bond ceiling to \$10 billion or \$20 billion, or eliminate the ceiling completely, so TVA could make the maximum long-range contribution to our nation's power supply problem, a problem which will be with us for several years.

The situation in May. Since the Budget Bureau sent its March 28 letter to the House Public Works Committee, the situation has included these elements:

a. The TVA Board sent a second letter to the House Public Works Committee stating that it was agreeable to the \$3.5 billion ceiling, instead of the \$5 billion ceiling. What this meant was that, with the Administration's position now made public, TVA was going along with the Administration.

b. There still has been no bill introduced on the Senate side. A key man is Tennessee Senator Howard Baker, a member of the Senate Public Works Committee. It is expected that Senator Baker will introduce a TVA bond bill soon. Whether he will go with the Administration's \$3.5 billion ceiling, or join the 17 Valley House members who back the \$5 billion ceiling, is not known at present.

c. Sen. Baker and Congressman Jones have paid a visit to the Director of the Budget Bureau, Robert Mayo, to talk about TVA's budget, including the revenue bond ceiling.

This is where the situation stands as of today: a House bill, with bi-partisan sponsorship by 17 House members, supports a \$5 billion ceiling; the Administration, on record for \$3.5 billion ceiling; the Senate, still unknown.

I certainly hope that TVA's key Congressional friends will hold firm for the \$5 billion ceiling, in spite of the Administration's recommendation for a much lower limit. Whether they will or not, only time will tell.

THE TEACHER I AM GOING TO BE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as a simple and beautiful ex-

pression of the relationship between a teacher and a child it would be hard to surpass the essay by Miss Allyn Lord, of Somerset, Mass., in my district, which she entitled "The Teacher I Am Going To Be." Miss Lord wrote it for a contest sponsored by Francis J. Kilgrew Chapter of the Future Teachers of America Club.

It is not surprising to me that it was a winner in the FTA national writing competition.

I want to congratulate Miss Lord for her truly eloquent words, and I am pleased to insert her essay, which was reprinted in the Somerset Spectator, into the RECORD at this point. The story follows:

"THE TEACHER I AM GOING TO BE," WINS NATIONAL WRITING PRIZE

A story originally submitted by Miss Allyn Lord, daughter of Mrs. Robert E. Lord of 117 Hemlock Street, Somerset, in a contest held by the Francis J. Kilgrew Chapter of the Future Teachers of America Club, in April is a winner in the FTA National Writing Competition.

Miss Lord's story was judged first by members of the high school English Department, Mrs. Marjorie Strickman and Miss Annie Scanlon, and Mrs. Anna Danielson, FTA sponsor, then entered in the national group competition.

It was judged to be of outstanding quality containing excellence of thought and expression and The Spectator is pleased to print Miss Lord's story.

THE TEACHER I AM GOING TO BE

How long will the world have to wait before it has children who can think? How long will it be before there is a generation that can rationalize? How long can we exist with thinkers in one category and doers in another? We need to show our children the realities of life and the goodness of the human soul; we must not, we cannot, indoctrinate them with categorized and meaningless facts.

Must we command and control our children? Why can't we be listeners and advisors? Children have a remarkable talent for learning when they don't even know they are learning, perceiving when there seems to be nothing to see, experiencing in the simplest of situations. If we could only foster these natural abilities in them, we could guide them toward enlightenment and reason.

Is conventionalism a must, or is it that individualism is dead? Perhaps a patterned, standardized, idealized world is good for our children. But somehow it seems we are all different from each other, and we ought to teach and be taught with consideration for these differences. If we are processed, there will be a mass of people, and nothing else. Just people, all alike, with no inspiration, no better goals, no future. Do we want this for the children of tomorrow?

And aren't children people? And don't they deserve, and even more, have a right to, our respect and admiration? We share our knowledge with other people, we speak freely and openly with other people, we have faith in the abilities and talents of other people. Yet our children receive nothing more than a "big desk"—"little desk" pattern in our schools. We must create a give-and-take structure, an attitude of mutual understanding. We must strictly guide, and at the same time softly respect them. They must be thought of as smaller images of ourselves.

And, most important, we must not frighten our children. We must not force them into learning, nor force them out of it. We must help them—help ever so gently—to understand our world and its incongruities and its failures, and its misfortunes. And we must open their eyes—open them with love—and show them the beauty and the wonder and

the loving spirit of humanity which still remains somewhere in this world. We have a commitment to our children not to carry on centuries of human mistakes, but rather to open to them a new horizon, a new tomorrow, a new world, in which they can live and educate their children.

This is a lot to ask of us, of anyone. This is perfection, and man is not perfect. Perhaps this is drearing. But anything is possible if you believe in it and want it badly enough. And I do.

ISRAEL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker for those of us who have stood by Israel since its creation in 1948, the result of the 6-day war between Israel and its neighboring Arab States seemed to offer a promise of future peace in the Middle East. I hoped at that time that the Arab nations would come to see the futility of waging war against Israel. Unfortunately, events since the 1967 war have demonstrated that the Arab leaders do not intend to negotiate with Israel. That the ability of Arab leaders to negotiate is presently reaching an alltime low is proven by the escalation of hostilities along the Suez Canal, increased terrorist forays into Israel, and the uproar in Amman that continues to threaten the throne of King Hussein.

The prelude to the 6-day war saw Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and Iraq cooperating toward the defeat of Israel. Since then, the Government of Jordan has claimed it does not desire to touch off further conflict, while Lebanon has attempted to remain neutral. Nevertheless, during the past 2 years, Arab guerrilla groups have grown in strength so much that they now base their attacks against Israel mostly from Jordan and Lebanon. It is by no means apparent that the moderate leaders of Jordan and Lebanon will be able to halt the provocative assaults of Al Fateh and the Palestine Liberation Organization. But make no mistake about it. Whatever instability ensues inside the moderate Arab States, the real loser is Israel, for it is Israel who suffers the casualties and damage of the guerrilla attacks.

President Nasser now commands a more formidable array of forces than ever before. He meets with the generals of Libya and Sudan, the two most recent joiners to the hostilities against Israel. Nasser relies upon Soviet surface-to-air missiles and Soviet pilots flying Soviet aircraft to protect Egypt's interior from Israeli penetration. This frees the Egyptian Army and Air Force to concentrate an explosive amount of force along the Suez Canal. Indeed, Israeli casualties at the Canal have gone up tremendously in recent weeks.

We can and must do something to counter this rapidly growing threat to Israel's security. The best way to reestablish the balance of power between Israel and her enemies is to provide Israel with

the aircraft she urgently needs to defend herself. Arranging for the immediate sale of Phantom and Skyhawk jets to Israel will also notify the Soviet Union that any further steps it takes toward bolstering Arab military strength can only lead to stalemate and, in the long run, defeat for the Arabs.

The reasons we have for rallying to the aid of Israel at this time are perfectly clear. In the Middle East, Israel is the only democratic country that seeks the friendship of the United States. Israel has also proved a good friend to many African states, which are also our friends, by extending to them economic and military assistance. By helping Israel in her hour of need, we insure the continued existence of democratic government in a far away, unstable part of the world. The time to act on our principles is now. Israel must be permitted to purchase the jets she needs for her survival.

THE FINE HOLY CROSS HOSPITAL,
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it becomes a pleasure and a privilege to meet people with high dedication and unusual qualifications and interests. It is such a rewarding and satisfying experience, that I am glad to share my admiration for the good Sisters of Mercy, the doctors, nurses, chaplain, and staff of the Holy Cross Hospital in Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

During my recent stay in the intensive care unit at Holy Cross Hospital in April of this year, I made wonderful progress under the fine medical competence of cardiologist, Dr. Joseph G. Kump and his experienced consultant, Dr. Clifton C. Leech. The good Sisters of Mercy, under Sister Innocent, as well as the nurses and hospital staff, certainly added to the promptness and certainty of my steps toward full recovery.

During my time in Holy Cross Hospital, the Chaplain, Rev. Richard P. Scherer, formerly priest from St. Anne's Church of Castle Shannon, a suburb of Pittsburgh in my congressional district, was everywhere encouraging the patients and sisters and staff, and surprisingly explaining his new and intense interest in his learning to become a licensed airplane pilot.

Everybody in the hospital has been so interested in his progress, that I must say we pretty much forgot our own problems in our watching his progress toward his first solo flight, and our best wishes supported by a few prayers for his safe ascent and ground return.

The Fort Lauderdale News and Sun-Sentinel in its issue of Saturday, May 16, 1970, has written a most interesting article on the duties and flying hobby of Reverend Scherer. I submit for the RECORD as a permanent memento for Father Scherer in the hope and expectation that he will successfully complete his studies

and become a fully licensed airplane pilot, as well as a dedicated priest, and heart warming Holy Cross Hospital chaplain:

PRIEST SKY PILOT FOR REAL
(By George Thomas)

Each time Fr. Richard P. Scherer glides in "on a wing and a prayer" at Pompano Airport these days, he moves closer to realization of a lifelong dream.

For this full-time chaplain of Holy Cross Hospital is only 10 hours away—10 flying hours, that is—from a license that will make him a "sky pilot" (military slang for chaplain) for real.

When he receives it, he will have rounded out the achievement—to a degree, at least—of a trilogy of lifelong ambitions.

"Since childhood," recalled the 45-year-old priest, "I've wanted to be a priest or a doctor or a pilot. Now I'll be a little bit of all three."

Although not a doctor in actuality, he explained, he has found a good substitute in his two-year-old role of ministering daily to the ill, and doctors consult with him frequently in making difficult moral and other decisions in the care of patients.

It has only been since his arrival at Holy Cross in March, 1968, that this veteran parish priest has begun to get a leg up on the two "other" loves of his life.

Before then, he had confined himself for 18 years to strictly parish chores in and around his native Pittsburgh, until a long illness sent him south for warmer weather on doctor's advice.

Ordained in 1949 at St. Vincent's of Latrobe, Pa., Fr. Scherer is spending the first two weeks of a three-week vacation in retreat at St. Paul's Monastery in Pittsburgh's South Side.

After another week spent at annual meetings of the Catholic Hospital Assn. and National Assn. of Catholic Chaplains in Cincinnati, he will return here in time for his 21st anniversary of priesthood June 12.

Learning to fly has not been a breeze for this busy custodian of souls, whose normal working hours are 4:30 a.m. to 8 p.m. or 9 p.m., six days a week.

Being a middle-class fledgling has been hard enough without having to cram all his flying time into his crowded Wednesdays off.

But after starting in February, Scherer managed to solo by March 25 and would probably have completed his requirement of 20 solo hours by now except for the vacation.

ONE MORE FEATHER

Flying will be one more feather, in the biretta of a priest who has already become a walking—and pedaling—institution in two short years here.

His day begins with early masses before 6 a.m., followed by room-to-room visits from the fifth (top) floor down.

With two-thirds of his ailing "flock" non-Catholics, much of his work is non-sectarian and some only indirectly religious.

Morale-building in general is a major part of his job.

Often he is one of the first persons called to the scene when an ambulance arrives, when a child panics in the face of surgery or when a long-term patient takes a turn for the worse.

His table in the cafeteria, marked "reserved," is always accessible to employees who have something on their minds or just want to chat—and there are always employees who do.

A familiar hospital sight is the chaplain riding a bicycle to work by the dawn's early light, cassock streaming out behind him, and parking in the space marked "chaplain."

That such an individual would roam among the clouds does not surprise his colleagues and friends—even if he should someday attempt it without a plane.

SST PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again call for the abandonment of the SST program. The SST is an aircraft that will not only create great problems in the fields of noise and air pollution but will also fail to correct the problems for which it is being designed. I will not dwell here today on the issues of noise and air pollution; many of my colleagues and I have dealt previously in detail with these menaces to life.

The real problem with the SST program is that the goals it is supposed to attain are in fact straw goals; that is, the program was developed first and then the goals were devised as strawmen to make the SST seem worthwhile. These goals; that is, conquering a massive technological and managerial challenge to be better able to tackle massive future tasks, and reducing unemployment, will not be furthered in the most efficient manner by continued SST development and production.

Mr. Speaker, why should the U.S. Government fund a program which will eventually cost \$1.3 billion in order to be better able to accomplish such massive tasks in the future? Such actions would be analogous to landing a man on the moon in order to be better able to construct massive flood control projects at home. On unemployment the answer is the same. The Assistant Secretary of Labor, Arnold Weber, has stated:

The net employment increase from SST production will be negligible.

Economic conversion studies and programs would be a better endeavor to fund.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the only possible gain from such an ill-starred venture is a rise in the prestige of the United States. But here I must ask again, is there not a better way to accomplish this end? Aid to developing nations, improved employment opportunities for all our people, and a speedy end to the destruction of thousands of lives a year in Indochina would all serve to enhance our national prestige much more than the ability to jet people from New York to London faster than many people can drive from the office to their homes during rush hour.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an article that appeared in Environmental Action into the RECORD which illustrates this position well. Entitled, "Government Finances Privately Built SST," it deserves the utmost attention of all Members. There are far too many other programs which deserve our all-too-limited funds. This argument is lucidly presented in a recent column by James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in the Los Angeles Times. The time has come for the Congress of the United States to end this waste once and for all and turn to problems that are both more immediate in their concern

and more widely felt by the citizens of the United States.

The inserts follow:

GOVERNMENT FINANCES PRIVATELY BUILT SST
(By Lyn Hayes)

President Nixon, against the judgment of some of his top advisors, has asked Congress for \$290 million in 1971 for a supersonic transport plane (SST) to help bolster U.S. prestige. Principal beneficiaries of the project will be jet-setters and its prime contractor, the Boeing Co.

In spite of criticisms—offered by several panels of the President's ad hoc SST Review Committee, Assistant Secretary of Labor Arnold Weber, presidential science advisor Lee A. Dubridge, and the chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, Russel Train—Nixon has requested money for the SST project from Congress. The Transportation Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has recently heard testimony and will vote in mid-May. Senate hearings are expected in June.

Boeing is not the only corporation which stands to gain from the development of an SST. General Electric with subcontracts, also courts the supersonic plane. The two companies have the opportunity to develop a 1.5 billion dollar product for an outlay of only .2 billion. The rest of the money (1.3 billion) will be furnished by the United States Government in the form of a generous loan, which some economists say will never be repaid. A prototype is presently under construction.

Two politicians, staunch supporters of the SST, also have a special interest in seeing it grow to maturity. During Senate debate on SST funding last December, Senator William Proxmire told the Senate that "after going over this matter in some detail, I have concluded that there are just two persuasive arguments for the SST. One of them is the distinguished senior senator from Washington (Warren G. Magnuson) and the other is the distinguished junior senator from Washington (Henry M. Jackson)." Boeing's headquarters and main plant are in Seattle. Magnuson is chairman of the Senate Commerce Commission and the Aviation Subcommittee. Jackson heads the Interior Committee and is ranking member of the Armed Services Committee.

Is it unusual for the government to foot 85 percent of the bill for a multimillion dollar private project? *Aviation Week*, a highly respected technological publication of the aviation and space industry, said in a recent editorial that, "The U.S. supersonic transport program . . . is another effort to develop a new type of government-industry partnership to meet a national goal whose technical complexity is far beyond the government's capacity and whose financial demands are far beyond the industry's capacity."

Aviation Week concluded that this partnership between Boeing/General Electric and the government is "symptomatic of the new type of industry-government relationships that are needed to cope with national problems of increasing urgency and complexity."

What kinds of national problems is the SST directed to solve? It is for one thing, supposed to provide a shot in the arm to our tumbling national prestige. We are assumed to be in some kind of race with other nations for an image of powerfulness—both military, technological, and symbolic. Russia is building an SST. Britain and France are collaborating on one. The international image of the United States would suffer if we seemed to be falling behind.

Similarly, we are driven to heed the cry for technological "progress." Development of a supersonic transport plane is considered to be a serious technological challenge. The in-

dustry has argued that building an SST would be a lesson in technological and management problem solving that could then be applied to other such problems of great magnitude. Many critics have urged the industries involved to direct their skills toward solving social problems. The nation can retain its image of technological superiority by advancing in areas of public need. The Department of Transportation, in a news release on the SST, shortsightedly insists that "the SST is the logical next step if the United States is to maintain technological leadership and enjoy the economic benefits such leadership produces."

It is often asserted that development of the SST will strengthen the economy of the nation by providing jobs and improving the balance of payments. Both arguments have been refuted. John Walgreen, an economist who assisted Robert McNamara in a review of the SST program during the Johnson administration, predicted that the government will lose more than a billion dollars on the SST. He estimates that no more than 139 SST's will be sold, while the Federal Aviation Administration predicts that 500 will be marketed. The Assistant Secretary of Labor, Arnold Weber, contradicts the claim that the SST will raise employment rates. "The net employment increase from SST production would likely be negligible. . . . The project would have practically no employment benefits for the disadvantaged, hard-core unemployed with low skill levels." Weber, as well as a study panel of the President's own ad hoc SST review committee, considered it likely that development of the SST would have a negative effect on the balance of payments.

These are the problems the SST is supposed to alleviate. What problems would the SST create? Briefly, noise and dirt.

The most commonly acknowledged problems is caused by sonic boom. The boom is a shock wave produced when the plane travels so fast that the air in front of it does not have time enough to get out of the way in the normal manner. The boom is created as soon as the plane reaches the speed of sound and is continuous as long as the plane is flying faster than the speed of sound. The "bang zone" is fifty miles wide, follows the path of the plane and is experienced on the ground as a loud explosion.

The United States government carried out sonic boom tests in several United States cities in the 1960's so discover how annoying residents found the booms and the extent of damage resulting from booms. Military supersonic planes, which produced booms only half as powerful as those SST planes will produce, were flown.

Booms produced by routine Air Force training flights and exercises have caused irreparable damage to ancient Indian cliff dwellings, causing rock falls and cracks in the caves.

According to the *SST and Sonic Boom Handbook*, sonic booms have caused the following kinds of damage:

- Cracked and shattered glass windows;
- Cracked plaster walls and dislodged loose plaster;
- Cracked masonry;
- Cracked highly strained foundations of buildings that were situated on ground that had undergone settlement;
- Cracked various kinds of brittle objects d'art and fragile antiques;
- Jiggled and vibrated shelves, causing dishes, tumblers, and vases to move sideways and fall on the floor and break;
- Set off burglar alarms; and
- Triggered rock slides and avalanches.

The Federal Aviation Administration has proposed a regulation that would ban supersonic flight over the continental United States. The danger to people would thus be reduced. However, FAA spokesmen have admitted that the regulation will be easy to

withdraw whenever economic pressure on the participating airlines makes overland supersonic flight necessary.

Limitations of supersonic flights to transoceanic travel would still victimize thousands of people on the high seas. It is likely that any FAA promise not to fly supersonically over the United States will be amended to permit flight over sparsely settled areas—the National Parks, the wilderness areas, small towns, the countryside, and other areas of retreat.

A second environmental objection to the SST concerns the unprecedented airport noise which the SST would produce. *Aviation Week* has admitted that sideline noises during an SST takeoff (noise to the right and left of the takeoff path) would be about 2.5 times as severe as that for a Boeing 707 plane. This prediction is conservative. Richard L. Garvin, a physicist who headed a panel of President Nixon's Science Advisory Committee, has said that the take-off of the SST will sound like "50 subsonic jets taking off simultaneously." Garvin, now with the IBM Watson Laboratories in New York, testified in late April before the House subcommittee responsible for the first Congressional decision on the bill.

Psychological ill-effects of noise are just becoming known. A leading authority on prenatal noise effects, Dr. Lester W. Sontag, Director of the Fells Research Institute in Yellow Springs, Ohio, has said that the SST's aggravated airport noise and its sonic booms could cause emotional upset in people who have to hear them. Pregnant women subjected to these noises could transmit the emotional upset to fetuses through endocrine changes, Dr. Sontag said. Other studies have focused on hearing loss caused by prolonged exposure to severe noise.

The Administration is asking for \$106 million this year to control air pollution. They are asking for \$290 million to build the SST, which will contribute to air pollution. Last year when he was Under Secretary of the Interior, Russell Train, now Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, wrote, "I would add pollution resulting from engine discharges as an additional significant environmental problem." He explained that the SST operates inefficiently at subsonic speeds, such as the speeds of takeoff and landing, resulting in a heavy discharge of pollutants into the atmosphere.

The Panel on Environmental and Sociological Impact, part of President Nixon's ad hoc SST Review Committee, reported that the widespread use of supersonic transports will introduce large quantities of water vapor into the stratosphere. (Under a thriving SST program, "large quantities" means 150,000 tons per day.) The weight of water vapor released is about 40 per cent greater than the weight of fuel consumed. The panel suspects that the heavy water vapor would affect the balance and circulation of atmospheric components. Unpredictable changes in climate are a likely result.

Exponential growth in population, Gross National Product, electrical power generation, or, for that matter, air travel cannot be long continued without sacrificing the quality of our environment. The long-range growth projections of the FAA which underpin the assumptions about the need for and the market success of the SST cannot be reconciled with life styles which place quality of environment and of human life above possession and use of material resources.

The SST is a prime example of a misallocation of resources, of priorities gone wrong. Its proponents claim that it is necessary for the prestige of the United States. Not only is it not necessary for this purpose, but the prestige of this country will be well served if the SST is not built. There will be prestige enough if we become the first industrial country to come to terms with its environment.

SUPERSONIC BOONDOGGLE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The House of Representatives spent four hours a couple of weeks ago in one of its better efforts at debate. The question was whether to appropriate an additional \$290 million toward development of the supersonic transport plane. Arguments on both sides were reasoned, persuasive, and well-informed; but in the end, the wrong side won.

On the most significant rollcall, the vote, in effect, was 176-162 in favor of going ahead. Now the Senate will have its chance to call a halt to this costly and self-defeating venture.

The key questions fall into three areas. Some of them have to do with the burden on American taxpayers; others deal with the kind of world we want to live in; still others go more narrowly to the plane itself and to the practical problems of its profitable operation. In each of these areas, in my own view, the weight of the argument goes solidly against the SST.

It is an elementary proposition, though some of the big spenders on Capitol Hill seem never to perceive it, that the resources of the federal budget are not unlimited. The paper surpluses once foreseen for this year have turned into real deficits. Demands upon the Congress—necessary and legitimate demands—keep rising all the time. If ever a time were at hand for the sober reconsideration of spending priorities, that time is now.

If a weighing of priorities were confined solely to transportation, leaving aside such domestic problem areas as law and order, pollution control and consumer protection, the \$290 million could be spent in far better ways. The overriding need in transportation is not to get a few travelers to Paris three hours sooner; it is to get millions of our people in and out of our cities.

During House debate, proponents of the SST made much of the argument that abandonment of the venture would result in kissing \$768 million goodbye. It is a formidable sum. But if the investment is foolish, it cannot be made wise by throwing good money after bad.

The taxpayers are being called on to put up 90% of development costs, now estimated at \$1.4 billion before production could begin eight years hence. If the taxpayers also have to foot production costs—a grim likelihood—that sum easily could double before the purchasing airlines sold their first tickets.

It is too much for a plane of such limited value, serving so small a segment of the public. And the distorted priorities are only part of the picture. The SST promises to be the noisiest aircraft ever flown. At supersonic speeds, it will lay down a destructive path of sonic booms, 50 miles wide. Waiting for the takeoff, it will create an ear-shattering racket that some experts have equated with the sideline noise of 50 ordinary jets.

This is progress? It is progress to the rear. And this is the point the Senate will want most carefully to debate. If the SST represented a genuine breakthrough in kind, rather than merely an advancement in degree, probably we would have to go ahead. If this were a matter of steam against sail, or locomotives as opposed to horses, or even jets as opposed to propeller-driven aircraft, the prospect of a genuine "new age might compel a different decision.

None of this applies to the SST. The plane offers greater speed. That is all. No other advantage is claimed. It will not be as comfortable as the new 747s now entering the international market. The SST will cost more to begin with; it will carry fewer passengers for shorter distances; it will demand favored treatment in traffic patterns wherever it is permitted to land.

No wonder the airline industry itself is lukewarm! No rush has developed to place firm orders for the Anglo-French Concorde. The 122 reported "reservations" for the SST are highly tentative, and the prospect actu-

ally of selling 500 of these planes, at \$60 million each, is pie in the sky.

One day, perhaps, when technology conquers sideline noise and sonic boom, the SST's hour may come. Seeing a profit, the industry will ante up its own capital and build the plane. But that hour is not yet. It is rather time to spend what public funds we can afford in solving a few problems here on earth.

THE UNO AND ITS TAX-FREE BOOSTERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions of Santa Barbara and the United Auto Workers Union using their vast tax-free financial wealth in an international education program to aid and abet survival of the United Nations Organization the workers and taxpayers of America should know the true establishment that blights our land.

Several pertinent newsclippings follow:

[From the Baton Rouge, (La.) Sunday Advocate, June 14, 1970]

LSU LAW PROF WILL ATTEND SEABED MEET

H. Gary Knight, assistant professor of law at LSU, has been invited to attend an international meeting related to seabed resources June 28-July 3 on the island of Malta.

The convocation, called "Pacem In Mari-bus," and sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, Calif., will analyze the technical questions of demilitarization of the seabed and topsoil beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction.

Also to be discussed at the international meeting are the questions of demilitarization of the seabed and an international regulatory scheme for the fisheries industry.

To be attended by representatives from more than 40 nations, the convocation was conceived by Mrs. Elizabeth Mann Borgese, daughter of the Nobel Prize-winning German author, Thomas Mann. Mrs. Borgese will serve as project director for the convocation.

LSU's Professor Knight has taught and done research on marine resources law for the past two years, not only as a member of the LSU Law School faculty but as a participant in LSU's National Science Foundation-sponsored Sea Grant Development Program. The Sea Grant Program is supporting Knight's participation in the Malta convocation.

Knight is the author of several articles on marine resources law, and has prepared the first materials in this field available for law school instruction. He is also active in efforts to create a management system for the nation's coastal zone.

[From the New Orleans States-Item, June 8, 1970]

PEACE ENDANGERED BY EXCITING RACE FOR SEABED RICHES

(By Ted Morello)

President Nixon's recent call for an international seabed treaty has focused attention on the race to harvest riches from the ocean floor.

The economic stakes in the race are enormous, as the first tentative probing with today's technology has shown.

In the diamond-studded seabed off South-west Africa, the production of gem-quality stones already exceeds \$4 million a year. A single offshore claim contains an estimated 10 million carats in diamonds, averaging half a carat but running as high as eight carats.

Gold deposits have been detected on ancient beaches submerged in the Arctic Ocean off Nome, Alaska. Platinum is sluiced into the Caribbean by northwestern Colombia's At-rato River.

Manganese nodules are widely distributed, usually at greater depths. Rough estimates of total deposits run to 10 trillion tons. This summer, a Virginia company plans to start dredging up the nodules and extracting commercially not only the manganese but the lesser contents of iron, silicon, nickel, copper and cobalt.

In shallow waters off the United States, Peru, Chile, Mexico and South Africa, phosphate deposits are extensive. Two deposits—one southeast of Charleston, S.C., and the other off Southern California—reportedly contain up to two billion tons each. The tonnage of each is equivalent to the Florida land deposit which has supplied 70 percent of the U.S. phosphate requirements and 30 percent of world production.

Most advanced of all ocean enterprises is the exploitation of oil and gas. Offshore drilling already accounts for one-sixth of the world's total oil production. The yearly value exceeds \$4 billion, including more than \$1.5 billion from U.S. offshore operations.

But the advance in technology opens the door to a new dimension in economic imperialism—the carving up of the ocean floor among countries strong enough to grab and hold it. Ever more dangerous to international peace is the prospect of undersea confrontations stemming from claim-jumping conflicts raised to inter-governmental proportions.

The United Nations has previously stepped in to head off a sea-bottom scramble rivaling Europe's 18th and 19th-century race for empires in Africa and Asia. The urgency of the move results from the growing awareness that technology is outracing the laws of the sea. Most of the trouble arises over definition of sovereign seas.

The U.S. and about 30 other nations stick to the traditional three-mile limit. But 15 others claim four to 10-mile limits, and about 40 insist on 12 miles. At least 11 governments stake out fishing rights or territorial jurisdiction as far out as 200 miles.

The 200-milers include countries on the west Coast of South America. Their claims are at the root of the "tuna war" that has led to gunboat incidents and strained diplomatic ties between Washington and Peru and Ecuador.

Ostensibly to safeguard threatened beaver and seal colonies, the Soviet Union has banned "fishing and any work, including the setting up of navigation signs" within 30 miles of the Komandorski Islands, near the Americans Aleutians. At the same time, the Russians have announced new restrictions on salmon, sturgeon and herring fishing in Far Eastern waters—already a zone of conflict because of Soviet seizure of "intruding" Japanese fishing vessels.

Since World War II, the continental shelf has become a region of growing exploitation and international conflict. Geologically, the shelf is an underwater extension of the continents. Its width ranges from a few miles up to 800 miles from shore, and its outer depth varies from about 150 to about 1500 feet. A 1958 international convention in effect gives a nation title to anything that it can reach and exploit on the shelf or in adjacent deeper waters.

On May 23 President Nixon proposed a treaty in which nations would continue to control most of the immediate continental shelf, but renounce claims beyond the depth of 200 meters (about 650 feet). The President

also endorsed and enlarged on a 1963 UN resolution for giving control of 90 percent of the seabed to an international governing body. Royalties collected by the body would be used for "international community purposes, particularly for economic assistance to developing countries."

Previous UN moves in this direction had already resulted in sharp lines being drawn between the Communist and non-Communist countries and, as a further fragmentation, between the haves and have-not nations.

The only meaningful point of agreement is that an international zone does exist—somewhere out there. But the range of opinion about the boundaries between national and international undersea territories has made it impossible to agree on the zone's size, shape and location.

Half a dozen countries already have the technology to carry their claims well past the 200-meter depth limit. Even before these countries have planted their flags beyond that point, some nations with no hope of matching them technologically—notably Brazil, Peru, Ecuador and Chile—have either staked out or indicated that they will claim unreasonably broad ocean territories to protect them from encroachment.

Under the double thrust of technological and legalistic claim-staking, more and more of the ocean floor faces nationalization. Ultimately, the undersea frontier claim of one nation would meet that of another—Japan and the U.S. in the Pacific, for instance, or Brazil and the Congo in the Atlantic. In time, expanding territorial claims would squeeze any international zone out of existence. There would be nothing left to exploit "for the benefit of mankind."

"The United States would have nothing to fear in such a wide-open race," says one American delegate to the UN Seabed Committee. "But it is not in anybody's best interest. It isn't the way to attack a global problem."

This brings up the second major barrier to a seabed treaty: The nature and powers of the regime that will govern in this underwater domain—in effect, the world's largest "nation."

The Soviet Union wants an international administering agency that would do nothing more than record claims registered by the exploiting nations. There would be no rules governing the claimants' eligibility . . . no time limit on claims . . . no supervision of operations.

One group of nations—the third World bloc—insists on an international agency to completely govern exploitation and production of seabed resources. Such a regime would itself exploit, refine and market these resources, even imposing price controls where necessary.

The U.S. argues that operations should be carried out by state or private enterprises under an international administrative agency. Says Dr. Vincent E. McKelvey, an American delegate to the UN Seabed Committee: "Far better than forcing the international community to take such risks is to put it into position where it allows the risks to be taken by others and benefits itself from their success, where it is achieved. Such a position would be advantageous to the developing and the developed countries alike."

From that basic position, the U.S. has proposed guidelines for the projected deep-sea agency. The U.S. envisions registry of claims fortified by criteria, including:

Procedures to verify compliance with operational standards.

Machinery for settling disputes.

Provisions for liability for damages caused by exploitation.

Provisions for protecting freedom of the seas, living resources and scientific research.

Rules governing commercial exploration and exploitation, including such matters as types of resources, multiple uses of the sea-

bed and the waters above it and the size and duration of claims.

Conservation and anti-pollution safeguards.

Eligibility and performance requirements for claim holders.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, June 15, 1970]

**GREATER TREND TO CITY LIVING IS PREDICTED
BY U.N. PLANNER**

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—A U.N. planning expert predicted today that more than half the world's population will be living in cities by the end of this century, and he said it may be a good thing.

But the consultant, Richard May Jr., said the only way to cope with continuing urban population growth is with carefully planned new cities that would accommodate about one million people each. Some 2,100 such population centers will be needed by the end of the century, he said.

May, the consultant for the U.N. Center for Housing, Building and Planning, offered his predictions and prescriptions in a paper written for a symposium starting at the United Nations headquarters today. The symposium, concerning "The Impact of Urbanization of Man's Environment," is sponsored jointly by the world organization and the United Auto Workers Union.

May said that right now, "no developed country has a higher number of specifically planned cities than the Soviet Union." In the United States, he said, "continued urban sprawl is regarded as inevitable, and only a fraction of new urban residents will be accommodated in new towns."

What would it be like to live in one of the "new cities" foreseen by the U.N. planner?

There would be no "degrading effects on its occupants and on the natural resources of the territory it occupies," May said. He added that the location of work and leisure facilities would be carefully laid out to "offer the maximum of human convenience, comfort, pleasure and peace of mind, with minimum congestion, health hazards and other disturbing influences."

Advances in communication systems and electronics, he said, "may make it possible for much of the work to be carried out within the immediate residential environment of the people or even in their homes."

May said one necessary evil in the daily life of today's city, habitual use of the private automobile, would be virtually eliminated. "Through the rational organization and planning of cities," he explained, "we can reduce considerably the need for mechanical transportation and facilitate the use of mass transportation."

And that, he said, would make "daily use of the private motor car unnecessary."

Such an urban environment could "raise living and working standards and provide the educational and cultural facilities and programs which can emancipate man from the dull drudgery and meagerness of peasant life," May said.

**PRINCIPLES FOR AN ATLANTIC
STRATEGY**

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, because our world grows smaller as advances are made in communications, travel, and trade, it is distressing to note that no substantial progress has been made in

unifying those nations which have compatible goals. In order to help fill that void, a substantial number of Members of Congress—111 at present—have endorsed either specifically or in principle the formation of a viable Atlantic union. To date, however, national interests have dominated the attention of most Western nations.

In the first of a series of articles, Aurelio Peccei, the vice chairman of Olivetti, outlines some of the principles and objectives of an Atlantic strategy. I commend this article to my colleagues and urge that they consider the need for an Atlantic union, and the desirability of beginning such efforts in the immediate future. Mr. Peccei's article follows:

**THE CHASM AHEAD: AN URGENT CALL FROM
EUROPE FOR ATLANTIC UNION**

(By Aurelio Peccei)

We are proud to begin here, by special permission of the author and publisher, an exclusive series of articles condensed from a book that combines, as few do, dire warning with constructive way out—Dr. Aurelio Peccei's *The Chasm Ahead* (Macmillan, N.Y., \$7.50). We explain on page 1 why we recommend it heartily to all our readers. Now a word about the author, and this series. First, to pronounce his name: Pey-chay comes close, with the accent on the last syllable.

Dr. Peccei was born in 1908 in Turin—a worthy birthplace for one who would unite the Atlantic nations, for Cavour, a leader in uniting the Italian states in the mid 19th century, was born in Turin in 1810. Dr. Peccei gained that "Dr." in economics at the University of Turin. He has been with the city's famed automotive company, Fiat, since 1930, and is now on its Executive Committee, with special responsibilities in world affairs. Since 1957 he has head Italoconsult, an international consulting and engineering firm specializing in development projects in Africa, Asia and Latin America. In 1964 he became Managing Director, or chief executive, of the Olivetti typewriter company, which took over a famous American competitor, now known as Olivetti Underwood.

We begin with the first half of chapter 3 of his book, with the title given below. Later we shall turn to the impressive case he makes earlier that the technological gap between America and Europe threatens to become a chasm disastrous to both. We hope to give enough taste of various parts of his stimulating volume to lead you to get the book (we have it) and read all its 282 pages. We have added all bold face emphasis.

PRINCIPLES FOR AN ATLANTIC STRATEGY

We are in danger of a societal schism right in the middle of the Atlantic system of nations.

I do not believe that I have overstated the implications and consequences of this situation. Should the reader, however, be still doubtful, he has but to think of the tremendous pace of technological progress which in the short span of a few years has changed the order of magnitude of many phenomena affecting our lives. The speed of development in our time is hardly believable. One of the greatest scientists, the late J. Robert Oppenheimer, marveling at it, said that "one thing that is new is the prevalence of newness, the changing scale of change itself, so that the world alters as we walk."

Now, if this assessment of the present plight of the Atlantic world is not altogether off the mark, it is logical to move one step further and inquire about the possible ways and means to put this situation straight again.

It is within our reach to stop Atlantic

disintegration? If so, how can the solidity of the Atlantic platform be reconstructed and the solidarity of its peoples be re-established, even in altogether new forms, which may be better adapted to the changing times?

This is too complex a matter, involving many variables and irrational elements, and blurred by spurious information and contrasting interests, to afford simple and immediate answers. A positive response to these questions, and to many other intricate issues which have paramount importance for our future, depends, anyhow, on the right approach to them.

As we are now about to enter and explore the unknown territory where solutions lie, I want to state we must pay more attention to how we chart our way into this new territory, rather than stumble on a good solution or two. It is a cardinal point in all my reasoning that it is immensely more important to determine the intellectual and organizational processes by which correctly to set objectives, define strategies, reach decisions and act on them, than concentrate on the solution of any individual problem or problems.

This represents an entirely new approach with respect to our present compartmented vision of what needs doing. Better said, this is one of the guidelines to the *New Approach* which I think is indispensable if we are going to organize a balanced and stable solution to the complex of problems confronting us.

As these problems become bigger, more intricate, more numerous and more interlocked, the question of method in attacking them becomes essential, lest we get lost in their dangerous maze, and formulate wrongly the questions that matter, or address ourselves to solve the wrong problems. The *New Approach* will exact from us an unusual effort that will be conceptual and philosophical before it is political and operational, and it will demand greater expertise than the more intuitive, rule-of-thumb and experience-based ways by which solutions were sought heretofore.

It also involves a much broader understanding than currently exists of the revolutionary changes occurring in the world and the new relationships between man, society and environment at this turning point of history. It likewise requires that the issues we are interested in resolving be placed in a much broader context where not only their inherent sequential cause-and-effect relations, but also the major interactions with all other relevant issues may be identified and considered.

Our approach is so fraught with nearly incredible contradictions and topsy-turviness that it cannot lead to any stable solution. Let me now give a few examples.

We serve and praise the national when the supranational or global is our challenge; we employ limited means to pursue unlimited objectives;

We adopt sectoral outlooks to approach interpenetrating and tangling phenomena; We look near and act short-term, while we need to see far and plan long-term;

We have profusion of knowledge but do not know how to use it;

We are committed to the hard sciences, while we are off-balance due to neglect of the social and moral sciences;

We trust more in our destructive might than in our capacity to organize peace and development;

We support old-fashioned concepts and attempt to use them to straitjacket sweepingly new realities.

With these totally misleading optics and practice, it is a miracle that we have not already led the Atlantic compact, or the world spaceship, totally astray.

This is a most serious matter. More than once in recent years mankind has already

lost its way in the quagmire, when only last-minute warnings stopped it on the brink of disaster. I would say that, at this stage, the odds are even on which way it will go. The stakes are of course very high. One can either wager one's lot that, collectively, humans are a mischievous species eventually dominated by a suicide complex, or still speculate that they are the rational and spiritual creatures we used to claim. Time will soon tell.

The myriad problems confronting us echo a growing concern creeping among the most alert of our peoples, and point inexorably to the need for a radical change in the direction along which human affairs are conducted: *The Great Change of Direction*, which is my central theme. This change is necessary in world as well as in Atlantic affairs. Its adoption demands a thorough and responsible debate on the objectives and a drastically new strategy for mankind and civilization, or more accurately, the adoption of a forceful and coherent strategy where there now is no strategy at all but only conflicting tactics and improvisation based on expediency.

This book's purpose is to put into real perspective some of the great problems I have mentioned, to show that they will become more and more interlocking and difficult to resolve as time passes. And that their compounded complexity and increased menace compel the abandonment of the present irrational, muddled, petty-minded, outdated, and potentially destructive conduct of human affairs, and the adoption of this new integrated, future-oriented approach.

Therefore, in discussing the delicate and worrying situations emerging in the Atlantic sphere at a time of impending general crisis, rather than suggest specific solutions, I will now indicate some of the basic principles which, in my view, should inspire our strategy in facing them.

THE PRINCIPLES OF PRIORITY AND INTERDEPENDENCE

The questions stemming from the Atlantic gap must be examined with this broad approach before we can reach valid conclusions about the way in which we should respond to them.

While a change of policies is required eventually to redress the situation, entailing a great number of separate and joint actions by the Atlantic countries, no such thing is possible unless public opinion supports it. The intellectual and academic communities, and the governmental, corporate, and union decision centers on both sides of the ocean must be convinced that we are face to face with the hard reality I have been describing, and should, therefore, be ready to endorse this change of course.

I shall not rest until this urgent message is fully communicated: Americans and Europeans alike must abandon the irresponsible complacency that has until now characterized their judgment—of their own economic strength, their capacity to govern themselves, and even the present and future shape of their mutual relationships—because the day they realize that the gap between them has become a chasm, and a threat to all, may be just one day too late to invoke the Atlantic spirit and solidarity.

When the present is already critical and the future looks bleaker, as are our present straits, recourse has to be had to both the techniques of crisis management and creative planning—provided, however, that the former by no means displaces the latter. In keeping with this severe rule I will now mention, as part and parcel of suggested forward strategy for the Atlantic nations, three guiding principles that in my view reconcile the needs of immediate action with the exigencies of policy planning. They are built around the simple and often heralded, but seldom applied, concepts of *priority, interdependence, and leadership.*

To start with, it is necessary on both sides of the Atlantic to undertake in earnest the difficult, even painful, task of recognizing and redefining priorities. No great statesmanship is required to discern that, at the present international juncture, not even the combined wealth, power, and capacity of all the Western nations, were they compactly united in total commitment, are enough to cope with the increasing mass of their own present domestic and Atlantic problems, plus those inescapably thrown in their lap by a troubled and expectant world, plus the equally important necessity of preparing a more stable tomorrow at home and internationally.

This inadequacy is made still more blatant because for the moment there is no such thing as a bloc of the Atlantic nations. Therefore, as a start, the question of priorities has to be taken up separately, for the United States, on the one hand, and—assuming the European nations are able to piece their views together—for a united Europe, on the other.

In the face of this stark reality, it is clear as daylight that the United States ought not get involved in this whole congeries of problems, and should think twice before tackling even major ones when they are only sectorally important for this country or the world; and that Europe ought to be even more cautious in its aims, and avoid trying to be a carbon copy of the United States. On each side of the Atlantic, political fortitude and vision are now required to determine a scale of goals and priorities consistent with their respective interests, commitments, and resources, deployed against the background of a world context, and considered over long as well as short periods; and then to make a set of coherent choices accordingly.

Instead of tinkering ineffectually, as both America and Europe now do in their different ways, with too many scattered problems or objectives—more often than not uncoordinated or at cross-purposes with one another—and instead of announcing more and more programs that patently can never materialize, each of them should firmly get on with the business of identifying a set of feasible goals, and reordering a comprehensive plan of priorities, and then set forth, and carry out, the projects and policies that are both feasible and of the highest priority. At the same time, each should abandon, postpone, or phase programs and commitments that are marginal with respect to the over-all objectives, or have lesser immediate or deferred importance according to this strategy.

These concepts are elementary, the constant guidelines of successful individuals and corporations. Yet they are consistently ignored by our national policy-makers. Their adoption would automatically lead the Western nations to give serious consideration and recognition to the second, and likewise fundamental, principle, based on the plain reality that in this era neither government nor industry nor any single nation, not even a whole continent, can go it alone, without sacrificing optimum opportunities and even jeopardizing minimal plans. Under the present international circumstances, this principle could, in the beginning, be most usefully employed within the Atlantic sphere.

In fact, *effective Atlantic interdependence is now more than ever a primary necessity for all our nations.*

It is as simple as that. Yet even this principle is ignored to the extent of acting contrary to historical trends. In this time of internecine debate and dissent, it is worth remembering that the record of the nations touched by the waves of the Atlantic has for more than two centuries been one of cross-fertilizing interdependence at peace and in war. Through their exchange of goods, tech-

niques, and ideas, the flow of capital and aid, and the migration of hands and brains, in defense of liberty and ways of life, and in shaping a great civilization and a common destiny, the all-important Atlantic platform has been welded together, and in its area the most advanced system of human organization recorded in history has been created.

What must now be resisted is the gap itself—the reversal of this natural course, the nonrecognition of interdependence as an indispensable basis for our lives. Our governments and our peoples should be brought to recognize that the chasm ahead and the consequent derailment of the Atlantic system, right at the moment when Atlantic strength is a prerequisite, would be a historical catastrophe.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

On these two counts—of priorities to be fixed, and interdependence to be enacted—criticism is easier and probably more pertinent at the present reading in the case of the United States. It is so, because this nation not only possesses the proper institutions to establish a coherent over-all policy but has developed superior forecasting, systems analysis, planning, and managerial capabilities, tools with which it can guide itself efficiently.

In the last few years, criticism has been forthcoming in abundance from many quarters. It interests all of us because it is directed at correcting some of the forces and tendencies that, by inadvertence, oversight, or contrary interest, work against the maintenance of a healthy Atlantic system by pushing the United States too far ahead of Europe in some sectors, and too far away from it in others. It also brings to the surface the neglect suffered by some important aspects or sectors of American society.

The over-all impression one gathers at present is that the national purposes of this, the greatest nation of all times, are far from clear, or at least that no strategic design has been conceived to fulfill them. This is a striking fact, particularly at a time when the condition of world affairs demands precisely these things—namely, over-all objectives, and strategies to achieve them—but on a much greater scale.

Some random specimens: John Kenneth Galbraith's *The Affluent Society* is already a classic, with its indictment of the American economic order based on a persistent imbalance between overproduction of wares for private consumption and underproduction of public services.

Signs of the existing grave confusion in, or lack of, leadership in the definition of basic priorities for the whole of American society may be gathered from the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders of March 1967, called the Kerner Report. Its memorable conclusion is that "our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal." The commissioners said that "only a commitment to national action on an unprecedented scale can shape a future compatible with the historic ideals of American society." Columnist Joseph Alsop (*International Herald Tribune*, March 20, 1968) commented with anguish that the report "is nothing more nor less than an official portrait of the American-dream-turning-into-nightmare."

This grave problem, smack in the center of United States cities, is a cause of consternation, not only for America and her friends and admirers, but also for those who, though not friendly, have enough salt in their head to understand that, if the United States is locked with her domestic problems, the chances of redressing the alarming situations that prevail throughout the world will become very dim indeed. And by the side, it provides proof that yesterday's improvidence spells trouble for today, and that the world is such an interlocking system that a domes-

tic problem here may have international repercussions everywhere.

Take another example: The military-industrial complex. General Eisenhower's historic and incisive warning in his last presidential speech of January 1961 brought up an issue which has been amply debated since: "This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, in every state house, every office of federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources, and livelihood are all involved: so is the very structure of our society."

Obviously, a multibillion-dollar effort concentrated in one single direction has an unbalancing effect, even for the strongest economy and nation. I was impressed by some comments on this, among others those made by Seymour Melman in his *Our Depleted Society*: I cannot refrain from brooding over the universal significance of some passages. Let me cite two:

"We can try to visualize the present power of the U.S. strategic nuclear stockpile in another way. Suppose a Hiroshima-size bomb had been exploded every day of every year for the last 1,965 years, or since the birth of Christ. The combined force of all of these explosions would be just over 14,000 megatons; this is only 70 percent of the destructive capability now encased in the U.S. long-range bombers and missiles alone.

"On the assumption of 90 percent attrition of aircraft and 75 percent attrition of strategic missiles, the resulting overkill factor would be about 220 times on the main population-industrial centers of the USSR. If the assumption of attrition were 50 percent, the overkill rate would be more than 1,000 times."

I fully realize that this is the shield under which Western Europe and many other peoples also have progressed and prospered. Moreover, this frightening investment of wealth and talent for destruction is the mirror image and replica of a similar, though more secretive, mad effort in the Soviet Union—which does not justify either of them on human and moral grounds. But what is important for our matter-of-fact reasoning is the assessment of this effort in the more general framework of national (and Atlantic, international), interests: a security effort which, according to Ralph E. Lapp, the outspoken physicist and author, has cost this country in the postwar years an investment of one trillion dollars and the emergence of what he calls the "weapon culture" and "weapon ego" (*The Weapon Culture, 1968*). Clearly, an effort of this magnitude cannot be conjured up without a strong impact on the allocation of national resources, both material and intellectual—and society's outlook on man and life.

Is this the best way to attain the purported goals? Has their priority been duly assessed?

What is the cost-effectiveness of this investment for the United States (or for that matter, for the Soviet Union), and how does it stand in total-value comparison, including social values, with other alternative investments?

Would its revision provoke, as one feels, a major change in politics and allocations?

It is not up to me, or for this book, to answer these questions, but I know that these distortions go beyond the economy's limit of elasticity, and their redressing will cause painful crises over a very long time.

Two highly authoritative comments place the problem of priorities in a global perspective, the appropriate framework for the leading nation of the Atlantic community and the world.

Walter Lippmann has, for some years, conducted an inspiring and most educative cam-

paign to show that the United States cannot fill a super-role in world affairs. Time and again he has entered the arena in his masterful way, warning the American and also his uncommonly vast European public that there is a very definite and already transgressed limit to the commitments the United States can make and fulfill in the world. Choices must be made, priorities defined. Among his innumerable articles, I remember reading in *Newsweek* (August 1, 1966) that "the United States, for all its wealth and military power and for all of the ideological pretensions... is quite unable to be the world's policeman and to conduct a global crusade for its way of life and its favorite doctrines."

"The unsolved problem, obvious for a very long time, which the people intuitively understand or seem to understand, is the problem of priority. It is true that the United States can spend more money on the cities and on Vietnam this year than last year, but it is not true that it can deal effectively with the war in Vietnam, the problem of the cities, the flight to the moon, the health, education and welfare of all the people, the new class war between the rich nations and the poor nations, pork-barrel appropriations for all states and cities, veterans' aid, foreign aid, debt, education and the balance of payments—all these things at the same time."

Alas, the question of priority is still very muddled, as developments in 1967 and 1968 show, with the financial and manpower resources of this nation overstretched, and its immense capacity to tackle large problems severely tested by the proliferating tentacles of too many issues attacked at the same time.

Even the immense power of the United States should not be overestimated. After all, the possibility of putting it to good use is limited, unless it is redirected and redeployed. A substantial change of direction in its utilization at home and abroad would multiply manifoldly its usefulness to all practical purposes.

The issue is blurred chiefly because, in our minds, the strategy of security has completely overshadowed what may be called the strategy of development. For example, it is commonly held that a situation of unipolarity exists now because the time of two superpowers is gone, and the United States has emerged as the only real global power, having greatly outpaced and outclassed the Soviet Union in techno-scientific, economic, and military potential, and creative capacity. But this conception connotes a yardstick of power, which measures nearly exclusively negative values of deterrence and retaliation.

What people want, besides security, are constructive policies, positive steps toward a better living standard, a more wholesome quality of life. To attain these other objectives, the formidable United States security-oriented potential is of little use—for the simple reason that it was conceived to suit a different set of requirements and priorities.

Not only does the whole question of domestic and international priorities need a thorough reassessment; the principle of Atlantic interdependence must be reaffirmed and redefined right in this country. It has undertaken a fearsome complex of worldwide obligations and commitments; and even if henceforth it uses restraint, they will remain a formidable lot. Furthermore, let me repeat, many high-priority problems nowadays surpass the capacity of any nation, even the United States, and demand strategies and policies that she cannot conceive and execute alone.

It now behooves the great and generous American people to come to the mature recognition that we cannot, of course, shirk global responsibilities and their relative burdens, but that the only way of facing them without courting disaster is to arrange all these demands, domestic and foreign, in a coordinated over-all plan, however imper-

fect it may be initially. They have to accept, at the same time, that the United States cannot decide the choices or conduct large-scale action without the support and participation of others, starting with Europe.

This change of direction will probably mean for the United States a slowing down in the advance in Research and Development investment in some sectors, while boosting it in others, accepting second place in some advanced technology or strategic fields, and relying, in a word, more on a policy of transatlantic specialization, mutuality of interests and joint planning ahead, than going it alone. It may be a difficult choice to make, and it may entail some risks. But it will open wider horizons to this nation, and offer it greater options.

Not least, it will establish with Europe that indispensable dialogue, real and creative, not only perfunctory, as now—on objectives and strategics concerning the great world issues: East-West relations, international socioeconomic development, the consequences of the technological revolution, etc. Even a joint effort to control and contain the causes of the gap will be a first, invaluable dividend.

If the United States will adopt the principles of priorities and interdependence, I have no doubt that she would change the focus of her policy back from the Pacific again to the Atlantic. Even assuming that the greatest challenges facing the West for the rest of the century are those of restraining China and maneuvering her peacefully into the international community—the timing and strategy have been wrong, with the United States engaged in these issues now and practically alone. Not only does the *locus* of her vital interests lie in the Atlantic-European area, but also, how much better it is for the United States to wait a few years, and prepare to deal with the Chinese issues from a much stronger position.

Such a position can be built only around a strongly fastened and united Atlantic platform. The obvious strategy is to give priority to the Atlantic platform and seek interdependence with Europe first, and then move jointly on to do the things that the United States alone can never hope to accomplish with respect to global problems.

Such as attracting the Soviet Union as a partner in the study of plans to stabilize and develop the great land areas in Asia and elsewhere (rather than rejecting her as a natural or potential enemy), and engaging her potential to cooperate in realizing constructive long-term policies of worldwide scope (instead of dissipating, on both sides, enormous resources in the vain pursuit of overkill supremacy).

The opposite policies, now being followed, have thrown the Atlantic camp into disarray. If the present trend continues, it seems inevitable that the more the United States gets single-handedly and inextricably involved in the Far East, the greater the attraction Western Europe will feel toward Eastern Europe and the Urals. Or the greater the doubts will become whether it is a paying proposition for it to resist the lures and threats that the Soviet Union may be tempted to make with a view to dividing and controlling it.

Already this quite negative polarization of American and European interests away from the Atlantic core, though fortunately still partial, is at the root of a good deal of disharmony and estrangement between them. Should the United States be entangled in Southeast Asia for a long time to come, the harm done to the Atlantic relationship could become irreparable. There is little doubt that, in such a case, Europe would practically turn its back on the Atlantic, and that the bridges to the East which President Johnson has advocated would actually be built by Europe alone. They would carry considerable mercantile, cultural traffic.

In sum, the different issues—from tech-

nology to Vietnam—are in fact interlocked. The problems of technological disparity between the United States and Europe cannot be resolved, any more than many other problems, except by a long-term over-all strategy jointly conceived and jointly undertaken by the Atlantic nations. This joint strategy does not necessarily have to follow the official formation of an Atlantic community of sorts; indeed, it may precede it and help in eventually giving life to it.

The first task is to impress on public opinion and political circles that, short of this combination of priority and interdependence policies between America and Europe, most of the measures otherwise devised to reduce the technological gap, or solve the other grave problems they have in common, though temporarily or sectorally promising, would be but palliatives; and the Atlantic and world situation would continue to worsen.

Finally, if the perspective of an impending and inevitable Atlantic community is created in people's minds, not only will the problem of the gap look less abrasive to European pride, and lose some of the ugly thorns it now has for all, but many new undreamed-of channels will spontaneously open for the free circulation of technology within this promised, unified community area.

OEO TRIES NEW PILOT PLAN FOR LOW-INCOME AREAS

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity is proposing a new demonstration program to test new approaches to stimulating economic development in low-income areas.

The program consists of an Opportunity Funding Corporation, with three components: opportunity guarantee; community development discount; and incentive stimulator.

The purpose of the project is to give financial institutions more incentive to channel funds into low-income communities.

The May 20, 1970, issue of the American Banker describes this interesting and unusual program in some detail, and I would like to place this article into the RECORD at this point:

OEO TRIES PILOT PLAN FOR LOW-INCOME AREAS, ILLINOIS BANKERS TOLD (By James Rubenstein)

PEORIA, ILL.—The Office of Economic Opportunity has launched an experimental funding program to give banks more incentive to channel funds into low-income communities, a top OEO official told Illinois bankers here Tuesday.

The program called: "Opportunity Funding. An Economic Development Demonstration," is aimed at generating increased economic activity among financial institutions and supplements the agency's existing economic development projects in minority, rural and urban areas explained Alfred H. Taylor, Jr., executive director of the planning and review committee of the OEO, to the 79th annual convention of the Illinois Bankers Association.

Mr. Taylor is assistant to Donald Rumsfeld, OEO director.

Under the pilot program, the OEO will offer participating banks four loan and deposit guarantees which will:

Finance working capital requirements of community development corporations.

Repay deposits to poverty area banks above the \$20,000 Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. limit.

Repay capital notes issued by poverty area banks.

Offer a guarantee on standby loans issued by a bank to a community-owned shopping center for initial equity and funds for start-up expenses.

If these and other elements of the program prove successful, the OEO hopes to seek legislation to make them permanent, he said.

In discussing the Opportunity Funding Corp., a non-profit corporation which the OEO has formed to conduct its minority activities, Mr. Taylor, a former vice president in the trust department of the Harris Trust & Savings Bank, Chicago, observed that experience suggests that financial institutions have been reluctant to undertake low-income investment because of the high risks and lack of incentive.

In an OEO report Mr. Taylor made available to the press, it noted that one of the principal characteristics of low-income communities is the absence of a sufficient financial base to generate increased economic activity.

"The inability to form capital and bid for credit acts as a block on development," said the report.

"In the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, New York, an area with a population exceeding the entire city of Cincinnati, there are only two small banking units. There are many communities in Chicago each housing tens of thousands of people where there is no commercial banking institution whatsoever.

"Under these conditions, capital and savings do not form. Where conventional credit sources are absent, low-income consumers and entrepreneurs must rely on loan sharks and high risk credit merchants," the OEO survey maintained.

"The Opportunity Funding Corp. has three units, explained Mr. Taylor, who substituted for Mr. Rumsfeld, who cancelled because of a special Cabinet meeting in Washington.

The first unit, the opportunity guarantee component, will strive to remove the "risk aversion" of banks and other institutions in committing capital and credit to the poor.

"It will operate in situations involving comparatively high risk and only in cases where comparable guarantee arrangements are not available from existing Federal, state or private sources.

"The purpose is to determine whether risk of loss on credit, bonding and insurance in low-income areas can be kept within tolerable limits."

A second unit, community development discount component, will be a small central discount facility "intended to demonstrate the feasibility of a mechanism to purchase SBA- and EDA-backed obligations and other commercial paper generated by enterprises in low-income communities."

It will repackage, guarantee and resell these obligations as securities to private investors, he said.

"It is intended to test whether a discount facility can increase liquidity and lending capacity of financial institutions serving low-income areas. A successful demonstration of the community development discount unit could lead to legislation creating such a facility on a permanent nation-wide basis," he explained.

The third element of the program, incentive stimulator component will field-test various new financial inducements including simulated tax incentives.

"The unit will devise ways of applying these incentives in assisting community development corporations, low-income credit units and other public and private institu-

tions now serving the interests of these communities," he said.

"The incentive unit will focus particularly on identifying institutions which are unresponsive to the needs of low-income communities and identifying new incentives to make them more successful."

STATUTE EXTENDING VOTE TO 18- TO 20-YEAR-OLDS CONSTITUTIONAL

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself for a few moments to what many of us in the Congress consider an excellent opportunity for bringing young Americans into the mainstream of the democratic electoral process. We in the House are expected to consider this issue late this week or early next, when we begin debate on the important measure to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The issue, of course, is the proposal to enact a proposed Federal statute reducing the minimum voting age to 18 in Federal, State, and local elections. The proposal was approved by the Senate in March as an amendment to the Voting Rights Act extension.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of many Americans that some young people have apparently lost faith in the orderly elective process of change, claiming that it is too slow to meet changing national conditions and needs. And we are aware that many others lose interest in the political process during the 3 or 4 years between high school, when their interest peaks, and the day they become 21. The threats to which the future political participation of both these groups is subject can be overcome, in my opinion, by the 18-year-old vote statute.

I realize that there are some in our number who, while they generally agree with the need to extend the franchise to 18-year-olds, think that either independent action by each of the States or a constitutional amendment, in which the Congress and at least three-fourths of the States participate, is necessary.

I would only point out that the Supreme Court has consistently upheld the congressional responsibility for protecting the voting rights of qualified American citizens. What we are attempting to say, by extending these rights to a greater number of Americans by statute, is that 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds, who, partly because of increased education and the corresponding increase in the quality of their judgment, are considered qualified to work, raise families, pay taxes, and go to war, should also be considered qualified to vote.

It should be additionally noted that the proposal poses no threat to the electoral process. The Senate-passed measure contains a provision that would assure Supreme Court review of the 18-year-old vote before the statute's January 1, 1971, effective date. Under the proposal, the Attorney General would

be empowered to institute actions against State or political subdivisions, or, conversely, a State could call for an injunction against enforcement of the provision.

The proposal would also give U.S. district courts jurisdiction of such proceedings, and would provide for both an expedited trial before a special three-judge court, and an expedited appeal directly to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of today's youth has shown a great desire to constructively influence the course of national events—we have only to recall the recent intensive and most impressive youth lobbying effort here on Capitol Hill for evidence of this desire. I think we owe our young people the chance to prove they mean what they say.

At this point, I would like to include in the RECORD a brief prepared by the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, entitled "Statutory Reduction of the Voting Age." The New York City association has been long recognized as one of the top legal associations in the country, and its committee on Federal legislation has produced a great number of well-reasoned studies on a variety of issues which have concerned us here in the Capitol. The following product of the committee's labor is up to its usual high quality:

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK—STATUTORY REDUCTION OF THE VOTING AGE

(By the Committee on Federal Legislation)

In February 1970, this Association issued a report which considered the proposed extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Administration's alternative, urging that the trigger clause and prior clearance provisions of the Voting Rights Act be extended for an additional five-year period.¹ We opposed those provisions of the Administration's bill which would eliminate the requirement of prior clearance for voting law changes in jurisdictions with a history of discrimination and which would have the Attorney General send voting examiners throughout the nation, rather than concentrate them in jurisdictions which had been identified by the Act's trigger clause. We endorsed as desirable voter reforms the Administration bill's proposed nationwide ban on literacy tests and national residency standards for presidential elections.

In March 1970, the Senate adopted a substitute for the Administration bill which would: extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 for an additional five-year period; prescribe national residency standards for voting in presidential elections; impose a nationwide suspension on literacy tests; and modify the trigger clause to apply to jurisdictions in which less than 50% of the voting age population were registered for or voted in the 1964 or 1968 presidential election. The bill also contained a provision which would reduce to eighteen the voting age for national, state and local elections. The Senate bill will be considered shortly by the House of Representatives under a rule whereby it must be approved or disapproved in its entirety.

This report is directed to the provision for reducing the voting age. This is one aspect of the present bill on which we had not commented in our prior report and it is an aspect that must be considered and resolved by members of the House when they vote on the bill in its entirety. We are of the unanimous

opinion that the voting age may constitutionally be reduced by statute. We also believe that such a reduction is desirable.

We strongly urge approval of the entire Voting Rights Act in the form now before the House, for the reasons stated in our previous report supplemented by the reasons stated below.

The issue of eighteen year old voting has had a long history in our country. Serious efforts to lower the voting age were made following the Civil War and during World War I, World War II and the Korean Crisis. These proposals, however, met with little legislative success.²

The arguments now being made on this issue are also not new. Having re-examined these arguments in the context of present-day America, we believe that there is no compelling reason for continuing the disfranchisement of eighteen year olds. A principle of our society is that government rests on the consent of the governed, as expressed through the medium of voting. Mass participation in voting is essential to represent the will of all the people, and the enfranchisement of most major groups is needed in order to legitimate government in the eyes of each group. When we consider the increased educational level and political maturity of the nation's youth and the civil and military responsibilities which they are expected to assume at age eighteen, we can only conclude that they should also be afforded access to the ballot box.

We cannot close our eyes to the daily news reports which attest to the disaffection and frustration of today's youth and their desire to be involved in the political processes of our government. It is all the more important in these times of unrest in our country that this major segment of our population have the opportunity to express itself in the orderly and peaceful processes of elections for legislators and executives. We are not impressed with the arguments that the reduction of the voting age will weaken majority rule and have undesirable effects on our party system and governmental structure. In this regard, we are reminded of similar views which were expressed in the period before elimination of property restrictions on the right to vote and again before extension of the franchise to women and to black citizens. These reforms served to strengthen our system. We expect the same result if the franchise is extended to eighteen year olds.

Turning to the constitutional question, we find sufficient support for a statutory reduction of the voting age in Congress' authority to enact "appropriate legislation" to enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment. This authority, contained in Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment, has been broadly construed by the Supreme Court in recent decisions, most notably in *Katzenbach v. Morgan*, 384 U.S. 641 (1966). In that case, the Court upheld the constitutionality of Section 4(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1963, whose principal effect was to prohibit New York State's English literacy requirement for voters. The Supreme Court's position was that Congress could forbid New York's English literacy test whether or not the test violated the Constitution. The Court reasoned that even though the test might not itself deny equal protection, its elimination could be viewed as a measure designed to protect New York's Puerto Rican community against discriminatory treatment by government.

The *Morgan* case indicates that in adopting appropriate legislation under the Fourteenth Amendment, Congress is authorized to intrude upon the reserved powers of the states even when its action tends only indirectly to insure compliance with the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court demonstrated its willingness to accede to the congressional

judgment as to the necessity for any such imposition on state interests.

"It was well within congressional authority to say that this need of the Puerto Rican minority for the vote warranted federal intrusion upon any state interests served by the English literacy requirement. It was for Congress, as the branch that made this judgment, to assess and weigh the various conflicting considerations. . . . It is not for us to review the congressional resolution of these factors. It is enough that we be able to perceive a basis upon which the Congress might resolve the conflict as it did."³

Given the Court's statements that Section 4(c) "may be viewed" as designed to secure equal protection and that it was satisfied merely with being able to "perceive a basis" upon which Congress might reach its conclusion, it is clear that Congress possesses far-reaching authority to adopt legislation based upon the Fourteenth Amendment. If a congressional enactment prohibits state action which is arguably discriminatory, the *Morgan* decision offers constitutional support for the congressional prohibition.

It is proper that Congress be given such broad discretion in enforcing the guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment. It is particularly important that Congress, as the selected representatives of the people, be empowered to determine when state voting laws fall short of the standards of the equal protection clause.

We have no doubt that there is ample basis for a congressional determination that states unfairly discriminate against persons between eighteen and twenty-one when they deny those persons the right to vote. The fact that eighteen year olds assume so many of the responsibilities of older citizens (not the least of which is their obligation to serve in the armed services) offers sufficient justification for a congressional judgment that it is unreasonable to deprive them of the essential right to vote.

Furthermore, young people today are highly capable of making intelligent voting decisions. Today's youth have attained educational levels and political maturity and awareness not manifested by the eighteen year olds of earlier generations. For example, 79% of persons between eighteen and twenty-one today are high school graduates, while only 17% of persons in the same age bracket in 1920 had graduated high school. While 47% of today's eighteen year olds attend college, only 18% were in college in 1920.⁴ Statistics such as these support a congressional finding that voting age requirements established almost 200 years ago are now outmoded.

Although the position that Congress may reduce the voting age by statute has received the support of respected constitutional authorities,⁵ other noted scholars contend that a lower voting age may be implemented solely by means of a constitutional amendment. Six Yale Law School professors recently challenged the constitutional basis for a statutory voting age reduction, questioning the breadth of the Supreme Court's decision in *Katzenbach v. Morgan* and pointing to the provisions of Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment.⁶ They claimed that *Morgan* deals only with policing state restrictions on ethnic minorities and that it was inappropriate to extend its application to a measure affecting all young Americans. We do not agree that the *Morgan* decision must be limited in that fashion. The nation's youth constitutes a group which may be the victim of unreasonable voting discrimination as much as females, black citizens of the southern states or Puerto Rican residents of New York State.

The six Yale professors also argued that Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment explicitly recognizes the age of twenty-one as a "presumptive bench mark" for grant of the right to vote and that it is difficult to con-

Footnotes at end of article.

strue the equal protection clause to permit Congress to modify that constitutional presumption. Section 2 provides:

"When the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States . . . is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State."

We cannot see how this provision precludes Congress from lowering the voting age to eighteen. Section 2 was designed to implement the grant of the franchise to blacks and its mention of the age twenty-one was merely intended as a reference to those persons who, by the prevailing standards of the 1860's, would be eligible to vote but for the color of their skin. The fact that the voting age was twenty-one a century ago does not resolve the question whether the same age requirement constitutes unreasonable discrimination in the 1970's. As the Supreme Court has recognized, concepts of equal protection "do change".⁷

Some authorities have expressed concern over the uncertainty which could result if the voting age provisions of the bill were invalidated by the courts subsequent to its implementation. We believe that the voting age provisions effectively deal with this problem by adopting an effective date of January 1, 1971 for the age reduction and providing for expedited judicial proceedings.

The Supreme Court has made it clear in other areas that where the right to vote is denied, the burden lies with those withholding that right to demonstrate that the denial is necessary to protect a compelling state interest.⁸ The issue here is analogous; it is a heavy burden to justify the denial of the franchise to ten million citizens aged eighteen to twenty-one who are by standards of education, exposure to media, bearing of the responsibilities of citizenship, concern for the national welfare and all other criteria of political maturity an integral part of our society. We do not believe that those who would deny young people the right to vote can sustain such a burden. These young citizens should be placed in the political mainstream at the earliest possible opportunity. For these reasons, we support the provision of the Senate bill which would reduce the voting age to eighteen.

CONCLUSION

The Voting Rights bill should be approved in its entirety, including the provision for lowering the minimum voting age to eighteen.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on Federal Legislation, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; Sheldon H. Elsen, chairman; John F. Cannon, Harvey P. Dale, Hon. Nanette Dembitz, Ambrose Doskow, Michael S. Fawer, John D. Feerick, Peter M. Fishbein, Mahlon Frankhauser, Robert L. Friedman, Robert J. Geniesse, R. Kent Greenawalt, Conrad K. Harper, Thomas V. Heyman, David M. Levitan, Arthur Liman, Jerome Lipper, John Lowenthal, James H. Lundquist, Michael G. Marks, Edward A. Miller, Alan Palwick, William B. Pennell, Hon. Irving Younger.

FOOTNOTES

¹ 25 Record of N.Y.C.B.A. 250 (1970).

² Georgia lowered the voting age to eighteen in 1943 and Kentucky did the same in 1955. Alaska entered the Union with a voting age of nineteen and Hawaii with an age of twenty.

³ 384 U.S. at 653 (emphasis added).

⁴ Testimony of Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Cong. Record, March 11, 1970, p. 6936.

⁵ See, e.g., address of Paul A. Freund and statement of Archibald Cox, Cong. Record, March 11, 1970, p. 6934; Cox, *Foreword: Constitutional Adjudication and the Promotion of Human Rights*, 80 Harv. L. Rev. 91, 107 (1966).

⁶ Letter to the Editor from Alexander M. Bickel, Charles L. Black, Jr., Robert H. Bork, John Hart Ely, Louis H. Pollak, Eugene V. Rostow, in *The New York Times*, April 5, 1970, p. 43.

⁷ *Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663, 669 (1966).

⁸ See, e.g., *Kramer v. Union Free School District*, 395 U.S. 621 (1969); *McDonald v. Board of Election Comm'rs of Chicago*, 394 U.S. 802 (1969).

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to stand here in the House of Representatives—the place which we all love so dearly—to pay homage to that man among us who has embodied over the years the virtues we respect the most: honor, courage, ability, kindness, industriousness, integrity, love of country.

The Speaker of the House—JOHN W. McCORMACK—has exhibited those virtues so consistently and for so many years, that many of us have been inclined to take them for granted.

However, now that our dear friend and leader has announced that, because of the unfortunate illness of his beloved wife, he must step down from his position of power, we, all of us, have begun to realize even more than usual, how much he has meant to us as legislators and as human beings, and how much he has meant to this country.

I first came to Congress 24 years ago. I remember JOHN McCORMACK with the utmost clarity from those days. He was already a veteran Congressman, but he was never so busy or so involved that he did not have time to help and advise the most inexperienced among the freshmen Members.

I suppose no two men in the House possess more differing backgrounds than do the Speaker and myself. The distance between our birthplaces—South Boston and Mena, Ark.—cannot be measured in miles, it can be approximated only in light years. By the same token, there can hardly be two more differing constituencies than the Ninth District of Massachusetts and the Sixth District of Texas. It was inevitable that there should be some issues on which we would disagree but now, on looking back, I find with some surprise that they were far fewer than I had expected.

I remember JOHN McCORMACK with some awe, as an absolute tiger in debate. Even when I disagreed with his point of view I was impressed with the vigor of his mind, the clarity of his presentation, the intellectual radar he used to find weaknesses in the arguments of his opponents. And, no matter how spirited

the debate, JOHN McCORMACK was never mean, or cruel, or spiteful toward those who honestly opposed him. And when the battle was over, it was over; he never carried a grudge on or off the floor of the House.

There were those—I hasten to say I was not among them—who feared that JOHN McCORMACK's prodigious ability as an advocate would interfere with his objectivity and fairness as the Speaker of the House. These fears were held by those who did not know him well, and they were totally groundless.

I do not think there is a single Member of this House who would disagree with me when I say that no Speaker could possibly have been more fair, more evenhanded, more considerate in his management of his high office than JOHN McCORMACK has been. It is very significant that my colleagues in the Republican Party have been just as eloquent in praise of this great man as have my colleagues in the Democratic Party. He has always been the Speaker of the entire House, and not just the Speaker of any partisan section of this body.

JOHN McCORMACK has enriched this place for 42 years through his membership and through his leadership. He has enriched the lives and broadened the horizons of everyone with whom he worked, and everyone who followed his leadership.

In good times and in bad he has been the embodiment of integrity, the soul of honor, the essence of reliability. He would always—frankly and openly—tell you what he thought he could or should do—and what he thought he could not or should not do—and that was it. His character is such that he is and always has been incapable of dishonesty, incapable of dissembling truth, incapable of acting in any way other than the most upright and straightforward way.

Mr. Speaker, I am intensely grateful for the privilege of having served in this body with you and under you. I am proud to have lived in a legislative era which you have done so much to fashion and create.

Your performance here reminds me of the lines of Rupert Brooke, written during the First World War:

Honor has come back, as a king, to earth,
And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
And Nobleness walks in our ways again;
And we have come into our heritage.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker, for your counsel, your friendship, your leadership, and your example. And may He grant you and your beloved wife many years of happiness together.

CONGRESSMAN WHALEN COMMEMORATES THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE INVASION OF THE BALTIC STATES BY RUSSIA

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, a knock on the door, a boxcar, and Siberia's frozen tundra: These, in substance, are

what we commemorate this week. In this, history's most deliberately vicious century, these tools are commonplace, so commonplace that their perversity is met with a shrug rather than with concern, with acceptance rather than with revulsion.

Saturday, June 15, 1940, saw the United States practicing its normalcy. If at all concerned about wartime Europe, Americans focused their attention on Hitler's "New Order," then in rapture over France's capitulation.

Hardly noticed at all were the columns of Soviet troops knifing through the Lithuanian Republic, a thrust planned a year in advance. Latvia and Estonia would share the same fate shortly.

Before seizing Lithuania, the Russian secret police had prepared its dreadful lists of persons who would have to be deported or killed to reduce the threat to the Soviet domination. The pattern was a familiar one—the neutralization or elimination of those who possessed authority or influence and the potential to employ it.

Thus, government ministers, parliamentarians, magistrates, and law enforcement officials felt the brunt of Russian brutality. The church, the natural leader in a Christian nation, naturally was the target of massive persecution which persists even today.

Within a month of the Red army's arrival, elections were held to choose a controlled parliament. One candidate per district was allowed to run. No more than one quarter of the electorate, however, bothered to turn out.

The tragic story was repeated in Latvia and Estonia as the light of freedom, if not snuffed out by the Soviets, became only a flicker in the hearts and minds of the citizens of those three countries.

Mr. Speaker, 30 years now have gone by since that illegal conquest took place. Despite the passage of time, the plight of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia has not been forgotten. These small but proud Baltic States are the victims of the worst that man is capable of.

Their hope for eventual freedom and justice, however, has not diminished and the people of the United States share and support that desire.

AS IT LOOKS FROM HERE

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a declining gross national product, accompanied by high interest rates, increasing unemployment, and high taxes are not meaningless technical terms to be tossed idly about by Government officials. They have a far more human impact.

My good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURLERSON) excellently brings this point home in what I feel represents one of the truly definitive statements made about the present state of our national economy.

In his regular report to his constituents, "As It Looks From Here," he has, in his characteristic manner, sharply defined a problem that administration officials say we must expect in even greater quantity during the months ahead. With his gift for describing the human side of any governmental problem, he clearly indicates that unless we, and more directly the administration, are willing to exercise some empathy for people being put out of work or those workers finding smaller pay checks at the end of the week during a time of inflation, we must be prepared to find more families, and not less, as the gentleman says, "getting caught short."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge too strongly that we pay heed to this vignette. It speaks far more clearly than all the charts and graphs in Washington that the state of the economy is not getting any better, but worse, regardless of what the administration soothsayers have predicted:

AS IT LOOKS FROM HERE

(By Omar BurlerSON, M.C., 17th District, Tex.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It was one of those evenings of gusty winds and intermittent downpours. A three-quarter moon seemed to enjoy dodging in and out of the clouds.

Inside the brightly lit grocery store six carts of groceries were lined up behind each of two opened check-out counters. Beside each cart stood people who looked tired and bored, waiting their turn.

First in line was a lady with two small children clinging to her side. Her accent suggested that she was Puerto Rican. Both she and the children watched attentively as each item was rung up on the register. After the obnoxious and repetitive clanging sound that cash registers make, it finally produced the final bill.

The woman took a final look at the white figures on the spinning wheels and then in her purse. In a soft voice she said to the checker, "I have got to take something back." The little girl at her side looked up at the others, not realizing their bored and impatient attitude.

Doubtless the checker had been through this before and tried to be helpful and even cheery.

"How much are you short," he asked the woman.

"It was the check," she said. "It wasn't as much this time."

With the checker's help they looked over her cart of groceries. There was a large bag of rice and about three pounds of cheap hamburger meat. There was a box of laundry powder and two loaves of yesterday's bread, which can be bought for 10 cents off the regular price.

Then there were some fresh vegetables, some toilet tissue and a quart of skim milk. Included were potatoes, wieners and a large box of cereal. There were several packs of soft drinks, some peanut butter and king sized cans of beans.

The eyes of the two, the checker and the woman, went over the items almost one by one.

Back to the shelves went a jar of red cherries, two or three oranges, some vanilla ice cream and a jar of jelly.

Back went about everything that makes things a little nicer—to improve on the plebeian.

The woman was still a dollar short, so back went the peanut butter and one carton of Kool Aid, and maybe another little item.

Watching all this without doing anything is kinda difficult. Maybe some didn't care but there was the urge to step forward and

pay this little bit for the woman because the children were watching. It wouldn't do—so nothing is said. The woman looked back at the rest of us and it seemed the most to be done was to smile and try to impart the thought, "don't be embarrassed, I've been caught short too."

Then she goes out into the rain with the children close behind her. At home she will cook the hamburger and the beans but there won't be any ice cream or red cherries or the jelly or oranges.

There is a lurking guilt but a man in line shakes his head and mumbles, "Those people never know what they want."

The woman would not be interested in the theories of inflation. There are a lot of them but you can't eat them. She would not be interested that food, as related to over-all living costs, is lower priced than other essentials. Washington thrives on statistics. People who have to put the nice little items back on the shelf and see the disappointment in their children's eyes can't live on these statistics which come from averages and generalities. Because we have to have it every day we are aware that food prices are high and that inflation continues to be one of the greatest problems of the country.

A number of remedies have been applied and more are talked about, but relief is slow in coming. Those who have money can afford it; those with none can usually draw on programs of assistance; the large number in between—those on fixed or modest incomes, which includes most of us—are feeling the pinch.

GOOD OUTCOME IN ITALY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of June 11, 1970, was brought to my attention. The results of the Italian elections can only serve to raise Italian domestic conditions and bolster the goal of European unity. I, therefore, bring this article to the attention of my colleagues:

GOOD OUTCOME IN ITALY

Italy's two-day regional elections may turn out to have been one of the most hopeful developments in that country's entire post-war history. The results, for those interested in Italy's continued economic progress and democratic orientation, were far better than almost any observers had predicted. From almost every point of view, the better forces rose, and their opponents dropped.

There had been almost universal forecasts that the Communists, feeding upon national political disunity, upon everpresent economic discontent, upon the general malaise found everywhere in the world today, would sizably increase their percentage of the vote. Instead, their percentage dropped slightly. So did that of the Country's largest party, the Christian Democrats. So did those Socialists who had broken away from the main Socialist Party and allied themselves with the Communists.

The gainers were the three members of the present governing center-left coalition which are most active in seeking just and democratic solutions to Italy's problems. These three, the Socialists, the Social Democrats and the Republicans, saw their share of ballots go to 20.3 percent as against only 16.6 percent two years ago.

What does this mean? It means, hopefully, that, while the present four-party coalition

will continue to govern the land, the emphasis within that coalition has now shifted further in the direction of active reform. It means that the rightwing of the Christian Democratic Party, which has hoped someday to be able to create a coalition with parties still further to the right, sees such hopes greatly weakened.

It is particularly important that the socialist breakaway group, which allied itself to the Communists, did so poorly. This enables the regular Socialists to continue playing a progressive and democratic role within the governing coalition without fear of losing influence with the working class. It also means that the Communist hope of gradually swallowing Italy's socialist forces has been given a sharp setback.

Clearly, this outcome in the regional voting will have a very considerable international effect. It confirms Italy's role in NATO. It binds it more securely to the Common Market. It will be seen as a rebuff to communism's efforts to further penetrate Western Europe. It will obviously gladden Washington's heart.

What is needed now is for the governing coalition, thus strengthened, to press forward with those reforms for which the Italian voter has now so clearly spoken.

A PATH TO PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. With the situation in the Middle East during the past 6 months having steadily deteriorated, it is rare to come across words that not only coolly dissect the problems but offer some solution to them. I recommend for your reading the recent editorial in the Washington Post which cogently discusses the Soviet threat to American interests in the Middle East and just what the United States ought to do about it.

The editorial follows:

THE MIDEAST: TIME FOR DECISION

For two months the United States has juggled the question of how to meet the Soviet Union's daring move into a direct combat role in the Mideast. The delay has been costly in terms of encouraging among some Arabs a belief that violence rather than negotiation is the way to get back their territory. Delay has also helped the Russians to establish their initiative in the world's consciousness as a fact, as a part of the region's reality. There are, nonetheless, we believe, tolerable costs. Time was needed for American officials to argue out their differing conceptions of the nature of the threat posed to American interests by the Soviet pilots and SAM-3 missiles in Egypt. Time was needed, too, for the public to register its views on the kind of American policy it expects and would support.

Two things are now clear. The first is that the period in which Washington could reasonably regard Moscow as a responsible, if limited, partner in Mideast peacekeeping has passed. For a year the Nixon administration operated on the assumption that a Soviet interest in deterring Mideast hostilities and in earning American cooperation on other issues would restrain Moscow's hand. By last February, however, the President had become disillusioned enough with the Russians to warn that he would regard their effort to achieve regional predominance as "a matter of grave concern." That this is in

fact the Soviet goal can no longer be doubted. No other conclusion explains the singlemindedness with which Moscow has armed its Arab clients and has now come itself to their side.

The second developing reality is that there is in the United States a very large measure of public support for a firm American policy in the Mideast. To cite one sign of it, some 70 senators have endorsed an appeal to the administration to continue selling Israel combat airplanes. That this appeal comes at a moment when the Senate is trying to limit the President's freedom of action in other areas, is particularly impressive. So is the fact that the Senate's appeal is being made after a full public discussion of what the issues and risks and stakes for the United States are. The Senate's statement indicates that Americans understand quite well that the Mideast is of much greater intrinsic importance to this country than is Southeast Asia—and that the role of the United States is expected to play in the Mideast is by comparison a modest one.

With the Soviet Union's challenge and the American public's support both established, the administration has no further reason to delay a decision to keep the arms pipeline to Israel open. The more definitely the decision is taken and announced, the more effective it can be in signaling to Arabs and Russians alike that the United States is fully prepared to implement its pledges in the Mideast. However misplaced, doubt about American reliability encourages both Arab illusion and Israeli hysteria—a deadly combination.

At the same time, the United States should put forth diplomatic conditions to show that it is not merely and irresponsibly feeding a raging fire. The Israeli government, largely in response to American pressure, has finally accepted the principle of withdrawal from occupied territories, and it has also backed off from its previously rigid insistence that negotiations with Arabs be "direct." These are important shifts (they threaten yet to bring down Israel's coalition government). In pursuit of an "evenhanded" policy, the United States should now urge its Arab friends—Egypt, in particular—to move a similar distance toward Israel. No American urgings, however, are likely to be anywhere near as effective in inducing realism in Egypt as Cairo's own perception that Washington cannot be bluffed out of its appropriate interest in stabilizing the Middle East.

BALTIC STATES

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this week we mark the anniversary of two major events in history, the loss of independence by the Baltic States and their absorption by the Soviet Union. Between June 14 and June 17, 1940, the Soviets presented the three nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania with ultimatums and then invaded and occupied them. This was followed by incorporation of these nations as constituent republics in the Soviet Union.

The story of the Baltic nations has been one long tragic struggle against czarist and Soviet imperialist designs to secure outlets on the Baltic Sea. During World War I, patriots in the three Baltic States seized the opportunity presented by the conflict between Germany and

Russia, the disintegration of the czarist Russian Empire, and the general chaos to reassert national independence. Between the two world wars, the three Baltic States enjoyed two decades of national independence and self-government; Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania each assumed the obligations of a sovereign state in the international community. They were admitted to membership in the League of Nations on September 22, 1921, and they exchanged diplomatic representatives with other nations. The United States extended full recognition to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on July 28, 1922.

The aggression, which led to World War II, also brought about the end of independence for the three Baltic nations. After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September of 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into the Baltic Republics and annexed them in June of 1940. The sufferings inflicted on the Baltic countries by the Soviet occupant surpass in magnitude anything they had been subjected to before. Hundreds of thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians were systematically exterminated, tortured, deported to slave-labor camps and prisons in Russia. A policy of colonialization, succeeded terror and genocide, in an effort to destroy the identity of these peoples and submerge them in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Thousands of Russians have been moved to the Baltic States. The industry of these nations has been made completely dependent on Russian raw materials. Their languages and culture are jeopardized. And yet, the Baltic peoples still find the will to resist and remain loyal to their national integrity. The Soviets have not succeeded in weakening the ethnic and cultural identity of these countries and their people, nor have they been able to change the priority of loyalties from native to Russian.

The United States has never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. As Americans we believe in freedom and self-determination. For the millions of oppressed peoples in the Baltic countries there can be no rejoicing, no taking for granted of the fundamental human rights which we, in America, are privileged to share under our democratic system of government.

On the 30th anniversary of the Communist enslavement of the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, let us renew our efforts toward the restoration of freedom and independence of these courageous people who pin their hopes on us and the entire free world that they may, once again, live in peace and freedom in their homeland.

JACOB S. POTOFKY SPEAKS OUT FOR PEACE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Jacob S. Potofsky, general president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America,

AFL-CIO, CLC, delivered the keynote address at the 27th biennial convention of the union, held on May 25 in Atlantic City, N.J. Mr. Potofsky is not only one of the outstanding labor leaders of this Nation. He is a national figure, whose works and words have marked him as a proponent of progressive change, aimed at bettering the lot of us all.

Because of his distinction, Mr. Potofsky's speech at the convention of his union automatically deserves careful and considered attention. And because of the especially trenchant remarks made by Mr. Potofsky, his speech stands as a lucid and incisive discussion of the problems which beset America, the obligations which must be met, and the goals which must be set.

The major theme of Jacob Potofsky's speech was the war because, as he said:

(I) t underlies practically all our troubles. Vietnam is a vital key to war or peace in the world. On its swift end may well depend the very preservation of our own democratic way of life. And everything that we cherish lies in balance on the developments in that area.

I commend Mr. Potofsky's speech to my colleagues, and in doing so, I would quote again from his address:

Our Nation needs peace now. The world needs peace now. The speech follows:

JACOB S. POTOFSKY SPEAKS OUT FOR PEACE

Our country is facing one of the darkest periods of the century. We are beset by a host of problems—more complex, more perilous and more numerous than at any time in recent history.

The war in Southeast Asia is escalating without end in sight; more of our boys are being killed and maimed. The blight of our cities is becoming worse with every passing day; pollution is increasing; our natural resources are being wasted; inflation is continuing at an intolerable rate; unemployment is increasing daily; prices and interest rates are soaring; dissent is discouraged and intimidated; our young people are frustrated, alienated and angry; our foreign friends are bewildered by our actions; extremism of right and left is becoming a part of our daily life; and our country is more bitterly divided than it has been in a century or more.

TIME TO SPEAK OUT

This is a sad and sorry picture. It can be remedied only if we begin by having the courage to look honestly at these issues. It is time to speak out. This is what I shall attempt to do.

I shall therefore talk principally about Vietnam because it underlies practically all our troubles. Vietnam is a vital key to war or peace in the world. On its swift end may well depend the very preservation of our own democratic way of life. And everything that we cherish lies in balance on the developments in that area.

I am not suggesting that the American public is of one mind about Vietnam. Because that is not so, it is important to analyze the issue as rationally as possible.

Now, let's see what are the facts. Vietnam has cost us almost 50,000 of our young and almost 300,000 wounded and maimed.

A week before last, more of our soldiers were killed than in any week during the past nine months.

It has disrupted the lives of millions of our young who were inducted in that war.

It has brutalized and demoralized our soldiers on a scale never before experienced.

We have devastated a land that we are trying to save; villages and towns have been destroyed; uncounted numbers of innocent Vietnamese have been killed or uprooted.

This war has already cost us more than \$100 billion; yes, \$100 billion.

The President recently vetoed a measure of Congress providing one and a half billion dollars more for education, on the ground that it is inflationary. Yet, at the same time, we are spending more than 2½ billion dollars a month on the war in Vietnam.

How topsy-turvy things are! Money for education is inflationary but money for killing is considered by some to be right.

But \$100 billion is not the only cost.

We shall have to pay interest on that \$100 billion probably indefinitely, and the interest bill alone in the future will be tens of billions of dollars.

We have been in Vietnam for almost nine years. We have bombed Vietnam, North and South, with more explosives than were used in World War II. Think of all that bombing against a small country. Yet it appears that the military will of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong has not been broken.

MILITARY VICTORY A QUESTION

It has become questionable whether a military victory will ever be possible—a fact that even the generals are now admitting.

General Ridgway—the former UN and U.S. Commander in Japan, Korea and Far East, and later Army Chief of Staff, said some time ago:

"We should repudiate once and for all the search for a military solution and move resolutely along the path of disengagement."

On April 20, the President gave the nation a reassuring report that "everything is going well and we are in sight of a just peace." He announced at the same time an intention to withdraw 150,000 troops within a year. Yet, only nine days later, with nothing substantially new developing on the military scene, the President widened the war in Cambodia and renewed the bombing of North Vietnam—a complete re-escalation of the war.

One may ask: why the panicky rush? Why didn't he consult with the Congress about this? There was plenty of time. Was he afraid that the Congressional and public opposition would veto the military eagerness to go into Cambodia? After all, Congress has a Constitutional responsibility in these matters, too.

Our invasion in Cambodia means that all the tragic errors of escalation are being repeated. We are being plunged deeper and deeper into the pit of disaster.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

That is why we support the efforts of those courageous and truly patriotic American Senators who have sponsored legislation designed to bring to a speedy end the most disastrous war in our history. Let us pray that success may crown their efforts.

The Congress must exercise its Constitutional responsibility of not leaving the war-making decisions to the President alone. To do so would spell the abdication of its responsibility.

The Cambodian invasion is tragic on other grounds as well. For example, it may undermine or threaten the success of the arms control negotiations and talks in Vienna. And the success of these talks is vital to the peace of the world.

Another damaging consequence of the Cambodian maneuver is the definite weakening of American power to influence the situation in the Middle East. I need not remind you what a powder keg that is. The Mideast may blow up again.

Israel's security is an over-riding moral imperative of the world. Yet the Soviet Union freely sends arms, planes, missiles, technicians and pilots into Egypt to support Egyptian and Arab belligerency. Direct Soviet intervention in the Middle East has already stimulated Egyptian offensive action along the Suez Canal.

Do you believe that the Soviets would have dared to risk such brazen intervention into Egypt—particularly after its brutal invasion

of Czechoslovakia—if we were not bogged down in Vietnam?

One must ask: "How did our country get so involved in Southeast Asia? What is the explanation?"

I suggest that there are two explanations underlying our activities in Vietnam. One is the dominant role of the military, and the other is the enormous profitability of war.

MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

It is probably a fact that never before in our history have the military and their allies in defense industries possessed such power in our nation. This military influence even worried President Eisenhower after his long experience as a general and as President. And if anyone had intimate knowledge of this military-industrial connection, President Eisenhower was the one.

President Eisenhower said in his farewell speech (January 18, 1961):

"We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence . . . by the military-industrial complex . . . We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. . . ."

Yet, that is exactly what happened.

The record of military miscalculation in Vietnam is terrifying.

Our so-called military experts have made one costly mistake after another. They have asked us to swallow their forecasts of victory through escalation far, far too often. They have asserted that their special sources of secret intelligence should command complete and unquestioning support. But their dismal record of failure has lost them their right to a blank check from the American people. We have all paid, and are still paying dearly, for their mistakes—and how much longer? Who knows?

Now we come to the other half of the military-industrial complex. If profits were taken out of war, we would have fewer and shorter wars. I have no hesitation in saying that if profits were taken out of the Vietnam war—profits shared by industrialists here and by the new crop of millionaires in Saigon—the Vietnam war would have been a dim memory by this time. All the talk about saving democracy for the South Vietnamese would have vanished into thin air by this time. Pious cries of security and patriotism are too often the mask for profiteering patriots. Let us never forget that.

The military are responsible for the staggering increase in defense expenditures from 12 billion dollars in 1948 to 80 billion this year—an increase of 700 per cent.

Senator William Proxmire established that military spending could be cut by \$10 billion a year without impairing national security. The waste runs into billions more.

An Air Force efficiency expert testified on the enormously inflated costs of a Lockheed plane for the Air Force, amounting to \$2 billion. You know what happened to him? He was fired for telling.

Over 2,000 former officers of the rank of colonel or navy captains or higher were employed by the leading military contractors. I don't have to tell you what that means.

The former Research Chief of the Pentagon called on Congress to halt the growth of the United States military machine before it became a Frankenstein monster that could destroy us.

WASTE VERSUS SECURITY

Do you know what happened when Congress was asked to scrutinize defense spending more closely? The President appointed a blue-ribbon panel to serve as a watchdog over the Pentagon. But do you know who was on the blue-ribbon panel? Eight of its members have interests of more than a billion dollars in defense-related industries. Instead, what we desperately need is the most critical, intensive examination of every aspect of defense spending industries.

Let us not mistake waste for security.

The true American patriot is not the one who wants to increase defense spending. The true American patriot is the one who wants every dollar spent on defense to be spent effectively, not wastefully—and not for the benefit of defense profiteers.

We want an America which is strong—strong not only militarily, but economically, politically, diplomatically, and above all, humanely.

Now let me turn from the military arena to our domestic scene. What has the Vietnam war done to us at home?

The war has done great damage to the spirit of America. There is a bitter and ugly mood in the nation. A climate of fear has descended upon our land. The war has set men against each other. The war has caused division between the people and their government. It has aroused suspicions and false accusations. It has brought back some of the evils of McCarthyism—an evil which it took us years to overcome, and which we had all hoped would never reappear.

Today, we have tapped wires, political snooping, secret informers—all of them the marks not of a democracy but of a police state.

Our Bill of Rights is in danger of erosion. Until we have peace, our very democratic processes are threatened.

Today those who oppose war are attacked for their lack of patriotism. Dissent is confused with disloyalty. Yet high government officials try to intimidate our newspapers and radio and TV.

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

Let us bear this important fact in mind. Dissent is the spur to reform. It is in troubled days that the rights of the dissenters must be upheld if the liberties of the many are to remain safe.

Let us not forget that our nation's greatness springs from the vision of greater freedom for all, not restricted liberties for some. We must carry the torch of freedom against the forces of dark suspicion and fear.

When the war ends, we can hope that we will be able to establish our democratic priorities once again. But it may take much longer to recover from the spiritual effects of this military disaster.

One of the greatest tragedies is what has happened to our youth, so many of whom have lost much of their faith in our leadership and in our democratic system. Students are not saints, but neither are they bums or rotten apples!

Their frustrations and alienation have become intense. Some have resorted to violence—and in some cases, such as in the tragedy at Kent State and Jackson State, they have been met with inexcusable violence. It is most unfortunate that it took these tragedies to wipe out the indifference with which the problems of the young were met in high places.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Violence must be condemned. It is self-defeating and leads only to more violence.

VIOLENCE LEADS TO CHAOS

Those who practice violence—whether they are young or old—whether they are white or black—whether they be students or national guard, or police or workers—must recognize that they are all contributing to chaos. If history teaches one thing, it is that chaos is followed by periods of the iron fist. After the chaos, no one knows what kind of dictatorship will emerge. We do not have to be reminded how Hitler came into power.

Let me say one word to the youth, to our young—for they are our most precious asset. Meet the challenge that faces you not with violence but with practical, constructive action. Choose the traditional way of democracy, the peaceful way. Become active this summer and fall in the election campaigns; work with labor to elect candidates who will

help end the war in Vietnam speedily. Help not only end the war, but enable America to meet its domestic needs.

Years ago, students used to be excused from school to harvest the crops in the fall. Today, why not let them out of school to harvest votes?

I hope that we will give our youth the right to vote in national elections.

It will bring the talents and energies of our young into the normal democratic process. Today, the educational levels of our young people are so much higher than they were before. They are old enough to fight and die in Vietnam; they are old enough to work, to marry, to pay taxes, yet they are denied the basic right to participate in our democratic society—the right to vote.

As a matter of fact, by depriving 18, 19 and 20 year olds the right to vote, we are contributing to one of the causes for their despair.

The 18-year vote is overdue and should be passed by Congress this year.

BY-PRODUCTS OF WAR

There are many other consequences of the Vietnam War.

The 30 billion dollars a year we spend for war cripples our financial ability to deal with serious domestic needs.

Every warplane built for Vietnam means we cannot build a new high school.

Every shipment of guns costs us public housing for our cities.

Every tank and truck means a cutback in our war on poverty.

Our needs are almost without end. Our resources of water and air are being polluted at such a rapid rate that the very life of civilization is in danger.

To reclaim our air and water will cost billions of dollars, to build advanced disposal plants, to change the way we burn our fuels, to create new and cleaner sources of power.

We must spend those billions of dollars if we are to preserve life itself—but today we are spending those billions on tanks and ammunition for Vietnam—almost \$3½ million every hour of the day and night.

NEED DECENT HOMES

One of the most serious national needs is housing for those of moderate income. We need officially 2,600,000 new units of housing each year just to keep up with our population growth, but we are building less than half. In some cities, including New York, our stock of housing is slowly growing smaller at the very time when our needs are increasing.

We will never solve the crisis of our cities until we start a massive housing program.

But today inflation has driven up the cost of housing beyond the means of private enterprise to build it, and the war has robbed our government of the funds to build it.

As a result, we are not building middle- or low-income housing to meet our needs, and our cities continue to deteriorate.

Many of our citizens—blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans and others—have not been given equal opportunity. Some of their needs must be met through laws requiring an end to discrimination in voting, jobs, housing and education. These laws must be enforced vigorously and fairly.

TO WIPE OUT GHETTOS

But some of the needs of minorities can only be met by new expenditures for schools and housing and medical facilities to wipe out the ghetto slums from the face of the land. So long as we have a war budget and inflation, we will not have the funds that are needed for these purposes. Until we have peace, we will not be able to make substantial progress in reducing poverty and ending all trace of discrimination and bringing all people into a first-class citizenship.

My friends, the quicker we extricate ourselves from the war in Vietnam, the sooner we can attend to these urgent needs.

There are other costs of war as well.

Working people in America do not need an economist to tell them about inflation. We feel and see inflation every time we walk into a supermarket or barber shop or movie theatre. We feel and see inflation when we buy a car, or look around for a modest home to buy—those who can afford it—or get a bill from a doctor or hospital.

Despite wage increases negotiated by trade unions for every major industry during the past five years, workers' real wages have gone down instead of up.

There appears to be no end to the inflationary spiral. Despite the Administration's repeated predictions to the contrary, the battle against inflation has been lost! It is estimated that it won't take many more years before our present dollar will lose a third of its purchasing power.

Inflation is a direct consequence of our swollen wartime economy—and so are the steps taken by the Administration to halt inflation. One of these steps has resulted in the highest level of interest rates in more than a century. The government had to borrow more than 100 billion dollars for the Vietnam war. This has resulted in an escalation of interest rates, with the result that every purchase became more costly. The cost of money affects every nook and cranny of our lives.

If the war continues, interest rates may go so high that the government may find it difficult to finance the war and even minimum domestic requirements. That will mean higher taxes and more will be taken out of our pay envelopes.

Between inflation and high interest rates, many businesses will have to close down or face bankruptcy.

We don't need dictionaries to tell us when a recession comes. It is here right now—it is here!

UNEMPLOYMENT AND INFLATION

What do you think will happen when businesses close down? More and more unemployment. Those still working will be working fewer hours. Take home pay will go down and down.

I ask you, who is the first to lose his job when unemployment rises? Is it the President of General Motors or Dupont? Of course not! It is the working man, and what is worse, it is likely to be the least skilled, the member of a minority group, the person who has the least savings to fall back on, and the one who has the most difficult time to find a new job.

Neither inflation nor recession affects all equally. It is those of modest means—workers, retired people—who are hardest hit by both. If this trend continues, social tensions are bound to be aggravated. Both inflation and recession are a direct result of the war, and we will not end them until we end the war.

Two years ago we faced the challenge of a Presidential election. The trade union movement met that challenge with all its energy and determination, and almost singlehandedly made it one of the closest elections of modern times. Nevertheless, despite our efforts, the election was lost.

The 1970 elections will be a battlefield for the control of Congress, particularly the United States Senate. In the elections of six to 12 years ago, a number of remarkable liberals came to the Senate from marginal states—men who might never have won except for the unusual liberal landslides of those years.

This year, no one has any expectation of a liberal landslide, and, as a matter of fact, a number of those Senators face very difficult reelection races. One of them, Senator Ralph Yarborough, of Texas, the chairman of the Senate Labor Committee and one of our liberal champions, has already lost to a conservative in the primary.

The labor movement must meet this chal-

lenge with all its resources. These Senators depend to a large extent on organized labor, because the support which used to come from their party has sharply declined. Only the trade union movement survives as a strong, nationwide institution to support liberal candidates.

I know I do not have to urge the officers and staff members of the Amalgamated to greater political efforts, for it was under Sidney Hillman's leadership that the labor movement first became active in political education and we have continued to devote ourselves wholeheartedly to this important task.

ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES

So, delegates, I have talked this morning mostly about challenges, not achievements. The fact is, that we have much to be proud of. We have given working people a strong voice in their own destiny. In the course of our years, we in the Amalgamated have built institutions to provide many of the necessities of a decent life—health insurance, pensions, education, housing, medical care, and much more.

But this is no time to rest on our achievements. The challenges that confront our country and indeed the world, are overwhelming. If we do not meet them, our way of life, and civilization itself could be in mortal danger.

We, as Amalgamated officers and members, represent a crosssection of American working people, men and women from every area of the nation, from big cities and small towns and villages, from North and South, from the East Coast and the West Coast. Our membership works in factories and stores and service establishments. We represent every nationality and every race and religion.

Delegates, I am convinced that our members, like all working people, and like the majority of all Americans, want peace. They want peace now, without delay. They want peace without further military adventures, without more killing.

So I call on you today, to bring up all your reserves of strength and dedication to our noblest ideals and goals.

PEACE, NOT WAR

We must strive to impress upon our government that the people of our country and of the world want and demand an immediate commitment to peace, not war.

We must bend every effort to influence our military leaders that death and destruction must come to an end, that the way of weapons is not our way.

I do not talk of peace next year. I talk of peace now. The hour is late and the country's danger is great.

This is the hour of decision.

Our nation needs peace now. The world needs peace now.

Let us all be united to help achieve that inspiring goal.

ODYSSEY OF A NATIONAL TREASURE: THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, FROM INDEPENDENCE HALL TO THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, each year hundreds of thousands of tourists stand in the Rotunda in the Main Exhibition Hall of the National Archives in Washington, before the display of the Decla-

ration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. These three are the most hallowed, revered, and treasured documents of all the archives of our American Republic. Everyone knows the story of their creation.

This Fourth of July 1970, will be 194 years from the day the Declaration of Independence was approved by the Congress. I want to recount the amazing, unbelievable story of what happened to the document itself, over the span of almost two centuries. Indeed, it is a miracle that this original version survived at all.

For almost 50 years after it was signed, for all intents and purposes the Declaration was a forgotten object. Not even Thomas Jefferson realized what he had done, until near the end of his life. On January 21, 1812, he wrote to John Adams, in a somewhat nostalgic vein:

Sometimes, indeed, I look back to former occurrences, in remembrances of our old friends and fellow-laborers, who have fallen before us. Of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, I see now living not more than half a dozen on your side of the Potomac, and on this side, myself alone.

Curious footnote to history, here. Jefferson and Adams both died, on the same day—July 4, 1826, the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration. Jefferson had been invited to attend a celebration marking the event, but knew he was too ill and declined. On July 3, he awoke, seemed confused about the date, and eagerly asked his doctor: "This is the fourth, is it not?" When told it was only the third, he seemed to rally all his energy to survive for 1 more day. Which he did, until around 1 p.m. on July 4, 1826, at his estate at Monticello, Va. Hundreds of miles away, in Quincy, Mass., the dying John Adams, who expired in the same hour, feebly raised his head from his pillow and murmured his last words: "Jefferson still lives."

On February 19, 1813, Jefferson wrote to William P. Gärner; the text of the letter is self-explanatory:

Your favor of the 13th has been duly received, together with the papers it covered, and particularly Mr. Barralet's sketch of the ornaments proposed to accompany the publication of the Declaration of Independence contemplated by Mr. Murray and yourself. I am too little versed in the art of design to be able to offer any suggestions to the artist. As far as I am a judge, the composition appears to be judicious and well imagined. Were I to hazard a suggestion it should be that Mr. Hancock, as President of the Congress should occupy the middle and principal place. No man better merited, than Mr. John Adams to hold a most conspicuous place in the design. He was the pillar of its support on the floor of the Congress, its ablest advocate and defender against the multifarious assaults it encountered. For many excellent persons opposed it on doubts whether we were provided sufficiently with the means of supporting it, whether the minds of our constituents were yet prepared to receive it &c. who, after it was decided, united zealously in the measures it called for.

I must ask permission to become a subscriber for a copy when published, which if rolled on a wooden roller & sent by mail, will come safely. Accept the assurances of my respect & best wishes.

The physical life of the Declaration began on July 19, 1776, when it was "engrossed" in the beautiful, formal handwriting of the times by one Timothy Matlack, using quills and specially made ink, on a sheet 30 inches by 25 inches. On August 2, 1776, it was "compared at the table" and found ready for signing.

The engrossed copy was, like all other parchments of the day, rolled up—never folded—and deposited in the office of the Secretary of the Continental Congress at Philadelphia. It was taken out and unrolled only when delegates came by to affix their signatures.

The Declaration was not written in a time of victory. Indeed, on July 4, British Gen. Lord Howe was busily landing the last contingents of a 32,000-man force in New York. On August 27, 1776, Howe attacked Long Island, forcing Washington to withdraw, and on September 12, the Americans had completely abandoned New York. There was a brief stand, at the Battle of Harlem Heights, on September 16, but Washington's communications were endangered and he had to fall back.

The same thing happened on October 28, at the Battle of Red Bank. Then, in the middle of November, Forts Mifflin and Mifflin, overlooking the Hudson, fell, with the capture of 2,800 Americans and the loss of much badly-needed materiel.

Through November and December Washington retreated through New Jersey. General Charles Lee was to cover the retreat, but allowed himself and many of his 4,000-man force to be captured near Morristown. Washington and the remaining 3,000 Continentals crossed the Delaware into Pennsylvania. Congress fled from Philadelphia to Lancaster on December 12; the Declaration, along with other State papers, was packed into a coarse linen sack and went by light horse-drawn wagon to Lancaster, where Congress reconvened on December 20.

Then, on December 26, 1776, Washington took a desperate gamble and hurled his 2,400 troops against the Hessians at Trenton. The 1,000 Hessians out of 1,400 were captured; many supplies were also taken. Eight days later, at the Battle of Red Bank, on January 3, 1777, Washington met and defeated the British again and captured more supplies. In 10 short days the dying members of the American Revolution had been fanned into flame. Frederick the Great said the operations amounted to one of the most brilliant campaigns in military history. The British evacuated all garrisons in central and western New Jersey. Washington's forces went into winter quarters at Morristown, and Howe gave up his plans to attack Philadelphia. The Declaration of Independence went back to Philadelphia—its first home—after a 2-month absence.

Howe was on the move again in 1777. Spring and early summer went by as Howe tried, fruitlessly, to maneuver Washington into battle. Not until September 11, at the Battle of Brandywine, did Howe score: He turned Washington's right wing and forced the American Army back toward Philadelphia. In Congress, on September 14, 1777, Sunday:

Resolved, that the public papers be put under the care of Mr. Clark, and that he be empowered, upon the Congress removing to Lancaster, to procure wagons sufficient for carrying them thither, and apply to General Dickinson, or any other officer commanding troops in the service of the United States, who is hereby directed to furnish a guard to conduct the said papers safely to Lancaster.

On the road once more, for Lancaster, Pa., but not for long. Congress declared that "water must flow between us and the enemy," so over the Susquehanna River, and the Declaration of Independence, under protection of two regiments, wound up in the courthouse, at York, Pa.

Then on February 6, 1778, the Franco-American Alliance came into being, with two treaties: Amity and commerce, and another, an alliance effective if and when war broke out between France and England. Which it did, on June 17, 1778; on June 18, Sir Henry Clinton—who had succeeded Howe—pulled his 13,000 troops out of Philadelphia and headed for New York. The Declaration came back down the old York Road and went back to the State House, in Philadelphia.

Peace with Britain in 1783 did not end the Declaration's wanderings. At the end of the war, Congress proposed to furlough the soldiers with assurance of a discharge when the peace treaty was signed, and financial settlement later. This was not satisfactory; on June 17, 80 mutinous recent recruits marched from Lancaster to Philadelphia, routed out several hundred Pennsylvania soldiers—mostly new men—and barricaded Congress in the State House while demanding immediate settlement. Congress was given 20 minutes to act; it merely walked out, through a riotous crowd that had by that time been drinking freely and heavily. Nothing happened; Congress, however, did not appreciate the mutiny, and in the Journal for Saturday, June 21, 1783, we find:

Resolved, That the president and supreme executive council of Pennsylvania be informed that the authority of the United States having been this day grossly insulted by the disorderly and menacing appearance of a body of armed soldiers about the place within which Congress were assembled, and the peace of this city being endangered by the mutinous disposition of the said troops now in the barracks, it is, in the opinion of Congress, necessary that effectual measures be immediately taken for supporting the public authority.

Resolved, That the committee, on a letter from Colonel Butler, be directed to confer without loss of time, with the supreme executive council of Pennsylvania, on the practicability of carrying the preceding resolution into effect; and that in case it shall appear to the committee that there is not a satisfactory ground for expecting adequate and prompt exertions of this state for supporting the dignity of the federal government, the president on the advice of the committee be authorized and directed to summon the members of Congress to meet on Thursday next at Trenton or Princeton, in New Jersey, in order that further and more effectual measures may be taken for suppressing the present revolt and maintaining the dignity and authority of the United States . . .

The next entry in the Journals is for Princeton, on Monday, June 30, 1783. Congress and the Declaration did not

stay there long, either; in the Journals for Saturday, October 11, 1783:

That the president of Congress be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to adjourn Congress on the 22nd, to meet at Annapolis, in the State of Maryland, on the 31st of October . . .

Because Congress was wrangling over a permanent seat for the Federal Government. On October 21, 1783, prior to the move to Annapolis, the Journals state:

Whereas, there is reason to expect that the providing buildings for the alternate residence of Congress in two places, will be productive of the most salutary effects, by securing the mutual confidence and affections of the states, Resolved, That buildings be likewise erected for the use of Congress, at or near the lower falls of Potomac or Georgetown; provided a suitable district on the banks of the river can be procured for a federal town, and the right of soil, and an exclusive jurisdiction, or such other as Congress may direct, shall be vested in the United States: and that until the buildings to be erected on the banks of the Delaware and Potomac shall be prepared for the reception of Congress, their residence shall be alternately at equal periods, of not more than one year, and not less than six months in Trenton and Annapolis; and the president is hereby authorized and directed to adjourn Congress on the 12th day of November next, to meet at Annapolis on the 26th day of the same month, for the despatch of public business.

So a year at Annapolis, then on November 1, 1784, to Trenton. In January 1785, Congress received "a letter of the 14th, from the mayor of the city of New York, enclosing a resolution of the common council, offering to the United States in Congress assembled, such parts of the city hall, or other public buildings belonging to the corporation, as Congress shall deem necessary, and best suited for their accommodations," to which Congress responded that "Congress entertain a just sense of the attention which they have manifested to the interest of the Federal Union."

On December 21, 1784, Congress resolved that "it is expedient Congress should determine a place at which they will continue to sit, until public buildings for their proper accommodations shall be erected," and on December 24, 1784, "Adjourned to meet at the city of New York, the 11th day of January next." So bundle up the Declaration, again, along with all the other papers. This time the Declaration had its longest stay since it had been engrossed: On the second floor of the old City Hall Building Wall and Nassau Streets NE., until the end of 1790.

At this time the Declaration was given over to custody of the newly formed State Department and went back to Philadelphia. It stayed awhile in a building on Market Street, then moved to Arch and Sixth Street, then to North Alley, and later to Fifth and Chestnut Streets. Finally, in 1800, at direction of President John Adams, it went for the first time to the new Federal City in the District of Columbia, soon to be known as Washington.

In May 1801 the document went to the War Office, on 17th Street. Here it stayed until August 23, 1814.

The War of 1812 began in June of that year. General orders to the British fleet were "to destroy and lay waste such towns and districts upon the coast as you may find assailable." To Admiral Sir John Cockburn, the orders meant just that. Strengthened in 1814 by 5,400 British veterans of the recently ended Peninsular War, he swarmed up Chesapeake Bay and landed this force, under Maj. Gen. Robert Ross, on the Patuxent River. They formed column and marched out; Washington was just 40 miles away.

On August 24, 1814, the British advance was opposed at Bladensburg, Md., by a force of 6,500 untrained militia and a tiny band of 400 sailors and marines, under command of "incompetent political Maj. Gen. William H. Winder." Ross' advance guard of 1,500 swept them into flight. Commodore Joshua Barney rallied a naval contingent of gunners, and Regular Army troops, to contest the attack, but they, too, were driven from the field. James Monroe, then Secretary of State, had meddled in the measures for the defense of Washington—which now lay helpless—and was later to comment that "military affairs should be left to military men."

The British swept into the city on August 24; according to tradition, only a few shots were fired at them, and these from a site about three blocks northeast of the Capitol Building itself. Some of the old, smaller columns of the original Capitol Building were scarred by British musket shots; since extension of the East Front of the Capitol, the columns are now inside, and the marks can be seen to this day.

Monroe may have bungled at conducting a battle, but he ordered three State Department clerks, John Graham, Josiah King, and Stephen Pleasanton, to pack up all documents and get them out of the city. Down from the shelves, into coarse linen sacks, and out of town. That night, Admiral Cockburn of the British Navy ensconced himself in the Speaker's chair in the House Chamber. The so-called British stairway, a curving stone staircase beginning on the ground floor of the Capitol Building, is still very much in use. According to tradition, Cockburn and his men had come up these steps.

He leaned back in the chair. He roared:

What shall we do with this citadel of Yankee democracy?

"Burn it" was the thundering response; and the drivers of the carts hauling the Federal Government's archives out of Washington, looking over their shoulders, could see flames leaping into the night as the city was put to the torch.

First over the Potomac River, into Virginia, by oxcart; the Declaration's first stop was in an abandoned gristmill, owned by Edgar Patterson, about 2 miles above Chain Bridge, north and west of the city. However, they were near a cannon factory; not wishing to be discovered by roving bands of British soldiers, the carts lumbered off in more wagons, procured by Stephen Pleasanton from neighboring farmers. At this point the Declaration's mode of travel becomes

somewhat obscure: it was in the caravan that eventually reached Leesburg, 35 miles away, but whether it was by single horse cart, ox team, or a team of four horses in a heavy wagon is uncertain.

They reached Leesburg late at night; the burning city was visible on the horizon. An empty house was found; the papers and the Declaration were placed inside; the doors were locked and the keys given to a Reverend Littlejohn. For some weeks the Declaration stayed here, and not until the British Fleet had left the Chesapeake Bay was it returned to the ruined city.

In 1823, the Declaration of Independence took the first step that would make it in time the most reproduced single document in world history. John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, had an exact and official facsimile made, signatures and all. This is the only facsimile of the original; all others are copies of this facsimile. The original plate is today in custody of the State Department. Two hundred copies of the original facsimile were made by order of Congress, and went: Two to each surviving signer—Jefferson's two were on parchment; the President and Vice President, James Madison, and the Marquis de LaFayette; 20 went to Congress; 12 to Government departments; two to the Supreme Court; two to the White House; and one to each State's Governor.

For some years the Declaration was in what Daniel Webster, Secretary of State, referred to as a "suitable accommodation for safekeeping"; namely, the U.S. Patent Office. Not under the best of care; a report in 1856 said:

The Declaration was hung in a simple frame and placed opposite a tall window where it was exposed to the chill of winter and the glare and heat of summer.

In 1876, it was returned to its first home, Philadelphia, where a national exposition at the centennial of the Declaration was held. On the Fourth of July, 1876, it was read aloud by a grandson of Richard Henry Lee to the assembled crowds. To quote an account of the day:

The faded and crumbling manuscript, held together by a simple frame, was then exhibited to the crowd and was greeted with cheer after cheer.

Philadelphia tried to keep it, but was refused; it was a national heirloom, and was returned to Washington.

But not to the Patent Office; State had just moved into a new fireproof building. The Patent Office was supposed to be fireproof, too, but a few months after the Declaration had been moved, the Patent Office was completely destroyed by fire.

By this time it was in quite bad shape. Timothy Matlack had used special, professional inks; his penmanship was still perfect. But the signers had used ordinary inks, and signatures were fading. Edges were torn, and the lower edge of the Declaration was particularly bad since it was always unrolled from that end. On September 28, 1921, Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes was successful with an Executive order that put the document under care of the Library of Congress. From then on efforts of the best experts the country had went into repair and restoration.

During Calvin Coolidge's administration a simple shrine was dedicated, in the Library, in the presence of the President, the Secretary of State, and a group of Members of Congress. As the Declaration was fitted into its frame, which was enclosed by two gold-plated bronze doors, two stanzas of "America" were sung. That was all. Not a word was spoken.

It hung there until December 26, 1941; on that date, it was removed to the bullion depository at Fort Knox, for protection in case Washington should come under enemy air attack. In the early autumn of 1944 it was declared all danger to the Library was past; on October 1, 1944, the Declaration returned to the city, and to the Library, where it stayed until December 1952.

Then, the world's largest safe was opened in the National Archives Building. Seven and a half feet long, 5 feet wide, and 6 feet high, its walls are 15 inches of steel, strong enough to withstand the collapse of the entire Archives Building above. The safe has an elevator which bears the Declaration up into the rotunda of the main exhibition hall every morning, and carries it down again each evening.

The business of the Congress of the United States, on July 4, 1776, began with a request for flint and troops; the last order for the day dealt with a directive for selling 25 pounds of powder. In between came the Declaration of Independence, in which 56 men did "mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

It did cost some of them their lives, and some their fortunes. But notice the wording, and read it on the document as it hangs in the National Archives, today. The term "sacred" applies only to honor. Not to life; not to fortune.

Was this perhaps the greatest lesson they were trying to teach us? Is this perhaps why this document has been so truly miraculously preserved over almost two centuries? I think it was; life and fortune are passing things, but the most enduring of all is honor. "Sacred" honor.

If we, as citizens of this our American Republic, if we take anything as a symbol on the Fourth of July, if anything touches us when we see this Declaration of Independence enshrined in our Nation's Capital, if it moves us to any sort of a resolve, as a country, or as an individual, to a rebirth and rededication of any facet of our private or our national life, let it be our honor, to hand on unstained and bright to American generations yet to come, and to the world.

Fifty-six men at Philadelphia did, in 1776. By their dedication to honor, they changed the world. So can we.

A REAL CHAMPION

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, next week, some of the greats in athletics, with the real emphasis on golfers, will gather here

in Washington to pay honor to Joseph John Miller. Thousands know him best as Jocko and he has to rank as the most popular and best golf starter in the United States. There has never been any doubt as to who "King of the Hill" is at the first tee at the Congressional Country Club.

It has been my rare pleasure to have the chance to become acquainted with Jocko Miller in recent years and it is a friendship that I truly value. Next week, as the friends of Jocko Miller gather for a testimonial dinner in his honor, you can be certain that time will be rolled back to review his 30 years' service to the club. But, when all is said and done, the compliment that Jocko treasures most is to be known as the best and fairest starter in golfdom. That he is, there is no doubt.

I would like to close with an excellent article on Jocko by Dick Slay which appeared in the June 14 edition of the Sunday Star. Slay's weekly column "Tee to Green" on Jocko was a great one. The article reads:

[From the Sunday Star, June 14, 1970]

JOCKO'S FRIENDS TO DO IT UP BIG

(By Dick Slay)

The sign on the door of the little house by the first tee at Congressional reads, "Jocko Miller, Esq." A member had the sign made a few years ago, and last year the board of directors knighted him the Director of Play in recognition of his 30 years' service to the club.

"What the hell," Joseph John Miller said last week, "they give me this new title and I'm still doing the same damn thing."

They are giving him something else next week, a black tie stag testimonial dinner at the Shoreham's Paladium Room. If that isn't impressive enough, consider that Vince Lombardi is chairman of the blast. Coach has known Jocko barely a year but wants to do his bit in honoring the man on the night of June 24. There won't be enough seats to handle all the thousands of Jocko's friends from over the years, but the room should serve a representative number, say up to 400, and the tab will be stiff.

There isn't any doubt among the caddies and players about who is in charge of the first tee at Congressional, but his gruffness is often of the impish sort and his waistline is really not as big as his heart. Even the youngsters who are admonished to tuck in their shirttails before teeing off on the middle nine know this.

HE WAS ALMOST A HOYA

On the subject of his avoirdupois, it is worthwhile to note that when Jocko first arrived here in 1929 from Lawrence, Mass., he was a legitimate lightweight. He was to enter Georgetown on a boxing scholarship but Lou Little had left the school that spring to take over as football coach at Columbia and suddenly there were no such things as scholarships for fighters at the Hilltop. Scratch one aspiring scholar with a good left hook.

Jocko went home to take a job as caddy-master at Andover Country Club, although he had no background in golf, but he spent his winters here working at various jobs around Washington. He found time to win the Middle Atlantic lightweight championship in 1929, the District AAU lightweight title in '30 and the District AAU welterweight title the year after that. You could see he was gaining weight.

He was also contracting a "tennis elbow" which helped him discard any ideas about turning pro as a fighter. He tried pro golf instead, although only from the business end at the club level, but after about five

summers or so at Andover CC he could get around in the middle 70s with no trouble.

Miller served 16 years as Chairman of the District AAU boxing committee and eight years concurrently as chairman of the District Boxing Commission, but otherwise his life has been in golf for the last four decades.

In 1938 he came here permanently as head pro at the old National Women's CC, which is now called Bethesda, and the next year Wiffy Cox hired him as matchmaker at Congressional. But in 1940 the draft caught caddymaster Roger Ricketts, Jocko was moved to the first tee and, except for Navy service in World War II, he's been there ever since as starter, caddymaster and coordinator of tournaments.

"THE CHIN" GOT BURNED ONCE

The Office of Strategic Services took over Congressional's grounds during the war for training of agents, but before the late Cox went home to Long Island for the war's duration there was a memorable match one day. Wiffy played Jocko, Eugent Pinman and the late Warner Gray by himself.

"Cox beat all three of us—our best ball—and he shot 29 on the back side to do it," Jocko recalls. "But in 1946, Wiffy was still in Long Island, Warner and I had the shop here and Lew Worsham was our playing pro and we talked Lew into the same match.

"We reminded him that Wiffy had beaten us when he was past his prime, and that a young man such as himself should be able to do at least as well. Well, Lew eagled old No. 8 to beat our three birdies and got even on the front, but on the back nine I birdied three holes in a row and 'The Chin' belonged to us."

Worsham was to win the U.S. Open the very next year, beating Sam Snead in a play-off, and has been the pro at Oakmont ever since. Lew will be among the diners at the Shoreham next week, and so will his brother, Buck, and the committee is about 90 percent sure Jimmy Demaret will make it.

Demaret and Miller spent some of the war together at Bainbridge Naval Training Center. Jimmy already had won one Masters championship and was to win two more, but he never forgot Jocko. Demaret always has liked a good party and this one could be a bell ringer.

INFANT EXECUTIONS IN HAWAII

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii, world renowned for love, peace, and beauty, shocked the civilized world last week with announcement that under its new libertine abortion law its people had sanctioned the execution of 862 infant babies over the past 3 months.

Hawaii, 43d in population of our 50 States, offers some indication of the anticipated death toll nationwide should the "right to abort" become a national law. Conservatively speaking infant casualties could be anticipated nationwide at 43,000 for a 3-month period or using the Hawaiian experience an annual loss of life reaching 172,400 infants.

Those who rightfully oppose our Asian military involvement because of the loss of 50,000 lives in 15 years should heed this war against little children being aggressively waged in the United States.

Ironically, many of the pro-abortionists who find nothing immoral or unconscionable in executing infants are among

the most blatant in denunciation of massacres in Vietnam and in the forefront in opposing the death penalty for convicted murderers, rapists and traitors.

Our National Government, through OEO and HEW giveaways of taxpayer's hard-earned cash, even makes subsidies to prepare and educate adults through sensitivity training—to develop self knowledge and awareness of individual impact on others.

172,400 projected deaths a year is a sizable impact on moral people. Murder, extermination, and a morality solve nothing.

Sex education and abortion must be replaced by education in morality, decency, and restraint.

I include several related news clippings:

[From the Washington Post, June 12, 1970]

HAWAII REPORTS 862 ABORTIONS

HONOLULU, June 11.—A total of 862 abortions have been performed since Hawaii's new abortion law went into effect three months ago.

Figures show:

About three-fourths of the patients were single.

The majority involved women in the 20-30 age bracket.

Abortion costs average about \$300, half of which represents physician fees and the other half hospital charges.

A majority of the cases are handled on an in-and-out-the-same-day basis.

Hawaii's law permits abortions at the discretion of the physician.

SU PROF GETS GRANT OF \$90,000

Dr. Edward E. Johnson, associate dean of the university and chairman of the department of psychology at Southern University, has been awarded a \$90,000 continuation grant from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

The grant will support completion of an investigation undertaken two years ago under the direction of Dr. Johnson at the Regional Evaluation and Research Center for Head Start located at Southern University where an evaluation of an intervention program for changing attitudes of Head Start parents was begun.

In his research, Dr. Johnson aims to help parents become more aware of and involved in the requirements of their children, to help them become more aware of their own potential and development capacity, and to assist parents in developing self-knowledge and awareness of their impact on others.

A VOLUNTEER'S VIEW OF THE VETERAN

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, the fine work being done by volunteers in our veterans hospitals came to my attention during a recent visit to the Albany VA Hospital in my district.

I am quite proud of the dedication shown by the hospital volunteers, who spend many hours of their time in service to patients. Mr. John J. Cox, director of the Albany VA Hospital, and Mr. Roderrick J. O'Connor, director of voluntary service at the hospital, both had high praise for the work for the volunteers.

The devotion and care exhibited by these volunteers was ably brought home to me when I read a letter from Miss Ginger Lee Tracy, a student at the College of St. Rose, who spends one evening a week visiting the sick and disabled servicemen in the hospital.

Miss Tracy's letter accompanied the minutes from the last Veterans' Administration Voluntary Service Advisory Committee meeting. I would like to share the warmth and earnest dedication of her message with my colleagues. Her letter follows:

SELFLESS, RESPONSIVE, CARING MEN

(By Ginger Lee Tracy)

As all my close friends and family know by now, the subject of the V.A. Hospital and its patients is one that comes up frequently. Since it is one of my favorite subjects I should like to do a special report on it.

For the two years I have been at St. Rose, my girlfriend and I have spent our Wednesdays visiting the guys at Veterans Hospital. I'm sure I can safely say for both of us that immediately following our first visit there we vowed never to return. In one afternoon we had seen more pain and suffering than in an entire span of twenty years. However, we did decide to go at least once more which proved to be one of the wisest moves in my life.

I can't think of enough adjectives to describe the men there: wonderful, selfless, responsive, and caring are only a few of many. There is Jack who at 24 was caught in the bomber doors of an airplane and now must spend the rest of his life paralyzed and in an iron lung, necessary because he can't breathe on his own. At first he was completely sarcastic and bitter but because of our persistence now responds so warmly to our visits that we hate to miss a chance to see him. His father told me that for the first time in 3 years he has something to think about other than his own condition.

Then there is Allen, or I should say was. When we first met Allen he was on the T.B. ward and we couldn't visit him without wearing those little protective gauze masks. This fall Allen was allowed to go outside which he really loved after being completely isolated for a year. Finally in October he went home. One thing I'll never forget is that he checked out of the hospital at noon and spent the entire afternoon at St. Rose with us.

There are so many guys I could mention—Charlie P. whose arms and legs were badly mangled in Vietnam when he stepped on a mine; Pete a middle-aged man with nothing physically wrong but then again he has no home to go to either; Mr. D. who is so old he can't hear what we say but buys us chocolates because he isn't allowed to eat them himself and who also has no one to take care of him. All these men are special, very special to me. They have done more to educate me than all the degrees I could earn anywhere. My problems seem so insignificant compared to the sorrows they have known yet they help us when we are down. I'm thankful for having the opportunity to meet them and get to know them all.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW DISCUSSES RATIONAL DISSENT

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, last evening in Detroit, Mich., Vice President AGNEW set forth a reasoned and responsible set of arguments relating to public discus-

sion of the issues. These thoughtful and well-expressed ideas deserve careful evaluation.

As I find many useful points expressed in Vice President AGNEW's speech, I insert it at this point in the RECORD for the interest of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

I would like to present a case tonight for progressive partisanship.

The word "partisan" has taken on an unfortunate coloration. It is being equated with divisiveness, with backbiting and acidulous personal references. This is not new in our history—James Madison, in the most famous of the Federalist Papers, warned of the "spirit of faction" that could tear the country apart.

Partisanship misplaced, partisanship overdone, can be a danger to democracy; but a progressive partisanship is at the heart of our liberty and without it, there would be no change in our society and no movement in our public philosophy.

We are entering our traditional period of intensified partisanship before an election campaign. Whether that period will be productive of intelligent challenge and debate, or sterile and conducive to angry shouting, is a test that we as a people will have to take.

I believe we will pass that test if we embrace the principle of progressive partisanship.

To do that successfully, we have to examine two slogans. One of these is rich with age and honor; the other is bright with new and conventional wisdom; both can be twisted to get us into trouble.

Slogan number one is seemingly unassailable: "United we stand, divided we fall." And slogan number two is becoming one of the most high-minded clichés of our time: "Let us de-escalate the rhetoric."

Let us begin with the first, which had its genesis in a poem written in 1776 by John Dickenson: "Then join hand in hand, brave Americans all/by uniting we stand, by dividing we fall."

That is the sentiment that brought us together as a nation, the spirit that permitted us to overcome our disagreements by acknowledging a deeper sense of common purpose.

On the great ends of liberty and justice and opportunity, that sentiment has never been truer. But we demean that spirit of unity when we try to restrict ideas about how to meet those ends. Here is what I mean:

We cannot agree about the need for freedom without acknowledging the freedom to disagree.

We cannot govern with the consent of the governed unless we respect the right of dissent of the governed. But remember, respect for the right of dissent does not mandate agreement with the dissent.

We cannot encourage a unity of purpose without stimulating a diversity of approach.

That is why every attempt to deny our diversity, to smother partisanship in an amorphous cloud of consensus, is doomed to failure. It confuses the ends with the means. United we stand in love of country, in desire for peace and progress—but divided we stand in approach, in style, in policy to reach the ends we seek.

By demanding unity, by denouncing dissent, we might find ourselves standing united but standing still. That is not what this nation is all about—unity is not an end in itself, it is a byproduct of progress.

Just as unity is not an end in itself, dissent is not an end in itself. Here is where I part company with some dissenters.

Rational dissent focuses on an issue, calls it to public attention and marshals the arguments to persuade the majority to its view.

That is the essence of progressive partisanship.

Irrational dissent focuses on an emotional issue, rejects logic, and demands change without intellectual challenge, without offering a constructive alternative.

Rational dissent anticipates disagreement; irrational dissent expects its views to be adopted as a revelation of truth and is infuriated when this does not happen.

Rational dissent properly defines its right to be heard and is ready and willing to accept criticism of its point of view; irrational dissent considers criticism of its point of view to be an attack on the right to dissent.

Rational dissenters, in the tradition of Holmes and Brandeis, have never been more needed than they are today. They are with us, but their ideas are too often ignored—not by the majority, but by the emotionaries, a relatively small group of anti-intellectuals that has snatched the standard of dissent from their hands.

Some of the rational dissenters I have been meeting with recently have pointed out that the emotionaries are not limited to their side. This is true. But we cannot abandon the public forum to the anti-antis. We cannot refrain from speaking out in the voice of reason, both in affirmation and in dissent, for fear of becoming identified with the emotionaries of the extremes.

That, of course, brings me to the next slogan, the new favorite of editorial writers of all shades of opinion: "Let's de-escalate the rhetoric."

I think the word "rhetoric" is being badly misused. It is being defined as vituperation, as poisonous invective. But rhetoric is not that at all: Rhetoric is the use of public discourse to persuade.

We do not have to depress that kind of rhetoric at all; on the contrary, we have to elevate the rhetoric. Only in that way can we hope to enter a season of progressive partisanship.

This does not mean that affirmers or dissenters have to color their speeches gray. It does not mean that we must dwell on abstractions and totally refuse to engage in personalities.

Our history is rich in anecdote about the cut and thrust of partisan debate, and it did get a little personal at times. I recall the remark of John Randolph of Virginia, aimed at a brilliant fellow member of the House of Representatives, Edward Livingston. Said Randolph: "He is a man of splendid abilities, but utterly corrupt. Like rotten mackerel by moonlight, he shines and stinks."

That was pretty rough. And so was labor leader John L. Lewis' characterization of one of my predecessors in office, John Nance Garner as a "card-playing, whisky-drinking, evil old man." (Some people have recently suggested that I stick to playing cards, which could contribute to the public safety.)

Governor Hiram Johnson of California did not like some of the press coverage he was getting during his administration, and he had this to say about the publisher of a major newspaper: "He sits there in senile dementia with a gangrene heart and rotting brain, grimacing at every reform, chattering impotently at all things that are decent, frothing, fuming, violently gibbering, going down to his grave in snarling infamy . . . disgraceful, depraved . . . and putrescent."

Now what have I ever said about the press to compare with that? Fortunately, the days of that kind of ad hominem blast are gone forever. But perhaps it has evolved into a less rancorous form of attack, similar to that unleashed by Winston Churchill at Ramsay MacDonald in 1933, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer: "I remember when I was a child, being taken to the celebrated Bar-

num's Circus, which contained an exhibition of freaks and monstrosities, but the exhibit on the programme which I most desired to see was the one described as 'The Boneless Wonder.' My parents judged that that spectacle would be too revolting and demoralizing for my youthful eyes, and I have waited fifty years to see the Boneless Wonder sitting on the Treasury Bench."

Can you imagine the wave of shock and horror that would pass through certain circles if anyone were to make such a remark to about, say, the chairman of a Senate committee? It would be an unthinkable example of the arrogance of power. The most one could get away with in these more sensitive times is another Churchill gibe at one of his opponents as "a modest man, with much to be modest about."

The purpose of this brief review of political invective is to show that we are indeed past our vituperative peak, in a sense, happily so. It is also good for us to recall that the shouted epithets we hear today are no match for the flashes of wit that lay behind some of the studied insults of yesterday.

Were they alive today, Randolph and Wilkes, Disraeli and Churchill, Huey Long and Harold Ickes would have to temper their blasts; history might have been the less colorful, but the times have changed and the climate is wrong for slambang vituperation. In its improper definition as invective, the rhetoric has already de-escalated.

But in its proper definition as rational public persuasion, the rhetoric of our times needs to be put to constructive use. In the very act of encouraging peaceful argument, we automatically discourage violent protest. In agreeing to disagree, as reasonable people, we admit to a unity of purpose.

A Greek philosopher first laid down the rules of rhetoric. I do not presume to challenge the principles of my ancestor Aristotle, but let me try to update them for the coming campaign:

Every view is a proper target for rational challenge.

Every challenge is a proper target for criticism and rebuttal.

No view has a claim on truth by virtue of wide acceptance.

No view has a claim on truth by virtue of limited acceptance.

Every partisan has an obligation to present his position forcefully, factually and fearlessly.

Every partisan has an obligation to admit to the possibility of error.

Every man has a right to be heard to the extent he shows a willingness to listen.

No man should interpret a willingness to listen as a commitment to follow.

No argument is fair that appeals exclusively to emotion.

No argument is realistic that rules out all emotion.

No age group or minority group or income group has a monopoly on wisdom.

No majority has the obligation to be silent, or the right to overwhelm dissent.

And finally, the thirteenth rule of rhetoric for our times, and the most painful one of all: Provided he acts without violence and within the Constitutional law, every man has the right to disagree with, and to break, every one of these "rules."

In doing so, I think it would be to his loss and society's loss, but freedom is not freedom unless it includes the freedom to be wrong.

Let us, then, elevate the rhetoric; let us think through all we stand for, and then stand for it publicly and affirmatively.

Let us not be afraid to be progressive partisans for all we believe to be right, and not speak of partisanship as something unworthy or un-American.

This was a nation built by ardent advocates of popular and unpopular causes. In each generation, they triumph over the detractors who shrug in hopeless resignation, and the

sloganeers of puerile obscenities, and the bookburners who try to destroy the ideas they cannot discuss.

Let us join the "happy warriors of the

political battlefield," discovering new depths of loyalty in opposition, new heights of unity in our diversity, and a new spirit of respect for each other's point of view.

SENATE—Wednesday, June 17, 1970

The Senate met at 11 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:

Let the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our redeemer.—Psalms 19:14.

Grant, O Lord, that our speech this day may arise from hearts in tune with Thy spirit. By prayer and meditation may our lives glow with a divine radiance and our actions be in harmony with Thy will. When the evening comes may we have the divine approbation of the ancient words, "Well done, good and faithful servant." In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 15, 1970, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 614. An act for the relief of Franz Charles Feldmeier; and

S. 1786. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of

the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 16, 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 Ohio, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF). Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Ohio is now recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me without losing his right to the floor or any of the time allocated to him?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

ADJUSTMENT OF OUTSTANDING CURRENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 930, S. 3825.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. S. 3825, to authorize further adjustments in the amount of silver certificates outstanding, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3825

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of June 24, 1967 (31 U.S.C. 405a-2), is amended by inserting a comma and the words "Federal Reserve bank notes, and national bank notes" immediately after "silver certificates" wherever the term appears and by striking out "(not exceeding \$200,000,000 in aggregate face value)".

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 937, H.R. 16731.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 16731, to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TOURS OF DUTY IN HOSTILE FIRE AREAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 936, H.R. 16298.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 16298) to amend section 703 (b) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority granting a special 30-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On line 5, strike the numeral "1971" and insert "1972."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as an explanation, at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, after the companion Senate bill was passed the other day, it was reconsidered because there was a difference in the date. We waited for the House bill to come over. The dates are now in accord and the pending bill has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 16298) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendars Nos. 927 and 928 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF). Without objection, it is so ordered.