

added as a cosponsor of S. 3311 and S. 3312, providing crime insurance to inner city businesses and homeowners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON). Without objection it is so ordered.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATION ACT, 1971—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 729

Mr. SCOTT proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 16916), making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he proposed the amendment appear earlier in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 730

Mr. PELL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 16916), supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 731

Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 16916), supra, which was

ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 645

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be added as cosponsors of amendment No. 645, to H.R. 16916, making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 700

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, his name be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 700 to S. 3867, to assure opportunities for employment and training to unemployed and underemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in provid-

ing needed public services, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment, in accordance with the previous order, until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24, 1970, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations recessed by the Senate June 23, 1970:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Donald G. MacDonald, of Vermont, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, vice Maurice J. Williams.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Louis M. Rousselot, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, new position.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VISIT TO WASHINGTON BY SIXTH GRADE STUDENTS OF CANTON SCHOOL INSPIRATION FOR PLAY

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House and Senate make arrangements for the various school groups from their districts, which come to Washington usually during the spring session. It has been my belief for some time that a visit to Washington and an opportunity to see Congress in action is well worth a day's absence from school, when the students are old enough to understand what they are seeing and hearing.

Proof of the advantages of such a visit was furnished in a letter I received from Mr. Donald M. MacLean, the teacher of a sixth grade class at Canton Elementary School in my district. Their visit furnished the inspiration for a play, written by them, and presented at their graduation exercises.

The letter and the play are included herewith and I am sure they will help the Members to realize how much knowledge is gained on these visits.

CANTON SCHOOL,

Baltimore, Md., June 16, 1970.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has been a most rewarding pleasure and experience to have taken a class from Canton Elementary School 230 to visit Congress and your own office. The booklets and the tour were most appreciated by all students as well as the adults who supervised the trip. My class wrote a play after they returned (June 2) and we did include you in it. Today my class had their graduation exercises and the play was a great success. We feel that you contributed a great deal to their thought and program. Most every child had one parent and many children had two parents present. You will see in reading the play that you were influential . . . many parents will remember you and the good that only you have done for these children. I do wish you could have been here today to see the results; they were magnificent. If possible, I shall return next year with the hope of educating more children in the fine way that you offered . . . one that is most exceptional and rewarding. All children have received the pictures and they are delighted. Michael Gapa has received his picture this morning, via my address since it was remailed by you.

Read the play. Give a copy to each of those fine gentlemen who assisted us on the tour. They were marvelous. The boys and girls will never forget this wonderful trip and the literature and pictures they received. I must say that I am grateful, too. My wife and I both thank you most heartily. May you have many more years of service, as long as you desire, in Congress. God bless you. A real big, BIG "thank you" to Miss Tracey. Respectfully,

DONALD R. MACLEAN.

PLAY BY SIXTH GRADE OF CANTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

JANICE. Mr. MacLean's Class presents some facts and skits on the importance of Canton and its activities in the community.

CHORUS

(Margaret, Janice, Kathy, Carmella, and Linda) All verses sung to the tune of "He's Got the Whole World in His Hands"; original lyrics by Margaret, Janice, and Kathy.

VERSE 1

"We've got sun and rain on our land,
We've got sun and rain on our land,
We've got sun and rain on our land,
To raise our crops on Canton's land."

VERSE 2

"The Canton Railroad is the best,
The Canton Railroad is the best,
The Canton Railroad is the best,
Bringing products from East to West."

VERSE 3

"We've got the world's trade in our port,
We've got the world's trade in our port,
We've got the world's trade in our port,
Bananas, cans, steel, and sugar in our port."

DANIEL J. One hundred eighty-five years ago this August Captain John O'Donnell sailed into Baltimore Town with a cargo of silks, satins, tea, china, and other Oriental goods. The crew was mostly Chinese, Malaysian, Japanese, and Moors, natively dressed. This was the beginning of trade with the Far East which became so valuable to Baltimore. From the profits, Captain O'Donnell purchased a large plantation of two thousand acres with three miles of waterfront. He named this estate "Canton" since his cargo had come from Canton, China. The land was bounded on the west by Alice Anne Street, on the east by Haven Street, on the North by Fair Avenue, and by the waterfront on the south. The name of Canton has stuck with this community ever since. The fame of Baltimore as a world port has never diminished. (Skit.)

DANNY K. Sugar is imported through the port of Baltimore in great quantities from the cane fields of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Central America. It is refined in Canton and shipped out by rail.

GARY. Canton is famous for shipping goods to all parts of the world. Ocean steamers carry many things such as steel products, bananas, canned goods, tea and spices, and cars from Japan.

CHARLES. Our merchant marine does a great job and Canton has a great responsibility both in sending and receiving goods.

DANNY K. Look at all those cans made here in Canton! They will be used as containers for beer, corn, tomatoes, crab meat, and other products made here.

CHARLES. Our can companies will always be in business.

GARY. We'll keep business at the highest record ever.

DANNY K. Lunch is over! Let's get back to work. We must get these cans shipped today. That sure was good coffee for lunch.

CHORUS, VERSE 4

"We've got stores and banks on the avenue,
We've got stores and banks on the avenue,
We've got stores and banks on the avenue,
We spend our money and save some, too."
(Skit.)

MARGARET. There's a sale at Epstein's on sweaters today. Want to go with me?

KATHY. Yes, maybe I'll see something I want.

(At the store.)

CATHY C. May I help you?

MARGARET. Yes, do you have sweaters on sale, size 34?

CATHY C. I have some under the counter. There, will these be all right?

MARGARET. Aren't they lovely? I'll take these two for \$6.99, please.

KATHY. I'll take this one. (to Margaret) Can we stop at the bank on the way back?

MARGARET. Certainly.

CATHY C. Thank you (handing purchases to the ladies).

MARGARET.

KATHY. You're welcome.

(At the bank.)

JANICE. Is this a deposit or a withdrawal?

KATHY. I am depositing \$45.00 today. Has the quarterly interest gone up yet?

JANICE. No, it begins July 1st and will be 5%.

KATHY. Thank you.

MARGARET. I paid my phone bill . . . saved some money, too.

KATHY. We both spent some money and saved some, too.

CHORUS, VERSE 5

"We've got white marble steps, row houses,
too,
We've got white marble steps, row houses,
too,
We've got white marble steps, row houses,
too,
They're neat, clean, spotless—just for you."
(Skit.)

KATHY S. (mother) Kim, wash the steps. Those white marble steps get dirty so quickly.

KIM (Joanne). All right, Mother. They will be white and shiny when I get done.

KATHY S. Kelly, get the bucket and clean the windows. We have a lot of work to do before father comes home.

KELLY (Cathy C.). Yes, Mother. But I got a ball game this afternoon. We are going to beat the Fantastics.

KATHY S. You will be done in time, I'm sure.

CHORUS, VERSE 6

(Later.)

"We've got the world famous beer, National,
We've got the world famous beer, National,
We've got the world famous beer, National,
We've got the world's most famous beer."

THOMAS (father). Whew! It was hot in the brewery today! I've got some good, cold National beer. I'm going to watch the Orioles slaughter the Indians on television tonight.

How was your game today?

KELLY. We won, dad. Mother, May Kim and I watch the little league? We already had supper.

KATHY S. Yes, but remember to be back home before dark.

KIM and KELLY. O.K. Mom, bye!

CHORUS, VERSE 7

(Next day.)

"We've got the best churches in our land.
We've got the best churches in our land,
We've got the best churches in our land,
We've got the best churches and their grand."

(William and others.)

(Same family indicates their devotion silently in their church.)

CHORUS, VERSE 8

"There's the little league baseball, we're proud of it,
There's the little league baseball, we're proud of it,
There's the little league baseball, we're proud of it,
There's the little league baseball, we're proud of it,"

There's the little league baseball, we're proud of it,
World famous Orioles—Watch us hit!
(Skit.)

WILLIAM. Let's go boys. It's time for practice. Vince, get the bats from my car.

VINCE. O.K. Bill. James, come with me and get the balls and gloves.

JAMES. Hurry up. Let's go.

WILLIAM. Mike, Get the catcher's equipment out of the car.

MIKE. Right! Mr. Nickel is here to umpire the game.

ROBERT. Come on. Bring all those bats over here.

JOHN. Here comes the coach for our little league team.

JAMES. Hi, Mr. Jim. How are you?

JIM. (Dave B.). Well, boys, is everyone ready for the game?

VINCE. Joe, our bat boy is missing.

MIKE. Here he comes now. He has the bat we make home runs with.

DAVE B. O.K. Let's start the game. Batter up.

(Two hours later.)

BILL. It is the bottom of the ninth. The score is tied. Vince is at bat. He hits a homer and . . . two runs score. We win by a score of 5 to 3.

MIKE. Look! he is here! Jim Palmer, Oriole's pitcher.

BILL. Let's ask him to autograph our ball.

HOWARD. That was a great game, boys.

MIKE. Would you autograph our ball?

HOWARD. You bet . . . some day you may be an Oriole player.

WILLIAM. And so the American little league players go home with their seventh win in a row.

CHORUS, VERSE 9

"We've got lots of crabs from Chesapeake Bay,
We've got lots of crabs from Chesapeake Bay,
We've got lots of crabs from Chesapeake Bay,
They're the best, now, wouldn't you say?"

VERSE 10

"We've got Haussner's restaurant up the street,
We've got Haussner's restaurant up the street,
We've got Haussner's restaurant up the street,
It has art to enjoy, and food to eat."

(Skit.)

LINDA. Oh, my, the art is so beautiful.

MARGARET. I wonder where these lovely paintings came from.

DARLENE. Many of them are from Belgium, Holland, and other European countries.

LINDA. Haussner's art collection makes this a fine restaurant.

KATHY. The food is delicious, they say. Let's try some.

(Sit down at tables.)

JANICE. May I have your order?

MARGARET. Sour beef and dumplings, please.

KATHY. I'll have two delicious crabcakes, and a salad.

LINDA. There is nothing like a steak, medium rare.

JANICE. I'll have your order ready soon. Yes, Miss? (to Darlene) What would you like?

DARLENE. I'll take an order of beef stroganoff.

KATHY. We'll all have a cocktail, no . . . a mint julep, and strawberry pie.

(Orders are served.)

KATHY. This was a very nice evening. We should come here often, the food is delicious, especially the crab cakes.

MARGARET. I love the sour beef and dumplings . . . superb.

DARLENE. I just love the art work. I'll never forget this evening.

LINDA. That strawberry pie is so good. I'll be back for more.

ALL. We must tell our friends.

JANICE. Thank you for coming, and come again. I'm glad you enjoyed your meal.

CHORUS, VERSE 11

"We all work the hardest in our school.
We all work the hardest in our school.
We all work the hardest in our school.
Our marks are the highest, yet they're cool."

VERSE 12

"We are known as the smartest, don't you know?
We are known as the smartest, don't you know?
We are known as the smartest, don't you know?
Cause we come from Canton School 2-3-0."

(Skit.)

TEACHER (STEPHEN). In 1789 the first ten amendments to the Constitution were formally proposed. They became effective two years later. We call these amendments the . . . Missy, do you know?

MISSY. They are called the "Bill of Rights."

TEACHER. What does the first amendment do for us?

RONNIE. The First Amendment to the Constitution states that the Federal Government guarantees freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to peaceful assembly, and the right to petition the government if wrongfully treated. Without it we would lose these personal freedoms.

STEPHEN. That is correct. Which amendment states that no officer of the Federal government may search a person's home without a warrant?

NANCY C. That would be the Fourth Amendment. It protects us from false arrest and search and seizure.

STEPHEN. To safeguard our freedom, no one may be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. What does this, the Fifth Amendment, mean to us?

MISSY. A man's life can not be taken unless he has been legally found guilty, and an innocent person can only be tried once for a crime, and not a second time.

STEPHEN. How important are the "Bill of Rights"?

NANCY. The Bill of Rights guarantee our freedoms and liberties so that each individual will be protected. These rights are being discussed today in the civil rights movement.

(Bell rings.)

STEPHEN. Your homework is to bring some problems we can discuss that deal with our community and our rights. Perhaps we can tell Congressman Garmatz of the Third District our problems. He represents Canton in Washington, D.C. Class dismissed.

CHORUS, VERSE 13

"We've got Edward A. Garmatz in Congress for you,
We've got Edward A. Garmatz in Congress for you,
We've got Edward A. Garmatz in Congress for you,
To express the needs of Canton too."

(Skit.)

DARLENE. Mr. Garmatz, there is a class from Canton School 230 here to see you.

HOWARD. Show them into my office. (Children enter). Gather around. Boys and girls. This is my office. I conduct so much business here. What can I do for you?

RAYMOND. We have been studying about the Constitution. We would like to see both houses of Congress in action.

HOWARD. I shall see that all of you have a seat in the Senate and in the House. Mr. Barnes will take you by subway.

MIKE. What is that award?

HOWARD. This award was presented to me by the American Legion. I have many awards. How do you like the Seal of Maryland?

MIKE. That's neat! It is all made of colored stones.

DARLENE. Boys and girls, be sure to come back and get your booklets after the tour of the Capitol.

Mr. BARNES (John). This way boys and girls.

(Statuary Hall).

Mr. OBERMAN (Mike G.). Gather around me, boys and girls. This is Statuary Hall. Every state in the Union has sent two statues of important people placed here in Congress. This is a statue of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. He was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

JOHN. Stand here. Be very quiet.

MIKE G. Andrew Jackson stood in this spot when he was President. He heard a group of men discussing his assassination but they were standing way over there. Listen and you can hear me. (Words are spoken at a distance.)

CHILDREN. I heard it. Wow!!! (all leave)

MIKE G. Be very quiet in the Senate.

(The Senate).

RAYMOND. Senator Fulbright of Arkansas is speaking.

GARY (Sen. Fulbright). And so I urge you to vote that we send planes to Israel to keep the balance of power in the Middle East. Another resolution is . . .

(Children leave).

HOWARD. Well, children. Here are your booklets . . . Our Flag, Our American Government . . . The Constitution of the U.S. . . . How Our Laws Are Made . . . A pictorial story of "The Capitol, and a booklet about places to visit." I shall always be happy to represent Canton in Congress. Come again. Good bye. Goodbye and thank you.

CHORUS, VERSE 14

"We've got Patterson Park just for you,
We've got Patterson Park just for you,
We've got Patterson Park just for you,
It has sports, parades, and concerts, too."
(Skit).

EVA. After the Revolutionary War, William Patterson came to Baltimore from Philadelphia. The post-war business boom made him the richest man in Maryland except for Charles Carroll of Carrollton. His fleet of clipper ships went over the whole world to connect Canton with the world ports and commerce. His property in Baltimore was considerable. He gave one of his estates to Baltimore, and more was added to make our Patterson Park of today. Patterson Park High School, to which many children from Canton graduate, was named after him.

PAT. This Chinese Tower is different than any I ever saw before.

JOANNE. My mother and father come to the concerts in the summer to hear the old favorite songs they used to sing.

PAT. I think I will go swimming.

CARMELLA. (She arrives). Wait for me. I want to go swimming, too. Let's watch the ball game after we cool off a bit.

JOANNE. I'll treat you at the White Coffee Pot Junior afterwards.

JOYCE. (Just arrives). Hey! There is a parade here tomorrow. It is Defender's Day and everyone in Canton will be here.

PAT. Defender's Day is remembered because we stopped the British from capturing Baltimore.

CARMELLA. And Francis Scott Key wrote the Star Spangled Banner.

JOYCE. It is also an "I Am An American Day" parade, too, to honor those who are the new citizens of our country. I must do an errand. I'll see you at the parade tomorrow.

CARMELLA. Rowan and Martin will lead the procession at one o'clock.

CHORUS: VERSE 15

"We've got Defender's Day, I'm An American, too!

"We've got Defender's Day, I'm An American, too!

"We've got Defender's Day, I'm An American, too!

"We all join in and parade for you."

PAT. Look at those floats!

JOANNE. That drill team is grand!

CARMELLA. There is the best band in the land!

JOYCE. I love a parade. Patterson has the best.

(All children, spectators, etc. leave the stage with their small American flags flying.)

Song: You're a Grand Old Flag . . . sung as children take their seats. Finale.

TIME FOR DECISION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, faced with the present Mideast crisis I feel that it behooves all Members to pause and think about our present policies and programs with regard to this part of the world. At a recent meeting of the American Jewish Committee, Prof. Nadav Safran, professor of government and associate of the Center for Middle East Studies at Harvard University, made a very significant statement on this question, one that has caused much discussion. I commend his statement of May 14, 1970, which I thought was particularly topical and meaningful to the attention of my colleagues:

TIME FOR DECISION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Nadav Safran)

The commitment of Soviet pilots and air defense personnel to the ongoing limited war between Egypt and Israel has given a new, possibly fateful, twist to the Middle East crisis, and has once more imposed on the United States the necessity to make new, critical decisions.

I do not know what these decisions will be. But I know of one current of advice being offered to the Administration which, if adopted, would have disastrous consequences for the cause of peace in the Middle East, for American interests in the area, and for Israel and American-Israeli relations. This advice does not spring from any malevolent intention. Worse than that, it springs from a very poor and simplistic understanding of the situation.

I would like to use this erroneous view as a take-off point for my own alternative analysis and conclusions. Now the erroneous view I am speaking of starts with four simple premises:

1. That the Soviet Union has gained and is gaining greatly from the persisting Middle East crisis, and is therefore not interested in a settlement;

2. That Egypt, the key Arab country, will never agree to make peace with Israel, and that pressure on it to do so would only cause it to turn in upon itself and produce chaos which would bring great danger to the entire area;

3. That Israel has been getting more and more extremist in its aspirations and inflexible in its posture as a result of its military strength and its immunity to outside pressure, made possible in a decisive measure by the diplomatic and material support of the United States;

4. And that the United States has been losing greatly and steadily from the persistence of the conflict and from its support of Israel.

From these premises, the upholders of the view under discussion draw the general conclusion that the United States should do its utmost to terminate the conflict, which they allege, so benefits the Russians and so harms the United States, by applying every possible pressure on Israel to accept a settlement that does not include the formal peace which Israel insists upon, and which the Arab countries will not grant. With regard to the particular issue raised by the commitment of Soviet pilots and personnel, these people caution the United States against providing arms to Israel in response for a variety of reasons derived from their premises: Giving arms to Israel, they say, would further antagonize the Arabs and drive them further into the arms of the Soviet Union; it would encourage Israel to continue in its intransigence; and it would prolong the conflict uselessly. What the United States should do, they add, is to take advantage of the present situation in which Israel is in a relatively weak and therefore presumably more amenable position in order to press it to accept a settlement that does not include peace.

When faced with such an analysis, one is very tempted to respond immediately with *ad hominem* attacks, with criticisms of particular points, or with bold counterassertions. This temptation must be resisted because it sidetracks attention from the fundamental weakness of the argument, which is in its basic approach. This approach is linear and simplistic; whereas the facts to which it addresses itself are dialectical and complex. In simple words, there is an "on the other hand" to each one of its basic premises, which if properly weighed, in the end produces a totally different picture. Let us go back over these premises and note those "other hands."

1. That the Soviet Union has been making gains in the Middle East as a result of the crisis—This is true. It has entrenched itself more deeply in Egypt, Syria and Iraq since 1967, and it has gained an entry into the Sudan as a result of a coup d'état that took place there a year ago.

On the other hand, the Soviet position has also suffered a great deal as a result of the crisis:

First of all, the Suez Canal has been closed since 1967, just when the Soviet Union was getting ready to assert itself as a global power with the help of a very substantial merchant marine and navy developed for that specific purpose in recent years. The closure of the Canal has frustrated Soviet plans by barring to them the main access route from their bases in the Black Sea to the Third World through the Indian Ocean, the Red Sea and the Suez Canal.

Secondly and by the same token, the footholds which the Soviets had gained in Yemen, South Yemen and in Somalia at the southern gateway of the Red Sea became useless and had to be abandoned because the northern gateway was closed.

Thirdly, Nasser's militant pan-Arab drive which had served as a vehicle for the extension of Soviet influence in the area, was checked, and in the case of Yemen reversed, as a result of Nasser's defeat in the 1967 war and his inability to recover his lost territories.

Fourthly, Soviet credibility and reliability as an ally suffered considerable damage in Arab eyes as a result of the failure to save the Arabs from defeat and failure to save them from some of the consequences of defeat. This is particularly true of Algeria, whose relations with the Soviet Union have cooled a great deal since 1967.

Fifthly, the assumption of the burden of rearming the Arab countries and supporting

their economies has cost the Soviet Union several billion rubles since the end of the war, in addition to forfeiting much of the pre-war investment. This cost constitutes a substantial drain of resources even for the Soviet Union, especially since it has not been doing so well economically in recent years. At the very least, the absorption of these resources in the Middle East pre-empted their use to extend Soviet influence elsewhere.

Last but far from least, the 1967 defeat shook the foundations of the Arab regimes on which the Soviet position in the Middle East rests, and left them more vulnerable than ever to sudden collapse as a result of the kind of pressures that are inherent in a continuing confrontation with Israel. To anticipate a little, it was precisely the fear that Nasser might collapse as a result of the Israeli response to his war of attrition that impelled the Russians to come in with their missiles and pilots.

If all this is true—if it is true that the position in which the Soviets have found themselves since the war involves important advantages but even more important disadvantages, it would be wrong to conclude that in principle the Soviets have absolutely no interest in a settlement. The contrary conclusion is more appropriate and finds confirmation in the fact that the Soviets had actually engaged for over a year before their recent move in negotiations with the United States aimed at reaching a settlement. The problem has been that the Soviets have not dared to move ahead of the Egyptian position, or to persuade Nasser himself to move forward and accept the principle of peace, which is the key to an agreement with the United States.

This leads us to the second assumption, that no Egyptian leader could afford to make peace with Israel. I cannot help but observe here the attempts to explain the Arab attitude in terms of "the Arab mentality" is the refuge of people who will not or cannot examine the facts. It is true that Nasser has been obdurate in his rejection of the principle of formal peace; but it is no less true, on the other hand, that he has come a long way in his position vis-a-vis Israel—from insisting on its destruction as the only goal and on belligerency as the only interim relationship, to renouncing that goal publicly, being willing to accept Israel's existence de facto, to terminate belligerence, recognize its frontiers, agree to free navigation through the Suez Canal as well as the Gulf of Aquaba and so on. I mention all this not in order to suggest that it is enough and not to make the points that Nasser is reasonable, but in order to point out that Nasser is rational and has acted rationally in the sense of matching ends and means and responding to the realities of the situation. If he has not so far taken the extra step of being ready to contemplate firm and binding peace, it is evidently, in view of this record, not because of emotional obsession but because the pressures working on him have not been sufficient to compel him to take that additional step. This does not, however, preclude that they might do so in the future. Much will depend on the position of the United States.

The third assumption concerning Israel's getting tougher is in part correct. However, like the other assumptions it tells only half the story and tells it too simply. The toughness of Israel and its relative inflexibility are products of the national consensus that has peace as its lowest common denominator. But on top of this denominator, there is a wide variety of views and forces which have been prevented from asserting themselves by the fact that the denominator itself has never been met. Let a concrete prospect of peace be presented to Israel, and

the national consensus would certainly break up, bringing down, in my judgment, the national coalition government based on it, and opening up the entire political system. The so-called "Goldmann Affair" and the agitation it caused in Israel when nothing more than the shadow of a shadow of a prospect for peace was involved is very significant in this respect. Now, whether a break-up of the national coalition and the reformation of the political parties would produce a simple majority that would favor peace without significant territorial changes from the pre-war lines is difficult to be certain about. My own judgment is that such a majority would emerge.

The fourth and final assumption to the effect that the United States has been losing a great deal as a result of the present situation is true also to some extent. But there is also an impressive ledger on the credit side and this produces quite a different net balance. On the debit side, there is undoubtedly a general loss of American popularity throughout the Arab world; but popularity is an extremely soft and unstable currency in international relations and should not be confused, as is often done, with influence. Moreover, influence and popularity are not necessarily always directly correlated: In fact, a power may be unpopular because it can exercise a great deal of influence. In the strict sense of the term, influence can be defined as a heightened probability that others should act as we wish them to. I submit that this indeed has been the case with Egypt since 1967. There has been a loss of popularity but a gain in influence. With Syria and Iraq, the United States has had no influence to begin with and therefore has lost nothing since 1967.

Continuing on the debit side, there is undoubtedly a loss to the United States in the weakening of the stability of Jordan and Lebanon as a result of the present situation, which, if it continues, may well bring about the collapse of the regime in either or both of these countries.

People who hold the view I am debating would add the Sudan and Libya to the debit list. I would not dispute that the United States position was somewhat weakened by the coups that took place in these countries, but I would doubt that the damage should be attributed to the Arab-Israeli confrontation.

In any case, let us note that the American interest in the Sudan had been very slight to begin with and that the loss for the United States in Libya was restricted and did not amount to any automatic gain for the Soviets. There was no attack on the position of the American oil companies in Libya and the United States was eased out of Wheelus air base rather than being thrown out by fiat, a mere few months before the lease on the base was to have expired anyway. At the same time, the new Libyan government did not turn to the Soviets for arms and advisers, according to the pattern of radical coups, but turned instead to France for help. This was done at the behest of Nasser himself for a very interesting reason:

By refraining from using the club against the United States that fell into his hands when the young Libyan officers solicited his advice, Nasser hoped to dissuade this country from responding favorably to Israel's then outstanding request for arms. Here is a dramatic illustration of the point I made a moment ago about the difference between popularity and influence. Here the Egyptian fear that the United States might respond by giving arms to Israel compelled Nasser to act in a way desired by the United States, even though giving arms to Israel has been a thing which had made the United States unpopu-

lar. You see loss of popularity, on the one hand, accompanied by increase in influence on a crucial issue on the other, Nasser realizing that it was dangerous for him to interfere with vital American interests.

On the credit side, there is a list of gains which is none the less impressive for being mostly the obverse of the Soviet and Egyptian losses. There is the frustration of the Soviet global strategy based on the Suez-Indian Ocean route; there is the pinning down of large Soviet resources in the effort to support shaky allies; there is the removal of the Nasserite anti-American pressure on regimes friendly to the United States. People forget, for example, that for five years before 1967 Egyptian troops had been fighting in Yemen with the explicitly proclaimed aim of overthrowing the so called "reactionary" regimes of the Arabian peninsula and the Persian Gulf, including the oil-rich Saudi Arabia and Kuwait; and that for five years the United States had used largesse and pressure to persuade Nasser to desist, without success. Today, as a result of the post-1967 situation, the proud revolutionary of yore, who would overthrow all the reactionary regimes, is now eating from the hands of these regimes.

Altogether, then, our examination of the four premises about the position and attitudes of the four principal actors in the present situation gives us a picture of a multiple tug of war in which the United States is relatively better placed to accomplish its aims than its opponents are to accomplish theirs. Our analysis, therefore, leads us to reject the panicky view that peace cannot be achieved, without, however, carrying us to the equally fallacious suggestion that peace is easily attainable or is around the corner.

There is a situation in which there is a set of opposing forces at work. The task of the United States is to try to manipulate these forces in such a way as to enhance those that tend to favor peace and to check those that tend to oppose it. The guiding strategy should be to maintain a situation in which the Soviet Union and Egypt can find no relief from the pressures under which they are and no outlet from the crisis except by taking the extra step of agreeing to peace. Once they do that, the United States can use this agreement to prod the Israel leaders to break up the national coalition government in Israel and bring about a political reshuffle that would hopefully produce a simple majority in favor of a peace of reconciliation.

The specific application of this approach to the particular issue of the commitment of Soviet pilots to the Arab-Israeli confrontation requires a few preliminary remarks: In the latter part of 1969, Nasser had declared the cease-fire dead and launched a war of attrition against Israel with a view to forcing it to accept a settlement of the crisis on Egyptian terms—that is to say on terms that rejected peace, negotiations, and recognition. Nasser's strategy in that war consisted of taking advantage of the immense Egyptian numerical superiority in manpower and artillery on the Canal front to launch continuous massive artillery bombardments and frequent commando raids. The idea was to inflict heavy losses of personnel on Israel which would sap its will to fight, and force it to mobilize larger and larger segments of its reserves, which would undermine its economy and its capacity to continue the war.

After suffering considerable damage, Israel devised an effective response by using its superiority in air power to foil Nasser's superiority in manpower and artillery. It started by systematically destroying Egypt's air defense system with air attacks and radar-jamming devices; proceeded with surprise airborne and seaborne commando attacks everywhere behind the Egyptian front, thus forcing Nasser to disperse his forces all

over Egypt to meet possible Israeli attacks; finally it went on to attack his exposed and dispersed forces to inflict maximum damage and force Nasser to agree to the restoration of the cease-fire. The operation succeeded so well that it turned the tables over on Nasser completely; it was Egypt, which was subjected to a war of attrition—saw treasures of equipment go up in smoke, suffered a hemorrhage of casualties, and had the morale of its forces shaken.

Unable to react himself, Nasser turned to the Russians and asked them to repair the situation or else face the risk of a collapse of his regime on which their position in Egypt and in the whole region rests. The Russians responded by rushing, by air, men and equipment to meet the situation. They quickly emplaced at strategic points in mainland Egypt SAM-3 missiles and committed Russian pilots to provide a first line of defense for the missiles from the air and Russian troops to protect them against Israeli airborne commando attack. So far, the Russian pilots have not intervened against Israeli planes operating in the immediate vicinity of the Canal front; but the Israelis had to give up almost entirely their penetrations into the mainland.

As soon as Nasser felt his mainland to be secure under Russian protection, he concentrated once again all his own air power and most of his ground forces on the Canal front and resumed the war of attrition, with already visible effect. This fact makes nonsense of the simple argument that the Russian move is defensive and therefore should not call for an American response. It may be defensive in intent but it has offensive consequences—and both of these aspects should be kept in mind in thinking of the proper response.

Taking these facts against the background of the position of the Soviets and their relations with Egypt, we get the following overall picture, which we may present in the form of a scenario: After nearly a year of vain effort to reach an agreement with the United States on a settlement that avoided peace, the Soviets, mindful of their interest beyond the Middle East as well as of the difficulties of their positions in the area, suggest to Nasser that perhaps the time has come for him to take the next step and agree to peace, although without territorial changes. Nasser, concerned only with his own more limited aims in the region and mindful that the Russians have no alternative to him, balks at the suggestion and wants to keep on trying to change the situation by continued military pressure and diplomatic maneuvers.

The Soviets, unable to apply pressures on Nasser for fear of breaking the branch on which they are sitting, let him go on. Nasser launches the war of attrition, gets himself into trouble and turns to the Soviets for help. The Soviets, fearing his collapse, are compelled to take a critical step of committing their personnel to the defense of Egypt's mainland. Nasser, having succeeded in using his weakness to suck the Soviets in, now takes advantage of the accrued strength in order to resume his war of attrition. The Soviets, having accomplished the essential purpose of saving Nasser from collapse, now stand at the crossroads and watch: If Nasser's pressure appears to be successful, they might throw their whole weight behind a continuation of his campaign of military pressure and diplomatic maneuver. If Nasser's pressures appear to fail, they might be in a better position to convince him that after having tried everything to no avail, there is no escape from taking the next step and agreeing to genuine peace.

Whether Nasser's pressure appears to be successful or not will depend in a decisive measure on how the United States responds.

If the United States responds to the present situation by providing arms to Israel and reiterating its commitment to preserve the balance of power in the area—which in effect means its opposition to any attempt to alter the situation by force and to insist that the only way to alter the situation is through peace—then 1) Nasser's offensive would be effectively checked, 2) his pressure will be seen to have failed, 3) the Russian intervention will be kept within the present limits, 4) and the Soviets will be able to reassert their argument to Nasser that peace is the only outlet for him. If, on the other hand, the United States equivocates on the supply of arms or, much worse, if it should choose this time to urge upon Israel a settlement that does not meet the minimal demand of peace, then even if the Israelis should respond successfully with the arms they already have, this will be a sign that Nasser's strategy is succeeding, that it is detaching the United States from Israel, and that the Soviets could therefore contemplate further steps to intensify the pressures to overcome Israel's predictable resistance.

One alternative would frankly envisage the continuation of a struggle in which the odds are favorable to the United States and which keeps the prospects of an eventual peace open. The other would immediately foreclose such prospects indefinitely and would set things on a turbulent course whose outcome God only knows.

PRETRIAL DETENTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, since pretrial detention was first proposed for the District of Columbia, we in the Congress who have supported the reasonable and judicious application of that principle have heard much debate on the subject.

In passing on any law, a legislator must realize that no matter how well conceived any measure is, it can be abused after it becomes law.

In considering proposals for pretrial detention, much of the debate has been helpful in providing necessary safeguards against possible abuse.

Overriding the reasonable debate is the consideration for providing protections and for the common welfare of the citizens and residents of the District of Columbia.

Someone once defined fanaticism as "redoubling your efforts when you have lost sight of your goals."

In the case of some who argue against pretrial detention, that definition surely applies. They have lost sight of the goal of this legislation—the welfare of the law-abiding citizens of the Nation's Capital.

We are committed to the protection of the rights of the innocent. Pretrial detention as proposed does just that. It gives the people of the Capital City the right to pursue their lives without fear of violence from a relative few already charged with perpetrating crimes against the public.

Last week, much of the rhetoric was cut short by a tragic event—a shoot-out

between a District policeman and an armed robbery suspect.

The violence, which left the suspect dead and the young police officer seriously wounded, in the most vivid terms imaginable, those of life and death, has illustrated the need for pretrial preventive detention.

The robbery suspect had been permitted to remain on the streets under bail for a successive series of offenses involving violence.

The details of the dead man's record and a plea for sensible use of preventive detention are spelled out in a Washington Post editorial appearing in the Sunday, June 21, edition. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the House and the other body. It follows:

CRIME CONTROL: A CASE HISTORY OF WHAT IS WRONG

"A Washington policeman shot and killed a fleeing robbery suspect at New Jersey Avenue and K Street NW," the story on Friday's front page began, adding that the officer had himself been shot twice by the suspect, according to the police. That was all that could be said in one paragraph, in a straightforward news account, and it is not until you examine the background of the dead man that the event becomes something more than a shoot-out between a policeman and a suspect—becomes, in fact, almost a model of what is wrong about our system of crime control. For the fact is that Franklin E. Moyler was more than a "suspect"; he was, from all the evidence, a hardened criminal, at liberty on a very small bond and awaiting trial for two previous offenses involving use of a dangerous weapon. In 1965 he was found guilty of robbery and assault on an officer and was imprisoned for nearly two years. After his release, he was charged with assault on several occasions. Last January he was accused of four offenses including assault with a dangerous weapon, but succeeded in regaining freedom when he put up one-tenth of a \$1,500 bond in cash. On June 1 he was arrested again on charges of robbery and carrying a dangerous weapon, and this time a bonding company put up the \$2,000 required for his release.

This is a record which calls into question almost every aspect of our approach to crime and criminals and criminal suspects—the efficacy of correctional institutions and of rehabilitation programs for convicted criminals; the speed, or shocking lack of it, with which accused persons are brought to justice; and, finally, the hard question of how to protect the public from people with demonstrably dangerous criminal tendencies who are set free for prolonged periods while awaiting trial. It is impossible to say precisely what might have been done to rehabilitate Moyler over the past five years even if the most advanced techniques had been available—except that it would have been worth a try. It is also impossible to know what would have been the judgment if he had been brought speedily to trial; he might well have been found innocent of the several crimes of which he stood accused, and released each time.

What seems inescapable, however, is that he would not have been at New Jersey Avenue and K Street NW last Thursday with gun at hand, as the police say he was, if he had been detained or even subjected to close and continuing supervision after his arrest on June 1 and until he could be tried—under a greatly accelerated and reformed judicial process. And some such precaution for the sake of public security would have been jus-

tified by the known facts in this case, in our view. The record suggested a pattern of criminal activity involving acute dangers to the community. The bail agency was apparently concerned about that risk. It recommended that he be required to get a job in January, and that he be placed in someone else's custody in June, but the judge ignored both conditions of release.

The chief difficulty with the present law is that it makes no allowance for restraints designed to protect the community, except in capital cases. The conditions of release specified in the act are supposed to be used only for the purpose of assuring the appearance of the defendant at the time of his trial. We think judges should also have discretion to use conditional release and monetary bail where necessary to protect the community and that in some cases, involving extraordinary risks, preventive detention for a limited period would be the lesser of two evils. If preventive detention had been used in this case, it might have saved the life of the accused and prevented suffering and danger of death for a conscientious policeman.

Unfortunately, the Department of Justice has sought to cast too broad a net. In some wide categories of cases it would allow preventive detention to become the rule rather than the exception carefully tailored to defendants with records of violence, bail-jumping or other conduct that may menace the public. The District crime bill now in conference between the Senate and House ought to be revised so that it would give the courts new resources in dealing with known criminals of Moyler's type, without making detention before trial almost a general rule in serious cases.

In light of that tragic shooting and the reaction in the wake of the event, testimony given last Thursday before a Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee hearing by U.S. District Court Judge George L. Hart, Jr., has even greater impact.

Judge Hart, who chaired a special committee appointed by the Judicial Council of the District of Columbia to study the operation of the Bail Reform Act of 1966, cites 14 specific examples of instances where persons charged with serious crimes committed subsequent crimes while on bail awaiting trial.

Judge Hart's statement deserves the greatest attention since it adds considerable weight to the point of view that pretrial detention is in the interests of orderly administration of justice in the District of Columbia and is in the interest of the common welfare of the community.

The judge, who has been sitting on the Federal bench in the District for 10 years is certainly well qualified to draw conclusions about the need for pretrial detention.

I insert Judge Hart's testimony in the RECORD at this point in its entirety and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House, but most especially to Members in the other body.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE L. HART, JR.

On January 21, 1969, I had the privilege of appearing before this Subcommittee and testifying concerning the operation in the District of Columbia of the Bail Reform Act of 1966. I wish to thank the Chairman and the Members of the Subcommittee for the privilege of again appearing before your Subcommittee, by invitation, to testify with regard to certain proposed changes in the Bail Reform Act of 1966.

In November, 1967, the Chief Judge of the Judicial Council of the District of Columbia appointed a committee of 11 to study the operation of the Bail Reform Act of 1966 in the District of Columbia. I had the honor to be the Chairman of that Committee.

The first Report of the above-named Committee was made to the Judicial Council of the District of Columbia in May, 1968. In my appearance before you on January 21, 1969, I reported at some length on the findings of the Committee as to the operation of the Bail Reform Act through May, 1969, and of numerous recommendations and actions taken by the Committee designed to improve the operation of the Act in the District of Columbia. In view of the fact that the testimony which I gave in January, 1969, has been printed in full for use by the Committee of the Judiciary, I shall not attempt to cover the matters testified to in January, 1969, but will limit my remarks to findings of the Committee since that time and, in particular, to its findings relating to matters covered in S. 2600.

One of the amendments to the Bail Reform Act proposed in S. 2600 provides that a judicial officer in determining conditions of release may consider and take into account "the safety of any other person or the community." At the present time a judicial officer may not consider the dangerousness of a person to the community in fixing conditions of release. Under the present law the judicial officer can only fix conditions of release designed to assure the appearance at court proceedings of the person charged with the crime. The Judicial Conference Committee, in its first Report in May, 1968, unanimously recommended that a judicial officer be permitted to consider danger to the community in fixing terms of release. (See: Report of the Judicial Council Committee to Study the Operation of the Bail Reform Act in the District of Columbia, May, 1968, pages 27 and 30).

The May, 1969, Report of the Committee again unanimously recommended an amendment to permit consideration of dangerousness to the community in fixing conditions of release. (See: page 16 of the May, 1969, Report)

S. 2600 would further amend the Bail Reform Act by providing for pre-trial detention in certain non-capital cases where a judicial officer determines that no conditions or combination of conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of any other person or the community.

The Judicial Council Committee in its May, 1969, Report, by a vote of 6 to 5, recommended pre-trial detention in certain cases. I will quote to you that part of our May, 1969, Report which covers the majority view on preventive detention.

"MAJORITY VIEWS: JUDGE HART, JUDGE MURPHY, MISS BACON, JUDGE NEBEKER, MR. WEBSTER, AND MR. WORK

"There are compelling reasons for enactment of a statute which sanctions preventive detention in some cases. A proper balance between the rights and interests of the individual and those of society requires such a statute. The statute, however, must contain appropriate standards, must include adequate due process safeguards to protect the rights of the individual and must be coupled with the rights to an expedited trial.

"In the view of the majority there are a significant number of persons who are charged with serious crimes of violence and whose repetition of crime while on bail poses a danger to the community. Accordingly, although absolute predictability of future criminal conduct is not possible, a court should be permitted, in its discretion, to deny bail (a) in a case in which a crime of violence was allegedly committed while on bail, whether the alleged crime was committed

prior to indictment, after indictment but prior to trial, or after trial but prior to completion of the appellate process; (b) in the event that a crime of violence is committed either while the defendant is on probation or parole, or within a reasonable time following the completion of a sentence; (c) where the court finds that a defendant is charged with certain high risk crimes of violence and will pose a danger to the community if released; (d) when a defendant is a narcotic addict with a habit so costly that it can only be supported by crime; and (e) where individuals whose alleged crimes, when committed in the context of a civil disorder, pose a grave danger to the community.

"Preventive detention is an historically recognized principle and is not a novel method of protecting the interests of society. The Judiciary Act of 1789, for example, provided for discretionary pretrial detention in capital cases. The Bail Reform Act of 1966 also recognized preventive detention as a method of protecting society's interests in pre-trial capital cases as well as in appropriate cases after conviction.

"Recidivist statutes serve as some precedent for the principle of preventive detention under the circumstances described above. These statutes, which impose a mandatory life imprisonment sentence upon one convicted of a number of distinct felonies, reflect, in essence, the judgment of society that such an individual is too dangerous to ever be permitted his freedom. These statutes contain an element of an attempt to predict future conduct; namely, that the individual, if released, will probably commit another crime. These statutes also embody a judgment that balances the rights of the individual to be free against the rights of society to be protected from probable criminal activity, and, under specified circumstances, permit deprivation of freedom based upon the individual's likelihood to commit criminal activity of some nature.

"The recidivist statutes may serve as a deterrent to those whose freedom is permanently threatened. On a smaller scale, a preventive detention statute which authorizes the deprivation of freedom for a limited time prior to trial may also be a deterrent.

"There is a large body of opinion among those who have studied the Bail Reform Act which supports the view that if sufficient judicial manpower, with the necessary supporting personnel, were provided so that every felony case could be tried within six weeks to two months, the problem of recidivism under the Bail Reform Act would be greatly reduced. With this we wholeheartedly agree, and we give our complete backing to efforts to provide speedier trials. However, such a result does not seem to lie in the foreseeable future. Furthermore, if such speedy trials were provided, there would still remain persuasive reasons to apply preventive detention to certain persons who are either (a) recidivists, (b) narcotics addicts with a habit so costly that it can only be supported by crime, and (c) individuals whose alleged crimes, when committed in the context of civil disorders, pose a grave danger to the community.

"To the extent that the prosecutorial system works efficiently, the balancing process, which permits minor pre-trial incursions on the freedom of certain defendants, works less hardship on these individuals. To the extent that the prosecutorial system does not work efficiently, the balancing process, which accommodates society's vital interests, permits an increased incursion on the right to freedom of the individual. It is unrealistic to assume that in the near future we are going to control crime on bail by improving conditions which lead to speedier trials. Currently we do not have a

system which functions with great rapidity, particularly in the large cities. New facilities, new plans and new processes will be slow in coming as they must be carefully evaluated and, if possible, tested in the context of protecting an individual's constitutional rights. Furthermore, our present system encourages delay, which generally works to the advantage of the defendant, and it may be anticipated that notwithstanding efforts to speed up the trial process individual defendants will utilize whatever methods are available to slow the process down.

"In summary, we believe that a preventive detention statute which protects both the rights of the individual and the rights of society should be adopted. Such a statute should, of course, only be invoked when lesser forms of incarceration, such as supervised or part-time release, cannot be said to adequately protect the interests of the community. Dangerous individuals who have a propensity to commit crime, who are narcotics addicts with a habit so costly that it can only be supported by crime, or who constitute a grave danger to the community in times of civil disturbance, can be identified by the same judges to whom we regularly entrust the determination of what defendants are too dangerous to be released upon appeal bond or to be given probation after conviction. A similar responsibility is thrust upon lay boards of parole.

"Judges must have the necessary discretion to protect the community; they should, within the framework of an appropriate statute, be permitted to exercise discretion to grant or deny freedom in pretrial cases."

As to the alternatives to preventive detention, such as speedy trial concerning which the Chairman was kind enough to ask my views, the majority report above referred to also treats with this matter.

If all serious criminal cases, or practically all, could be tried within 6 weeks to 2 months, the problem of recidivism by persons released under the Bail Reform Act prior to trial would, in my opinion, be greatly reduced. I believe that this view is borne out by statistics which have been gathered from various sources concerning this matter. While statistics on recidivism by persons on bail vary widely in their general conclusions as to the total number involved, the various statistics do seem to bear out that where such incidents occur, they usually occur at a period of time greater than 2 months from the date of release. It seems certain that the more delayed the trial, the longer a person is on release before trial, the more likely that person is to be involved in a subsequent crime. Thus, speedy trials, that is within from 6 weeks to 2 months, would eliminate much of the present problem. At the present time, the trial of the great bulk of felony cases in the District of Columbia within a period of 6 weeks to 2 months is not possible. To accomplish this result would require a doubling of the present judge-power available for such cases with supporting clerks, probation officers, U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshals and the buildings to house the increased personnel.

The doubling of judicial power available to handle felonies in the District of Columbia does not appear to be imminent. In the meantime, while we may argue over the extent of recidivism of persons released under the Bail Reform Act, it is certainly true that a significant number of persons who are released under the Act are charged with further serious crimes alleged to have been committed while the persons were on release. It appeared to be a majority of the Bail Reform Committee that a proper balance between the rights and interests of the individual and the rights and interest of society required an amendment to the Bail Reform Act to permit preventive detention

in certain types of crime involving certain types of individuals.

Surely, it is not an easy thing to balance the interests of an individual charged with a serious crime to be free pending trial against the rights of a law-abiding citizen not to be robbed, raped or murdered in his or her home or on the streets. There are powerful and compelling arguments as to why the rights of both should be protected. I suggest a balancing is desirable which considers the rights of both, insofar as it is possible to do so. It is desirable to weigh one right against the other right and to devise a plan which to the greatest extent possible will protect both. Preventive detention for a reasonable period for certain types of people charged with certain types of crime might well be thought to achieve this balance.

I sometimes think that when we talk of preventive detention we put too much stress on statistics and the rights of the person charged with a crime and wholly ignore the human elements as they apply to the victim. In other words, we talk of the accused as a deeply concerned human being and citizen, which he is, but consider the victim only as a cold, inhuman statistic, which he is not. He, too, is a human being and a citizen deserving of consideration.

In an effort to bring into focus the flesh and blood problems of individuals who are the victims of crimes committed by defendants released under the Bail Reform Act, I am attaching to this statement as Exhibit A the histories of 14 defendants and their victims which illustrates my point. In each of the cases cited the defendant was found guilty or pleaded guilty to the original and subsequent crimes.

Consider for one moment just the first case that I have cited in the Exhibit. The Bail Reform Act considered the rights of Kenneth H. Jackson but it certainly gave no consideration to the rights of Jane Doe (which is not her true name), a 16-year-old girl who was beaten and gang raped by among others, a defendant who had previously been caught in the act of attempted armed robbery and released under the Bail Reform Act. Should we not consider the rights of the Jane Does, too?

NO. 1—KENNETH H. JACKSON

Criminal No. 190-68

At about 8:00 A.M. on December 26, 1967, John Myers was sitting in his car in front of the Wholesale Auto Parts Store at 1821 14th St., N.W., waiting for the store to open, when he was approached by a man subsequently identified as Kenneth H. Jackson. Jackson pulled a knife, held it to Myers' throat, and demanded his money. When Jackson attempted to search Myers' pockets, the two men struggled and they were observed by Officers Glen Hilton and Burtell Jefferson who were on routine patrol in the area. The officers arrested Jackson and he was released on personal bond the same day in the Court of General Sessions.

Criminal No. 514-68

Less than three weeks later at about 7:45 P.M., on January 13, 1968, Jane Doe, a sixteen year-old girl, was walking in the 2400 block of Nichols Avenue, S.E., when she was grabbed off the street by three men, dragged onto the Birney School playground near the corner of Nichols Avenue and Sumner Road, S.E., beaten about the face and head with the fists of her assailants, and raped several times. Miss Doe subsequently identified Kenneth H. Jackson from photographs as one of her attackers. Jackson was rearrested and was again released on personal recognizance on March 1, 1968.

Juries returned verdicts of guilty as to both the rape and robbery charges on November 8, 1968 and December 9, 1968, respectively.

NO. 2—MICHAEL WHORTON

Criminal No. 624-67

On March 20, 1967, Michael Whorton attempted to rob DeeBo's ESSO Gasoline Station at 12th and Otis Streets, N.E., at approximately 1:15 in the afternoon, using a gun to threaten the proprietor of the station, John DeeBo. DeeBo struggled with Whorton, who fled from the scene and was arrested in the course of his flight by Officer Foy of the Metropolitan Police. Whorton was returned to the scene and positively identified by the complainant after Officer Foy recovered a pistol from him. Four days later Whorton was released on personal recognizance.

Criminal No. 107-68

Two weeks later at approximately 8:45 P.M., on April 7, 1967, two men entered a Safeway at 1731 Seventh Street, N.W. One of the men, subsequently identified as Whorton brandished a .45 calibre automatic pistol and demanded "all the money." The two men escaped with over \$1,000. Whorton was identified from photos the following day by a witness to the robbery, but was not apprehended until eight months later on December 12, 1967.

Whorton was subsequently tried for the first robbery on March 15, 1968, and found guilty. A guilty verdict as to the second robbery was returned on May 2, 1968.

NO. 3—DANIEL BETHEL

Criminal No. 1087-67

At approximately 1:00 A.M., on June 19, 1967, Ellen von Nardroff, 38 years old, was awakened in her home at 1852 Irving Street, N.W., by unknown sounds downstairs. She put on a robe and began to leave her bedroom to ascertain their source when she observed the stairwell light go on and heard the breaking of glass. She stayed in the bedroom and shut the door, placing a chair against it as she heard footsteps ascend the stairs. She was unable to hold the door closed as a man, subsequently identified as Daniel Bethel, forced his way into her room, pushed her down on the bed, unzipped his pants and climbed on top of her, trying to force her legs apart. He was unable to make penetration solely because his victim was using sanitary napkins. He then got off her, asked for her money, and took a black purse containing \$40.00. He then escaped.

Three weeks later at approximately 4:25 in the morning on July 10, 1967, Ellen von Nardroff's home was again broken into. Following the first break-in, however, she had purchased a twenty-gauge shotgun for her protection, and this time she and a friend held the intruder, again identified as Bethel, at bay until the arrival of the police. Bethel was subsequently released on his personal recognizance for both offenses on October 26, 1967.

Criminal No. 423-68

At 10:35 in the morning on February 5, 1968, two men entered Karl's Dry Cleaners at 6228 Third Street, N.W. One of the men brandished a .45 calibre revolver and told the store's owner, Norman Gray, to "give me your money," while the other man, subsequently identified as Bethel, went through Gray's pockets, removing some money and a watch. The two men then escaped in Bethel's car.

Bethel subsequently pleaded guilty to housebreaking and robbery on January 22, 1968, in connection with the two entries into the von Nardroff home. He pleaded guilty to the dry cleaning store robbery on October 4, 1968.

NO. 4—NATHANIEL LEE, JR.

Criminal No. 125-68

At 6:25 P.M. on November 20, 1967, three men entered and held-up a McDonald's Drive-in at 1603 Good Hope Road, S.E. One man was

armed with a .22 calibre pistol, another with a .38 calibre pistol and the third with a sawed-off shotgun. After taking an undetermined amount of money the men escaped. Nathaniel Lee, Jr., was subsequently identified by two eye-witnesses from photographs as the subject with the .22 calibre pistol. Lee was arrested on November 28, 1967, and was subsequently released on Personal Recognizance on January 30, 1968.

Criminal No. 462-68

Less than one month later at 2:05 A.M., on February 24, 1968, Larry Wise, a D.C. Transit Driver, was operating his bus in the vicinity of 15th Street and Stanton Road, S.E., when he felt a hard object in his back and was told: "Close the door and drive on straight, or I will kill you." Wise complied and upon, a further demand, turned over his money, his change carrier and his watch to the assailant, who was subsequently identified as Nathaniel Lee, Jr. Lee left the bus at 14th Place and Stanton Road, S.E., and was apprehended and held by a citizen who observed him running from the bus with the change carrier in his hand.

On November 4, 1968, Lee pleaded guilty to both the McDonald's and the bus robberies.

NO. 5—JOHNNY L. PETERSON

Criminal No. 1520-67

Early in the afternoon of November 6, 1967, Hubert Madison, returning from a lunch break while serving as a juror in the Court of General Sessions, was standing in an elevator in the courthouse when Johnny L. Peterson, a defendant in a criminal case in which Madison was sitting, told Madison that the jurors "had better be right on the inside or they will right on the outside." Peterson was charged with obstructing justice and was released on personal recognizance on January 26, 1968.

Criminal No. 651-68

Six weeks later at 5:05 A.M., Leon Hladchuk was removing newspapers from his panel truck in front of 3058 Mount Pleasant Street, N.W., when he was approached by three men, struck in the back of the neck by an unknown object, beaten about the head and face by his assailants, and searched for money. Hladchuk fought off his attackers and called the police. Officers Kenneth Brown and Wendell Huffstutler arrested the three men near the scene of the crime and Hladchuk identified one of them as Johnny L. Peterson.

Peterson was found not guilty solely by reason of insanity on the obstructing justice in a non-jury trial on October 7, 1968. He subsequently pleaded guilty to a lesser included offense of Attempted Robbery in the other case on January 9, 1969.

NO. 6—JEROME OLNEY

Criminal No. 533-68

At 3:10 in the morning on March 2, 1968, Hugo Barlow, a D.C. Transit driver, was operating his bus in the vicinity of 14th Street and Independence Avenue, S.W., when he was approached by a subject subsequently identified as Jerome Olney who threatened Barlow with a knife and demanded his money. Barlow and Olney fought, and Olney was arrested a short distance from the scene after leaving the bus. He was released on personal recognizance later the same morning of his arrest.

Criminal No. 735-68

Ten days later at approximately 10:45 in the evening of March 12, 1968, James Sullivan, another D.C. Transit driver, was operating his bus in the vicinity of 9th Street and New York Avenue, N.W., when a man pulled a knife and placed it against Sullivan's neck with his right hand while holding his left arm around the victim's neck and de-

manding his money. Sullivan complied and his assailant, subsequently identified from photographs as Jerome Olney, escaped. Olney was arrested on a warrant two days later.

On August 7, 1968, Olney pleaded guilty to the lesser included offense of assault with a dangerous weapon in the Barlow robbery, and to robbery in the attack on and theft from James Sullivan.

NO. 7—PAUL E. HAWES

Criminal No. 1042-68

On April 5, 1968, Paul E. Hawes was arrested near 1150 12th Street, N.W., when a car in which he was a passenger was found to contain large amounts of merchandise identified as having been stolen from Todd's, Inc., at 1102 F Street, N.W., earlier in the day. Hawes was charged with second degree burglary and released on personal recognizance on April 19, 1968, despite the fact that he was already on bond for a robbery that had been committed on January 26, 1968. (Cr. 646-68)

Criminal No. 1131-68

Five weeks after Hawes' release, on May 24, 1968, at approximately 5:00 P.M., five men entered the offices of Versis Food Distributors, Inc., at 2800 10th St., N.E. One of them, subsequently identified as Hawes, carried a sawed-off shotgun and demanded money from the employees while Hawes' confederates searched them. The five men then escaped with over \$1,200, but were apprehended a short distance from the scene by police officers in the vicinity.

Hawes pleaded guilty to both the January 26th robbery and the Versis Food Distributors robbery on October 15, 1968. Sixteen days later he pleaded guilty to the lesser included offense of attempted burglary in the second degree in the case involving Todd's Inc.

NO. 8—JOSEPH GANTT

Criminal No. 1390-66

At about 10:15 P.M. on August 29, 1966, two men entered Sparkie's Market at 3819 Georgia Avenue, N.W. One of the men, subsequently identified as Joseph Gantt, threatened employee Frederick Cooke with a pistol and advised him, "Play it cool, this is a hold-up." Cooke handed Gantt approximately \$150 in currency and the two subjects then escaped. Gantt was subsequently arrested on a warrant on September 4, 1966, after he had been identified in photographs. He was released on personal recognizance on February 6, 1967, pleaded guilty to the robbery on March 9, 1967, and was permitted to remain on personal recognizance pending sentence. When he failed to appear for sentencing on May 7, 1967, a bench warrant was issued.

Criminal No. 1062-68

Gantt was not apprehended and was not heard from until a year later when, on May 11, 1968, at about 8:35 P.M. he and a confederate entered the Safeway Store at 6101 Georgia Avenue, N.W. Gantt, with a double-barrelled sawed-off shotgun, and his partner with two automatic .32 calibre pistols, held up two employees, John Decker and Gary Swenson, and exited the store into the arms of waiting police officers who had observed the robbery. A jury returned a guilty verdict on the charge of armed robbery on January 10, 1969.

NO. 9—CLIFTON BULLOCK

Criminal No. 356-68

At 10:00 A.M. on January 16, 1968, two men entered the Safeway Store at 6101 Georgia Avenue, N.W. and approached Dennis Bailey, the store's manager. One of the men asked for a pack of cigarettes while the second, subsequently identified as Clifton Bullock, displayed a dark colored pistol and

told Bailey to let him have "all the money." Bailey turned over approximately \$143 and both men ran from the store. Bullock was subsequently arrested on a warrant the following day, admitted his complicity in the robbery, and was released on personal recognizance on February 1, 1968.

Criminal No. 1133-68

About two months later on May 4, 1968, a man and woman entered the Public National Bank at 7824 Eastern Avenue, N.W. After pretending to desire to open a new account the male subject, subsequently identified as Clifton Bullock, pulled a gun from his pocket and advised Mrs. Sacks, the new accounts clerk, "If you move, you white son of a bitch, I'll kill you." Bullock and his accomplice then accompanied Mrs. Sacks to teller Earl Dawson's window, where Dawson was directed to give them a sack of bills. After obtaining more money from another teller, Shari Rettig, the two subjects escaped from the bank into a yellow Cadillac, and then led police officer Kermit Hooper on a short high-speed chase until the Cadillac collided with another automobile and a bus, knocking all three persons in the car unconscious and eventually leading to the death of Bullock's female accomplice. After his release from the hospital, Bullock was again released on personal bond on October 21, 1968.

On January 28, 1969, Bullock pleaded guilty to armed robbery in the Safeway case and manslaughter and armed robbery in the Public National Bank case.

NO. 10—JAMES B. FIELDS

Criminal No. 92-68

At 4:20 in the afternoon on November 14, 1967, Florence Clarke, 75 years old, was jostled by a subject subsequently identified as James B. Fields, when she boarded a D.C. Transit bus in the 700 block of Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. After she was on the bus Mrs. Clarke observed that her wallet had been stolen when another passenger, Virginia Hayes, pointed out Fields as the culprit who had done it. Police officer James Bragg was also on the bus at the time and arrested Fields when they both alighted at the next stop. Fields was released on a \$3,000 surety bond on December 13, 1968, failed to appear for arraignment in February, 1969 due to his having been jailed in Pittsburgh for another offense, and was finally returned to this jurisdiction in March, 1969. Fields was subsequently released again in June, 1969, this time with permission to post 10% of a \$3,000 bond pursuant to the Bail Reform Act.

Criminal No. 1267-68

Two weeks after Fields' release an elderly nurse, Margaret G. Dutton, was standing near Garfinckel's on 14th Street, N.W., at about 3:00 P.M. in the afternoon of July 8, 1968, waiting for a cab. As she flagged one down, she was jostled by a group of men, and she noticed after entering the cab that her pocketbook had been opened and her wallet taken. The cab driver, Edward Nance, had observed the men who jostled Mrs. Dutton and stopped a passing police officer, Keith Matthews, to report the robbery. Officer Matthews tracked the three men and subsequently arrested one of them, Fields, a short distance from the scene.

On January 10, 1969, a jury returned a guilty verdict as to the robbery of Mrs. Clarke. Thirteen days later Fields pleaded guilty to the robbery of Mrs. Dutton.

NO. 11—GEORGE E. MCDAVID

Criminal No. 880-68

At 8 p.m. on March 21, 1968, Leo Falks was standing at a coat rack in David's Men's Shop at 3182 Mt. Pleasant Street, N.W. when

he was approached by two men, one of whom produced a pistol and told Falks, "this is a holdup, get in the back room and lay on the floor." The other subject, subsequently identified as George E. McDavid, emptied the cash register in the front of the store, and both men then left the scene. McDavid was subsequently apprehended shortly after the robbery in an apartment house less than 100 yards from the store. He was arrested and was subsequently released on Personal Recognizance on May 3, 1968.

Criminal No. 1271-68

On May 23, 1968, a man, subsequently identified as McDavid, entered Aristo Cleaners at 2819 14th Street, N.W., pointed a dark colored automatic pistol at Thelma Frederick, an employee, and stated, "give me the money." Miss Frederick complied and McDavid escaped with \$65. He was arrested on June 2, 1968, after Miss Frederick had identified him from photographs shown her by the police.

On October 21, 1968, a jury returned a verdict of guilty against McDavid in the David's Men's Store robbery. He subsequently pleaded guilty to the lesser included offense of attempted robbery on February 4, 1969, in connection with the Aristo robbery.

NO. 12—JOHN C. SWANN

Criminal No. 1224-68

At about 2:15 P.M. on June 11, 1968, Pauline Hawkins of 4201 4th Street, S.E., was asleep in her apartment when she was awakened by a knock at her door. She answered it and a subject identifying himself as a janitor entered. After pretending to replace a fuse, he grabbed Miss Hawkins by the neck, choking her with one hand and holding a knife in the other. He dragged her into a bedroom, raped her and then tied her hands with a scarf and escaped. Miss Hawkins' assailant was subsequently identified by a photograph and by fingerprints as John C. Swann. Swann was arrested and released on personal recognizance on June 14, 1968.

Criminal No. 1380-68

On July 6, 1968, at about 3:45 A.M., Swann visited the Jiffy Carry-out Shop, 5017 Indian Head Highway in Prince Georges County, Maryland, where Miss Hawkins worked. As she stepped outside to leave for home, Swann stepped out from behind the door and fired four shots at her, one taking effect in her left shoulder. Miss Hawkins escaped from Swann and was able to obtain assistance. Swann was subsequently rearrested and charged with intimidation of a witness in this jurisdiction.

On March 19, 1969, a jury returned a verdict of guilty against Swann in the rape case. A verdict of guilty as to the intimidation of a witness charge was returned on May 13, 1969.

NO. 13—THOMAS A. WILLIAMS

Criminal No. 488-68

At 7:45 A.M., on February 13, 1968, two men entered Dickey's Cleaners at 84 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. One man pulled a small handgun and told the employee in charge, Ann Rodgers, not to get nervous, while the other man jumped over the counter and took Miss Rodgers to the rear of the store where he obtained over \$900 in cash receipts. Both men then left the store. Thomas A. Williams was subsequently identified from photographs as one of the two robbers. He was arrested on a warrant on February 17, 1968, and was released on personal recognizance on March 11, 1968.

Criminal No. 1413-68

On May 27, 1968, two men entered the Old Colony Laundry at 6820 Blair Road, N.W., at approximately 10:30 A.M. One of the men, subsequently identified as Thomas A. Wil-

liams, took a silver colored revolver from his pocket and forced the clerk, Margaret Furgalson, into a back room. The two subjects then emptied the cash register of \$75.00 and escaped.

A verdict of guilty as to the Dickey's robbery was returned by a jury on July 5, 1968. Williams pleaded guilty to the lesser included offense of attempted robbery on May 7, 1969 in connection with the robbery of Old Colony.

NO. 14—BOBBY L. COLEY

Criminal No. 20-68

At about 11:30 A.M. on December 4, 1967, the residence of Alice White at 5402 Call Place, S.E., was burglarized. Detectives Karl Mattis and S. M. Kuntz responded to the premises and arrested Bobby L. Coley just outside the premises. Coley had served as a lookout. He was released on a daytime work release the following day under the Bail Reform Act.

Criminal No. 1513-68

On March 20, 1968, at 5:05 P.M., four men entered the Hospitality House Community Federal Credit Union at 516 "H" Street, N.E. and robbed the Credit Union of over \$700 at gunpoint. Bobby L. Coley subsequently admitted his participation in the robbery after being identified from photographs as a participant and arrested on April 4, 1968. He was again released on personal recognizance on May 23, 1968.

Criminal No. 1616-68

On August 13, 1968, at 11:20 A.M., three men entered the Columbia Heights Station Post Office at 1423 Irving Street, N.W. One, subsequently identified as Bobby L. Coley, carried a double-barreled sawed-off shotgun and yelled, "all you M. F. down on the floor, this is a hold-up." A witness in the post office escaped through a side door and summoned police help. When Officers Michael Hartford and Ronald Wilkins responded, Coley pressed the shotgun against the head of postal employee Clarence Smith and told the police if they came any closer he would "blow (Smith's) head off." After a tense period of minutes, Coley finally surrendered.

A verdict of guilty as to the White burglary was returned against Coley on September 27, 1968. He subsequently pleaded guilty to robbery in the Credit Union case and armed robbery in the Post Office cases on January 8, 1969.

VIOLATION OF VALID LAWS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, eight draft board vandals were recently convicted in Indianapolis in Federal court. The following editorial from the May 28, 1970, Indianapolis Star carries part of Federal Judge Cale S. Holder's instructions to the jury. As the editorial states, Judge Holder's points cannot be repeated too often.

The editorial follows:

VIOLATION OF VALID LAWS

Conviction of the eight originally self-proclaimed draft board vandals who call themselves "Beaver 55" reaffirms a principle of ever-growing significance in our time of widespread anarchy—that a political obsession, however strong, does not convey upon those who are possessed with it the right to break law.

As Federal Judge Cale J. Holder told the jury in court here in his final instructions, "The motives of the defendants are not controlling in the case which is before you for decision." He continued:

"Individuals who believe that the Vietnam War is illegal or immoral have the right under our system of government to express their views or to protest these events by any lawful means, such as peaceful picketing or parading.

"But the Constitution of the United States does not protect as a form of symbolic speech the destruction of public property and the hindering of the executive branches administering the Selective Service law and violation of valid laws designed to protect society."

These points cannot be stressed too often. Today's least restrained protestors have gone far beyond the scope of crime committed by the Marion County Selective Service Board vandals. In the name of political dissent, the most rabid revolutionaries have bombed, burned, wrecked, injured and slain. Many have called their acts of violence "symbolic speech." This is a corruption of language and logic.

By thus twisting language and logic, those who commit acts of illegal destruction and violence seek to gain immunity from the law. In fact, their attitude of considering themselves beyond the law encourages them to break the law.

If this attitude were universal there would be no law. Society would be reduced to the raw anarchy of fang and claw, sword, stone, club, fire and gun.

Those who pried the keystone from the structure would be as likely to perish when it crumbled as would those whose purposes they sought to foil in the process.

Civilization is founded upon the law, and so long as the law is maintained, civilization will endure.

L. B. J. SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yet another, but singularly outstanding, example of the close and fruitful relation between the governments of our land and its top academic minds is coming to fruition in central Texas. This government-academic interplay of ideas and programs is a characteristic of this country almost unique in the world in its intensity, and the L. B. J. School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin promises to carry this relationship to a new level of prestige and competence. There, professors, students, and people actively engaged in local, State, and national governments will meet to tackle issues ranging from sewers to disarmament. They will gather in what the school's vibrant Dean John Gronowski, former college professor, Postmaster General, and Ambassador to Poland, calls interdisciplinary, problem-oriented seminars. Leslie Carpenter who represents the Austin American Statesman in Washington recently compiled an evaluation of this experiment in education and government fostered by one of our greatest statesmen, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to reprint in the *RECORD* a portion of Mr. Carpenter's remarks:

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS' LBJ SCHOOL STIRRING INTEREST

(By Leslie Carpenter)

Come September, the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs will enroll its first 200 graduate-level students at the University of Texas. With it will develop the freshest and most educationally stimulating concept of advanced college study to come along in decades, if not centuries. At any rate, those in higher education think so and are paying close attention.

Consider some highlights:

Study there will range from the world at large to city hall, a far stretch but hardly impossible for the public-minded student.

A former President of the U.S., LBJ, in person, will be among the lecturers, another number one.

Students accepted at the LBJ school can forget about money. Their tuition and normal living expenses have been paid through a special fund, largely endowed by LBJ himself with others fascinated by the experiment in graduate-level education.

The most exciting of the new ideas to the professionals of the academic cult is the international concept of the LBJ school.

This plan, fresh as a daisy in its virgin field, concerns making meaningful use within the U.S. of the experience of foreign students who studied in American colleges and went back home to be successful in business or perhaps to become head of their own nation.

That particular "old grads" didn't have to hold diplomas from the University of Texas, seat of the vitally interested LBJ school. It might have been Harvard or Brown. Perhaps it was the University of South Carolina or Northwestern.

One interest figure alone. How good, to foreign students, are American universities? What does the family hear when he gets home? How well is he educationally prepared to contribute importantly to his own country? Are international relations served—and if so, how? What about those teachings of Christ which came before all these colleges—that message about peace and good will?

The plan is to bring in the non-American graduate of a U.S. college who has made it big back home for a series of lectures.

Much more is in store for the novel LBJ school.

For instance, almost everybody was surprised when the first announcement hit the papers that the LBJ school would give heavy emphasis to training students to go into state, county and city governmental work.

After all, the LBJ school, with its especially selected pre-paid students, would be in classrooms immediately next door to the LBJ Library, jammed full of the most important Washington papers ever collected in one place, spanning the 31 years Johnson spent in the House and Senate, as Vice President and President.

First impression protests from Washington died a quick death.

The Johnson concept has rich merit. Gifted young people are needed much more at the state level and below than in the federal. All those who howled so loudly about states' rights while Johnson was in the White House might take notice he is now trying to do something about that particularly thorny and difficult problem—by professionally training the next generation to come to grips with the machinery of the lower levels of public service. For too long, the public-minded young have thought only in terms of the higher salaries, retirement plans, prestige and other benefits of Washington.

Interestingly, the selection of dean of the LBJ school is John A. Gronouski. He has a Ph. D. and a college teaching background.

Also, he has important state, federal and international service behind him. He was commissioner of taxation in Wisconsin, a member of the Cabinet as Postmaster General and the U.S. ambassador to Poland.

One novel plan of the LBJ school has been announced. Students will be required to work with government officials at some level on a tough problem. They must participate in the solution, and their grade will be measured on how well that remedy works.

Much has been made in all the media on LBJ's "fee" for his CBS TV interviews. Involved only is an in-house bookkeeping situation, presumably for tax reasons. Johnson sold his memoirs for publication to Holt, Rhinehart & Winston, a wholly-owned subsidiary of CBS, for \$1.5 million, agreeing to do the three TV interviews as part of the deal. How much of the total was charged to which company is beside the point—especially when every dollar of the total has already gone to scholarships for the LBJ school.

DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. CONTE. The Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project has received a great deal of attention recently in this body. The environmental questions being raised about this project deserve our most serious attention.

The Massachusetts Audubon Society testified before the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee last month. Its testimony raises many of these questions, and for that reason I would like to include it in the *RECORD* at this time:

STATEMENT OF THE MASSACHUSETTS AUDUBON SOCIETY

Gentlemen, my name is Richard Malley and I am employed by the Massachusetts Audubon Society with headquarters in Lincoln, Massachusetts. I am substituting for Mr. Allen H. Morgan, the Society's Executive Vice President, who greatly regrets that he could not be present. The Society represents 16,500 members located primarily in Massachusetts, but also with members in every state of the Union.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works for allowing me to speak to you this morning in the Society's behalf.

My appearance here today parallels my appearance before this same committee almost exactly two years ago. What I have to say today will not vary greatly from what I said on the previous occasion. The basic issue is the same. In the two years, however, there has been a growth of public awareness to environmental issues. I shall not dwell upon that new facet, since I am certain that members of the Subcommittee are as aware of these developments as I am—perhaps even more so.

Yes, gentlemen, I come from Massachusetts, representing a Massachusetts conservation organization. Yet, I come to speak about a problem in another state. Does this seem strange? It shouldn't really, for the world today has become too small for provincial interest alone. The Massachusetts Audubon Society is as concerned with the redwood parks, the Grand Canyon, the Everglades of our country—even the world—as it is with the pollution of the rivers and other conservation problems within our own state.

For this reason, we wish to testify with regard to the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project that is proposed for northern Maine. And at this point, I would like to make it clear that as conservation organization, the Massachusetts Audubon Society is not alone in questioning this project. The Natural Resources Council of Maine; Maine Audubon; The State Biologists Association of Maine; the Appalachian Mountain Club; The Wilderness Society; The National Wildlife Federation and the Sierra Club all have made official comment or taken a stand on Dickey-Lincoln School. Actually, I suppose that you could boil down all our feelings to the one simple question—Why? Why, if our technology has progressed to such a remarkable degree, do we continue to propose the despoilation of vast chunks of land, and for really so small a return?

And why do we push blindly ahead on so-called "water resource development projects" like Dickey-Lincoln School, if the Supreme Court's decision on the High Mountain Sheep Dam (in June 1967) held any meaning? The court's opinion stated: "The test is whether the project will be in the public interest, and that determination can be made only after an exploration of all issues relevant to the 'public interest,' including future power demand and supply, alternate sources of power, the public interest in preserving reaches of wild rivers and wilderness areas, the preservation of anadromous fish for commercial and recreational purposes and the protection of wildlife."

Is this really wise budgeting of our tax dollars? Does not the taxpayer of Massachusetts, of New Hampshire, of the entire country—even Maine itself—deserve a "better shake for his buck?" If Maine needs the economic boost, we don't argue with providing such a sum—but we do believe it can be spent more wisely—to provide far greater economic benefit to Maine and at the same time spare this very great recreational asset.

I understand from people experienced in the electric power field that there are several alternative methods of meeting power needs. I also am aware, as I am certain that members of the Subcommittee are aware, that the idea of doubling electrical power production every ten years is under challenge. The proposition that anything that demands so much from the environment can be doubled each ten years without basic improvements in the efficiency of operation—and that, Gentlemen, is what the electrical power industry is proposing—only can be considered absurd. An industry that spends seven times as much stimulating a consumer market as it spends on research and development certainly strains public credulity when it speaks of demand forcing it to act!

But, Gentlemen, beyond the marring of our natural beauty, there is something that carries a very subtle importance here. The people of Maine, and we ourselves, are being tricked by the supposed vastness of space. If you look at a map of the State of Maine you will find that it approaches two-thirds forestland. Plenty of room for development you say. Well, maybe. But I submit that the greatest single asset that the State of Maine has is its forest. Not just for pulp and other wood products, but for the thousands upon thousands of hunters, fishermen, campers and general tourists that stream through our state each year on their way to "the Maine woods!"

Is this space important? I am sure that many of you esteemed gentlemen have heard of the famed Allagash wilderness. Many of you were probably responsible for helping to create that first Federal-State cooperative wilderness venture—The Allagash Wilderness Waterway. Well, gentlemen, I ask you please to talk with some of the people who are presently involved in that project. Investigate their concern! I guarantee that you will find that the question of how to handle the many

people—not the projected flow—but the present numbers that visit that area, and still retain a measure of peace and pristine beauty, this is already their major problem.

And yet, but a few miles to the west lies the wild and beautiful St. John River—still clean and uncluttered, still quiet, still true wilderness. And now we want to dam it! Put 90,000 acres, 150 square miles under water. We want to build a huge, ugly basin where the regular rise and fall of water will be 40 feet. Picture it, gentlemen! I can, and it is not a pretty sight. Besides, one thing that the State of Maine does not need is another lake—especially one in which the warm stagnant pool will replace one of the best trout streams in the northeast.

But space is what I am talking about here—Space and a very great Responsibility. You and I may never run out of it in our lifetime, but we all know that space—or the lack of it—is a growing national problem. Therefore, it behooves us—even more, it is our obligation to future generations to direct our progress with a complete awareness and adherence to good resource conservation practices. We must study our course so carefully, scrutinize all the possible alternatives, then, in the end, approve the plan that will give us the most and the best for a reasonable price—and with a minimum wastage of the resources concerned.

Have you studied the Dickey-Lincoln School project from a full resource point of view, gentlemen? We have asked this question before, as have several of our sister organizations, and there still has not been a satisfactory reply.

To my knowledge, the only balanced resource investigation that has been made on the St. John River's development was done by the Federal Inter-Agency Committee in 1955. At that time it was recommended that due to the "unique upland wilderness character, its outstanding scenic and geological features, mountain peaks, lakes, forests and marshlands," The Upper St. John River Basin beginning at Debouille Mountain be set aside in order to forever preserve the unique wilderness character of these Great Maine Woods.

Gentlemen, the value of wilderness resources established in 1955 has far more than doubled in 1970! Maine wildlands have become an increasingly more valuable commodity with the passage of 15 years, just as the problems involved in destruction of such rare areas have come more into public focus.

It has become patently obvious that the power as well as the duty of setting yardsticks for power rates is a governmental responsibility that no longer can be shrugged off onto destruction of the environment. Indeed, such a practice of the past has become quite obviously the worst possible means of establishing yardsticks, since it fails to take into consideration a prime cost of power production—that is, it fails to measure the cost extracted from the environment. The past disregard of such costs accounts for the rapid growth of the new conservation movement in America today.

Gentlemen, I thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you today. Your desire to hear and willingness to listen to a conservationist's views are most hopeful.

HOW ABOUT MY SIDE?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish American, of Chicago, Ill., is a

weekly publication serving the Americans of Polish descent in the Greater Chicago area and it has acquired a well-deserved reputation for its wide-ranging editorial commentary. The June 20, 1970, editorial comment discussing behavior on the campus I believe merits thoughtful reading:

HOW ABOUT MY SIDE?

Professor K. Ross Toole of the University of Montana is one member of the teaching profession in an institution of higher learning who minces no words in expressing his opinion of the disorderly behavior of a minority of young people. He says "... I am a 'liberal,' square and I am a professor. I am sick of the 'younger generation,' hippies, Yuppies, militants ... (it's) time to put these people in their places. ...

"Every generation makes mistakes, always has and always will. We have made our share. But my generation has made America the most affluent country on earth. It has tackled, head-on, a racial problem which no nation on earth in the history of mankind had dared to do. It has publicly declared war on poverty and it has gone to the moon; it has desegregated schools and abolished polio; it has presided over the beginning of what is probably the great social and economic revolution in man's history. It has begun these things, not finished them. It has declared itself, and committed itself, and taxed itself, and damn near run itself into the ground in the cause of social justice and reform.

"Common courtesy and a regard for the opinions of others is not merely a decoration on the pie crust of society—it is the heart of the pie. Too many 'youngsters' are egocentric bores. They will not listen; they will only shout down. They will not discuss but, like 4-year-olds, they throw rocks and shout." Professor Toole declares it is time to call a halt, and a great many people will say Amen to that.

HELPFUL YOUNGSTER: INDIANAPOLIS CITIZENS' FORUM SHOWS THE WAY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Indianapolis News for Wednesday, June 17, 1970, describes the further good works done by Mrs. Mattie Coney, of Indianapolis, and her justly famous Citizens' Forum:

HELPFUL YOUNGSTERS

Not long ago Mrs. Mattie M. Coney received dual honors for her work in helping make Indianapolis a better place to live.

This energetic and imaginative woman is founder and executive director of the Citizens' Forum which enlists and focuses the energies of citizens in improving their neighborhoods. The Forum has now come up with a new safety project for youngsters.

Sponsored in co-operation with the Police Department, the program will provide an incentive for youngsters to clean up their yards and premises. The reward will be a tour of police headquarters which has a double benefit of repaying children for their work and showing them policemen are their friends and their benefactors.

The boys and girls not only will be out of the streets and away from the dangers of automobile traffic while cleaning up their yards but in fact may decide to stay in their yards after they become clean and attractive.

As a matter of fact, the task of cleaning the yard and keeping the premises in shape ought to be a responsibility of the youngsters in a family. In other days, before the development of modern homes, household chores did a great deal to prevent the younger generation from getting into mischief by keeping it occupied.

The safety plan of the Citizens' Forum is a revival of this old and worthwhile custom.

UNFOUNDED CLAIM OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION CHARGED AGAINST SONORA, TEX., SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the May 27, 1970, issue of the Washington Evening Star contained the following article:

UNITED STATES CHARGES TEXAS SCHOOL WITH MEXICAN-AMERICAN BIAS

The Government has accused a school district in southwest Texas of violating the 1964 Civil Rights Act by discriminating against schoolchildren of Mexican-American descent.

The action yesterday was the first taken under the 1964 statute by the Justice Department involving Mexican-American—so-called Chicano—school problems. The department filed a complaint and a request to intervene in a private suit previously filed by the parents of eight Mexican-American children.

The suit accused officials of the Sonora independence school district in Sutton County with racial discrimination.

The Government said the district has no Mexican-American or black teachers and provides unequal educational opportunities for Chicano children by failing to offer bilingual and other programs to help Spanish-speaking children overcome language and cultural barriers.

The Government also said pupil assignment zones had resulted in one elementary school with a 100 percent minority enrollment and a lower percentage of Mexican-Americans in other schools in the district.

The Government asked the court to order the district to prepare a desegregation plan at the earliest practicable date.

The Associated Press carried the story throughout the Nation, with this lead sentence:

The U.S. Justice Department has intervened for the first time in a school integration suit involving Mexican-American pupils.

To the peaceful, law-abiding and tolerant-minded citizens of the town of Sonora, Tex., in the heart of the ranch country, this spotlight in the news was both a shock and a puzzle. Why, of all places, they wondered, would the powerful Department of Justice pick out their town as a sort of horrible example of racial discrimination in the public schools? A local lady wrote me:

What on earth have we done to cause the Attorney General to attack us?

My answer had to be:
I simply do not know.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced beyond any doubt that this Federal intervention was highly unjustified. Allegations have been exaggerated far out of proportion

to reality. If the Attorney General is to throw the weight of the Department of Justice into situations such as exist at Sonora, Tex., then, I dare say, to be consistent the Attorney General should file a thousand similar lawsuits tomorrow.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ALLEGATIONS

What are the allegations against Sonora? The Attorney General charged the school's two elementary districts were zoned in such a way that Elliott Elementary School had a 100-percent enrollment of Mexican Americans. So what? If that is true, then why make a big Federal case out of it? Why not allow affected complainants, if any, to file a simple rezoning suit in local courts?

Let us examine this issue very briefly. It happens that I am personally familiar with the situation. As is true of hundreds of towns and villages throughout the Southwest, Mexican-American communities have through the years sprung up, kept close together by family ties and ethnic and cultural preferences. This community of interest is understandable. It has followed a common pattern for years, preferred that way by the Mexican Americans themselves. As a general rule these ethnic settlements are a bit isolated, usually found on the outskirts of the main town.

As these communities developed, schools were built to accommodate the children of school age.

That happened at Sonora, a town of 2,500, where Mexican Americans chose to have their settlement about a mile from the main town. That was the way they wanted it. In due course of time an elementary school was built there, known as the Elliott School. In the city was another elementary school, a junior high school, and one senior high school—making four schools for the entire county.

It should be understood that so far as attendance was concerned the Sonora schools were devoid of any form of racial discrimination. Any student of any race was free to attend either of the two elementary schools, if the student lived in the district he sought to attend. The county has but one junior high school, and for years any student of any race, from any place in the county, was free to attend it. Likewise, the county has but one senior high school, which accommodates students of all races.

The Elliott School is essentially a neighborhood school, accommodating children of parents who choose to live in that immediate community. What sort of zoning does the Attorney General want? Does he want the Mexican-American community split in two, with half of the children permitted to attend their local neighborhood school and the other half forced to walk through rain and sleet, on occasions, for a mile to the other elementary school? And this along a big highway with constant traffic hazards?

Is that the way the Attorney General of the United States wants to treat those Mexican-American children? To me it is incredible. And I feel certain that is the way most of the Mexican Americans

down there would feel about it. I want them to know I have spoken up in their behalf before it is too late.

OTHER ALLEGATIONS

There are other allegations. The Attorney General says there are no Mexican-American teachers. That is true. The same can be said of scores of other schools throughout the Southwest. Until recently, when it became stylish to complain, no concern was expressed by local people because they were quite aware of the scarcity of qualified teachers of that ethnic origin. Efforts to recruit qualified Mexican-American teachers at Elliott have been in vain.

Any qualified Mexican-American teacher who is looking for a job would do well to apply at Sonora. If the applicant does not like what is offered there I can suggest another half dozen schools in the area which have been searching in vain for such teachers.

In addition, the Attorney General harps about lack of bilingual programs at Sonora. I am not aware of any Federal or State law which requires bilingual courses or teachers. I think there is something to be said for the bilingual approach where it can be made useful, but that is a matter for each school to decide. It might be desirable at one school but not feasible at another.

Ordinarily Mexican-American students learn English readily, and that is, of course, the important thing because this is an English-speaking country. I personally know a Mexican family, comprised of a father, a mother, and four children, who immigrated to Texas in 1960. Not one of those children could speak a word of English. Within a year every one of them could read, write, and speak English fairly fluently. And there was no bilingual program at the school they attended.

Mr. Speaker, I have listed the allegations—and the only allegations—of racial discrimination, charged against the Sonora school authorities in pleadings filed by the Attorney General. I can only say that surely in these troubled times the Attorney General and the great Department of Justice can find more important things to do, and find better ways in which to use that aggregation of legal talent.

CHARGES IN FIRST LAWSUIT

The Attorney General intervened in a lawsuit which was filed last December by and on behalf of eight local Mexican Americans. In addition to the allegations made by the Attorney General, the original suit raised two or three other claims of discrimination. One of these was that "the Elliott physical plant is isolated and in poorer condition than the Central plant."

Why isolated? If the community may be so described, any fool would know it happened simply because Mexican Americans chose to live there, in a so-called isolated neighborhood.

The petition then cited the fact that "the Elliott School lacks a cafeteria on the premises where students may be fed while the students at Central do have

use of a cafeteria within walking distance."

What the petitioner overlooked was that only one cafeteria is maintained for the four schools. Operating a cafeteria is expensive business, and few school systems of this size could afford more than one. With respect to the students at Elliott, for years a schoolbus has been used each day during the lunch hour to transport any of the students at Elliott who desire, to and from the cafeteria in town. It requires but a few minutes, and until this lawsuit was filed no one ever heard the slightest complaint.

As further proof of racial discrimination, the petitioner alleged:

The auditorium in the Elliott School contains folding metal chair and has no stage lights while the auditorium at Central has cushioned theater-type seats and a modern stage with stage lights.

This, too, is obviously a trivial charge—completely unrelated to the racial extraction on those who attend the schools. The Elliott School is a modern red brick structure, well furnished, well kept, and well equipped. The seats were installed some time ago and perhaps one of these days the school board will be able to afford replacements. They can hardly be expected to do everything overnight. Until this suit was filed no one ever thought of complaining about seats not being comfortable when infrequently used in the auditorium, or stage lights not being adequate.

I would defy any fairminded person to visit that school and not come away favorably impressed with the plant, the teachers, and the spirit and morale of the students. It is that kind of a school.

The real truth is that the Elliott School could be properly pointed to as something of a model for efficiently serving the educational needs of a local community. No claim is made the teachers are not well qualified and motivated. They are in fact dedicated and devoted to the well-being and improvement of every student they teach.

One other point might be mentioned. The school board provides free kindergarten for the accommodation of parents at the Elliott School community. There is no such preschool service in the main town. This special treatment was evidently due to the solicitude for the working parents who needed to be away from home frequently.

WHY WAS THE LAWSUIT FILED?

Mr. Speaker, I have examined both petitions, and I have listed all of the allegations of discrimination. One would then ask: In view of these flimsy charges, so lacking in substance, why was the lawsuit filed in the first place? Why should local people be subjected to such expense and harassment? It is manifestly unfair to the school authorities, to the taxpayers, and to the Mexican-American citizens who live there. The latter are hard working and law abiding, and they deserve better treatment than this.

What do these complainants want? They ask for a desegregation order. That would, I assume, force a portion of the

students at the Elliott School to walk a mile to and from school each day, through good or bad weather, away from their own neighborhood. One thing is certain: If and when that happens, there will be many Mexican American parents who will be understandably irate and unhappy.

IS FORD FOUNDATION MONEY INVOLVED?

I have said no one seems to know why this litigation was filed. The suit was filed by Pete Tijerina, executive director of the Mexican-American legal defense and educational fund, known as MALDEF. Both Tijerina and MALDEF are located in San Antonio, 200 miles from Sonora. MALDEF began its operations on May 1, 1968, backed by a \$2.2 million Ford Foundation grant. And soon Attorney Tijerina took over. The fund became deeply involved with some extreme and militant causes, including Mexican-American youth organization MAYO, which in some instances openly advocated violence and revolution. This was traceable to highly questionable leadership in the movement.

It follows that when that kind of money is available, every effort may be expected to be used by the unscrupulous to stir up racial unrest and litigation. When suits are filed, lawyers are paid, and when Ford Foundation money is available they may be paid well. In that case, what difference is it whether the lawsuit was well founded or what the ultimate outcome of it might be?

The very fact that the charges are so ridiculous and so lacking in substance lends credence to the suspicion that the well-being of Mexican-American citizens was not the real motivation behind the litigation.

In fact it was not long after MALDEF came into existence, with \$2.2 million in the till, that from Texas to California it was financing 155 cases involving alleged discrimination against Mexican Americans. Lawyers have been having a field day.

There remains one unanswered question: How did the Attorney General of the United States allow himself to be sucked in on a case which bears the trappings of a trumped up lawsuit?

FREEDOM OF CHOICE AT OCEANSIDE HIGH SCHOOL

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, freedom of speech is the essence of democracy. It is appalling, therefore, to note the action of the board of education and principal of Oceanside High School in New York to bar a graduation speech by the elected representative of the people of the area served by the school.

The decision not to allow U.S. Representative ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, my distinguished colleague, to speak at the graduation ceremonies is certainly out of

keeping with the democratic tradition and principles of our country.

To attempt to stifle the voice of Congressman LOWENSTEIN is contrary to academic freedom. The students of the Oceanside school voted to hear their Congressman. This decision should be honored.

We wonder why our youth are so disenchanted with their lot. This incident at Oceanside High School explains much that is wrong with our adult-run institutions. We teach the meaning of the democratic process and the orderliness of majority rule and yet fail to practice it.

This incident should not have happened. More than an affront to Congressman LOWENSTEIN it is a sad day for freedom.

SOLID WASTE, AMERICA'S NEGLECTED POLLUTANT

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by an article that appeared in the June issue of *Nation's Cities*. The article is the first of a four-part series concerning solid waste. Its author, Patricia Conway George, has done a fine job.

I know that the Congress has become more and more aware of the problems facing our affluent society, which produces more and disposes of more goods than ever before. If a program of recycling and reuse of refuse can be worked out, it would be a vast improvement over the current methods of use and disposal.

The article follows:

AMERICA'S NEGLECTED POLLUTANT SOLID WASTE

(By Patricia Conway George)

Although there has been a growing concern with the problems of environmental pollution over the last several years, it is only recently that one of the major causes of pollution—the mountains of garbage and refuse which Americans generate every year—has been brought to the attention of the public.

The first federal statutes aimed at combating water pollution went on the books 22 years ago; those attempting to control air pollution were enacted 14 years ago. But it was not until 1965 that Congress passed the Solid Waste Disposal Act, recognizing for the first time that much of the air and water pollution blighting this country has its origin as solid waste. (Trash burned in incinerators or open dumps is a major air pollutant; refuse dumps pollute ground waters and solid wastes dumped in streams pollute waterways.)

Each year Americans generate some 3.5 billion tons of refuse. That's nearly 100 pounds per person per day, including agricultural, mining, and industrial wastes. Little more than 5 per cent of this solid waste is ever collected. Most of the waste that is collected is picked up from households, deposited in crude, open dumps, and burned in the open without any form of air pollution control.

The bill for this minimal service comes

to \$4.5 billion a year, and it is estimated that merely to upgrade present facilities to acceptable sanitary levels would cost an additional \$4.2 billion over the next five years. This puts the cost of solid waste handling third highest among public services, exceeded only by expenditures for schools and roads.

These figures, however, tell only a small part of the story. Even more impressive is the rate at which our solid wastes are increasing—conservatively estimated at 4 per cent a year. This means that by 2000 we will be generating at least three-and-a-half times as much refuse as we are now, or 12.3 billion tons a year. Underlying this increase are some basic economic factors: rising population, increasing affluence, concentration of people in urban areas, the trend to disposable products, built-in obsolescence of even supposedly "durable" goods, self-service merchandising, the proliferation of packaging, and the increasing use of materials like aluminum and some plastics that are virtually indestructible. Since neither manufacturers nor retailers assume the responsibility for disposing of the goods they market, consumers simply use what they buy—and in many cases use it only once—then throw it away.

Until recently, Americans reveled in this economy of disposability without giving it a second thought. Now, however, people are suddenly becoming conscious of environmental pollution, the limitations of our natural resources, and the rising costs of disposal. Most major cities are running out of land for dumping and find that they cannot burn their refuse without badly polluting the air or investing in enormously expensive incineration equipment.

In New York State it costs 30 cents to pick up a bottle that was originally produced for about 4 cents. In New York City it costs more to dispose of the *Sunday Times* than to buy it, and more to handle a ton of refuse (\$30) than to mine and ship in a ton of Kentucky coal (\$23). As the costs and difficulties of disposal increase, there is a gradual awakening to the need for more rational solid waste management: this country, blessed with what once seemed inexhaustible resources, is at long last considering the possibility of recovering raw materials from its wastes and reusing them.

Our solid waste problems are indeed urgent, but it will take more than public awareness to solve them. First there will have to be strong legislation; then there will have to be substantial investment in developing modern systems and techniques. At the moment, not one of *Fortune's* "top 100" companies is significantly involved in solid waste management; and the refuse disposal industry, made up of numerous small contractors, ranks as possibly the most primitive major industry in the country.

Despite the lack of development and organization, refuse disposal is already quite profitable to people like scrap metal dealers and secondary material handlers whose annual volume of business totals nearly \$8 billion. Moreover, solid waste management promises, within the next 10 or 20 years, to become a larger industry than many of those now producing the goods which wind up in our disgraceful city dumps.

THE SOLID WASTE PROBLEM

Each year more than 190 million tons of refuse are collected in the United States, most of it from households and commercial establishments. This figure, however, represents only a fraction of the total of 3.5 billion tons of solid waste actually generated, including such uncollected refuse as agricultural wastes, mine tailings, etc. Spread out over the entire population, this means that every American generates about 98 pounds of refuse per day.

Staggering as this may seem, even more significant is the rate at which solid wastes are increasing. In 1930, the amount of refuse collected per capita was about 2.2 pounds per day; today it is 5.3 pounds. With our population growing at a rate of 2 per cent per year and consumption also rising at 2 per cent per year, solid wastes are presently increasing at a rate of 4 per cent per year. By 1980, the amount of refuse collected per capita is expected to be 8 pounds per day which, with an estimated population of 235 million, will mean that 340 million tons of solid wastes will be collected annually. By the year 2000, per capita refuse collection will reach 10 pounds per day. At this rate, we will be generating a total of 5.25 billion tons of solid waste annually by 1980, and 12.3 billion tons by the year 2000.

Where is all this refuse coming from? One source estimates that every year each person in the United States discards 188 pounds of paper, 250 metal cans, 135 bottles and jars, 338 caps and crowns, and \$2.30 worth of miscellaneous packaging. On a national basis, this adds up to 18.8 million tons of paper, 4 million tons of plastics, 50 billion metal cans, 27 billion glass containers, 67.7 billion caps and crowns, and \$500 million worth of miscellaneous packaging annually. Not to mention the 7 million automobiles that are junked each year, 110 million tons of industrial waste, 550 million tons of agricultural residues, 1.5 billion tons of animal manures (a good-size steer produces 50 pounds of manure a day), 1.1 billion tons of mineral wastes, and mounds of building and demolition rubble for which there are no total estimates.

PACKAGING

Although packaging accounts for only about 13 per cent of the total 360 million tons of household, commercial, municipal, and industrial wastes generated each year, its contribution to the refuse problem is significant because it constitutes as much as 70 per cent of the household wastes that are collected and most of the litter.

Packaging is currently a \$10-billion-a-year industry and production is rising rapidly. As a result, per capita consumption, which was 525 pounds per year in 1966, is expected to increase to 661 pounds per person by 1976.

Paper packaging alone is expected to double between 1960 and 1980, then double again between 1980 and 2000. (Interestingly enough, the supply of pulp wood is uncertain beyond 1980.) Another large increase is expected in the consumption of non-returnable containers (cans and bottles): from 28 billion units in 1966 to 61.1 billion units in 1976. However, the biggest rate of increase of all is expected in the use of plastics: from 2.2 billion pounds in 1966 to 6.3 billion pounds in 1976. This factor alone has important implications for solid waste management because plastics don't incinerate well (if burned at temperature less than 2,000°F the melted residues clog grates) and they tend to emit toxic substances, such as fluorine and isocyanates, or corrosive acids which ruin incinerator walls. Moreover, plastics don't deteriorate easily, don't compact well enough to be used in landfills, and can't be used for composting because they are not biodegradable.

These and other trends in packaging production and consumption imply several serious waste management problems. First of all, refuse collection may become more difficult because packaging materials particularly plastics, are increasingly less compactable, and the growing number of non-returnable containers is intensifying the litter problem. Secondly, disposal may become more difficult as incineration and sanitary landfill are more widely practiced because packaging is generally not susceptible to these measures. Thirdly, the recycling of

packaging materials (now about 10 per cent of production) may decline unless there is outside intervention because the salvage industry is not equipped to separate increasingly heterogeneous packaging materials. Furthermore, raw materials are usually cheaper to process than those recovered from packaging, and the price of secondary packaging materials is often too low for profitable salvage operations.

The Midwest Research Institute, in a study prepared for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Bureau of Solid Waste Management, has recommended that an effort be made to reduce the quantity of packaging materials used, solve the technical difficulties of processing packaging wastes, and prevent the destruction of valuable natural resources from which many packages are made. The institute proposes the following strategies to achieve these ends.

Research and development on materials and containers, improved salvage and reuse, and improved disposal technology.

Educational programs involving the packaging industry, consumers, and government agencies.

Incentives to reduce the technical difficulties of processing wastes, and subsidies to improve salvage operations.

A use tax on all packages, or a deterrent tax selectively imposed on specific materials.

The regulation of packaging.

This last proposal—the regulation of packaging—is a potentially effective but costly measure that has been receiving an increasing amount of attention lately. In 1967, the legislatures of some 19 states proposed laws banning non-returnable beverage containers. Although none of these bills was passed, the fact that they were being seriously considered indicates the growing concern with litter and other problems resulting from the proliferation of packaging.

DIGGING OUT: WHAT IT COSTS

Current expenditures for solid waste handling total \$4.5 billion annually. It is estimated that 80 per cent is spent on collection and 20 per cent on disposal. Approximately half of all collection services are provided by public haulers and half by private haulers.

Like the mounds of refuse being generated, the costs of handling it are rising rapidly. In Boston, the cost of municipal waste removal recently rose 50 per cent (from \$2.6 million in 1968 to \$3.9 million in 1969) as a result of payroll hikes. New York City spends \$150 million per year and employs 14,000 sanitation workers to collect and dispose of its solid wastes. In Milwaukee the average household now spends \$35.25 per year for waste removal, up to 34 per cent from \$26.40 a decade ago. Last year, costs in Albuquerque rose 20 per cent (from \$30 to \$36 per household); in Portland, Ore., they were up 13 per cent (from \$24 to \$27 per household). San Francisco spends \$22 per household per year for waste removal, and in Washington, D.C., household costs run as high as \$46.20 per year.

Despite these impressive expenditures, present refuse collection and disposal systems in this country are woefully inadequate; 94 per cent of all land disposal operations and 75 per cent of all incinerators have been rated "inadequate" by the Bureau of Solid Waste Management. The Bureau estimates that an additional \$835 million per year for the next five years—or a total of \$4.2 billion—is required to upgrade existing collection and disposal facilities to an acceptable level of performance. This figure is based on the use of current technology, current environmental quality standards, and constant (uninflated) dollars; it does not allow for population growth, an increase in consumption and waste generation, a change in the current ratio of land disposal to incineration, or inflation. (The impact of infla-

tion could be significant; for example, estimates for an incinerator proposed for New York City 10 years ago and still on the drawing boards were recently revised from an original \$20 million to \$80 million.)

REFUSE COLLECTION

It has already been noted in this report that half of all refuse collection services are provided by public agencies and the other half by private haulers. These private haulers operate either by contracting directly with customers or under franchises; the profits of franchised haulers may or may not be subject to regular public scrutiny. Where collection services are provided by public agencies, households are usually billed directly; in other cases, the service is financed out of general tax revenues. Public collection service can be provided at cost, for profit, or below cost with the difference being made up from tax revenues. In addition to public and private collection, a substantial percentage of solid wastes are transported by individual householders, commercial establishments, and industrial facilities.

Of the total population, 64 per cent (77 per cent in the urban areas and 22 per cent in the rural areas) live in communities that operate public collection services. However, the majority of cities providing public collection also use private services, which accounts for the 50-50 split between public and private operations. Some 337,000 workers are engaged in refuse collection, or one worker for every 590 people. Of these, 53 per cent are employed by public agencies and 47 per cent by private services.

There are 93,000 collector trucks equipped with compacting equipment, or one truck for every 2,100 people. Of these, 47 per cent are operated by public agencies and 53 per cent by private haulers. The great majority of these trucks in both the public and private sectors is employed in the collection of household wastes. In addition, there are about 179,000 other types of vehicles in use, or one for every 1,100 people. About 20 per cent are operated by public agencies and 80 per cent by private haulers. In the public sector, employment of these vehicles is about evenly distributed between household and commercial waste collection and street cleaning; two-thirds of those in the private sector are used to collect industrial wastes.

REFUSE DISPOSAL

Currently, about 90 per cent of all collected refuse is disposed of on land (85 per cent in open dumps and 5 percent in sanitary landfills), 8 per cent is burned in incinerators, and the remaining 2 per cent composted, dumped at sea, or discarded in some other manner.

Land disposal. There are more than 12,000 land disposal sites in the United States, not including so called "promiscuous" or unauthorized dumps alongside roads, etc. Of the total, 79 per cent are operated publicly and 21 per cent privately. Ownership of 63 per cent is public (the remainder of the publicly-operated sites are leased from private owners) and 37 per cent is private.

The Bureau of Solid Waste Management defines a sanitary landfill as a site where refuse is covered daily, where there is no open burning, and no pollution of ground water. Judged by these standards, only 6 per cent of all land disposal sites qualify as sanitary landfills; the remaining 94 per cent are really just crude, open dumps or, in a few instances, inadequate attempts at landfill. At many dumps, refuse is burned in the open with no form of air pollution control.

The 6 per cent of all land disposal sites which qualify as sanitary landfills handle an average of 27,000 tons of refuse per year at a cost of \$1.05 per ton. For open dumps of the same size, the cost is 70 cents per ton. However, the average open dump accepts only 11,000 tons of wastes per year. Cost for this

handling is 96 cents per ton, compared with \$1.27 per ton for sanitary landfills of the same size.

Transfer stations. Transfer stations are those sites at which refuse is transferred from collection to hauling vehicles. There is no estimate available on the number of transfer stations in the U.S., but a Bureau of Solid Waste Management survey of 43 of these facilities indicates that 76 per cent are publicly owned and 24 per cent are privately owned. It is likely that transfer stations will become increasingly important as waste handling techniques are improved. For one thing, these installations are essential in long-distance landfill operations where wastes must be transferred from expensively equipped collection trucks to larger hauling trucks or railroad cars. Also, it is at transfer stations that raw refuse would be compacted to medium or high densities for deposit in sanitary landfills, or sorted for salvaging and composting.

Municipal incinerators. There are 300 incinerators in the U.S., 96 per cent of them publicly owned and 4 per cent privately owned. One-fourth are located in residential areas; three-fourths do not meet the Bureau of Solid Waste Management's standards for refuse reduction (75 per cent or greater) or air pollution control. The average load is 188 tons of refuse per day, although those facilities built after 1950 can handle between 230 and 400 tons per day. Operating costs, which average \$4.50 per ton, vary widely depending on the type and condition of equipment. A fairly new incinerator in Atlanta, operating at temperatures between 1,800 and 2,000°F with 90 per cent reduction by weight, is yielding costs of \$6.69 per ton. In Detroit, the cost of incineration is \$10 per ton vs. \$6 per ton for sanitary landfill.

On-site incinerators. A small percentage of all refuse is burned in individual incinerators located in homes, apartment buildings, small businesses, and commercial establishments. However, most of these facilities are presently inadequate and produce significant amounts of air pollution.

Conical burners. Conical burners are metal teepees used to control open burning at dump sites. This type of facility is considered to be basically unsatisfactory in so far as all open burning is undesirable. Again, the total number of conical burners in use is not known, but of the 23 surveyed by the Bureau of Solid Waste Management two-thirds were considered unacceptable in appearance.

Hog feeding. About 4 per cent of all garbage collected is fed to hogs, but this practice has been steadily declining over the last several decades because there are laws requiring that the garbage be sterilized by boiling to prevent the spread of vesicular exanthema in hogs and trichinosis in humans. Moreover, the advent of kitchen disposal units has reduced the amount of raw garbage available, and it is generally inconvenient to separate garbage from other refuse prior to collection.

Ocean dumping. The practice of dumping raw refuse into the sea is declining because in many instances remnants drift back to shore. On the other hand, ocean dumping of chemicals and oil refinery wastes is increasing, despite the protests of conservationists and ecologists.

MARYLAND SOLDIER KILLED IN CAMBODIA

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp. Richard S. Cunningham, a coura-

geous young man from Maryland, was recently killed in Vietnam. I should like to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

MARYLAND SOLDIER KILLED IN CAMBODIA TANK ACTION

A Maryland soldier who was with the first tank unit to enter Cambodia has been killed in action, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Spec. 4 Richard S. Cunningham, 22, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Cunningham, 16616 Batson road, Spencerville, was killed May 14 when his tank came under hostile fire in Khmer territory.

Specialist Cunningham was a tank driver with H Company, 11th Armored Cavalry.

"PROUD OF HIS UNIFORM"

He enlisted in the Army in mid-1969 and won honors as the top recruit in his training battalion at Fort Bragg, N.C. In Vietnam he had three armored vehicles shot out from under him.

Specialist Cunningham "was proud of his uniform and realized he had obligations to his country," Mr. Cunningham said yesterday. "He wouldn't have been bitter about it, if he had come back. He knew somebody had to do it."

The young cavalryman was a native of Washington and attended Montgomery county schools. He graduated from Staunton Military Academy in 1966 and attended Montgomery College for a year and a half.

SURVIVORS NAMED

In 1968 he and a friend formed Cunningham & Smith, a company which operates a gas station and truck rental agency in Silver Spring.

Specialist Cunningham is survived by his parents; a brother, Alan; a sister, Elizabeth; three step-brothers, Peter, Mark and Robert Cunningham; a step-sister, Miki Cunningham, and his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. John T. Slater, Sr.

GRADUATION

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Bellmore Life, a fine weekly newspaper in my district, carried a thoughtful editorial message to this year's graduating high school seniors that I want to share with the Members:

GRADUATION

The time has come for the Class of 1970 to go out into the world. Their years of school have given them an outline of knowledge of society, which they will fill in from their experiences in the years ahead. They have received the trade or professional experience and skill necessary to get a job or the academic experience necessary for continuing into higher education. Hopefully school has instilled in them an eager desire to continue their search for knowledge. Now they must apply their accumulated knowledge in schools of higher education or in their new occupations.

In the last decade, as part of their learning experience, they have witnessed war in the Mideast, Biafra, Central America, and Indochina. And they have seen the work of VISTA, the Peace Corps, civil rights work, and urban renewal work. Their education has taught them that every man must take responsibility for the progress of his country. He must choose which course he wants for his country. And many have worked for constructive goals. They have seen what violence can

cause in Chicago, and what a peaceful demonstration can cause in Washington. Perhaps the greatness of the Class of 1970 is its recognition of problems from pollution to poverty, and its willingness to take responsibility and work to solve them.

Every member of the Class of 1970 must continue to work to build America. They will soon have the responsibility of directing our country, and will need all the experience they can get in working for government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Judging from their record—their scholastic achievements, their sportsmanship, their conscientious involvement in the changing reality of politics and community service—the Class of 1970 will make us proud of them as they apply their knowledge in the coming years.

JOE McCAFFREY SUPPORTS DICKEY-LINCOLN

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Joseph McCaffrey is without question one of the most listened to and influential commentators on the Washington scene.

I submit for the RECORD his comments of June 17, 1970, with respect to the merits of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project.

As Joe has said, there is a crying need for additional power in this country, and especially along the east coast.

We will be given an opportunity to take a step in meeting this need on Wednesday, June 24, when the House takes up the public works appropriations bill.

At that time our colleague, BILL HATHAWAY, will offer an amendment to include \$807,000 for the Dickey project. I urge all my colleagues to support BILL and the Dickey project at that time.

COMMENTARY OF JOSEPH McCAFFREY, JUNE 17, 1970

Next week the House of Representatives will have a chance to help fight the promised brown outs along the East Coast. There is, and there will continue to be, a power shortage along the coast, and other areas of the nation.

The shortage will get worse instead of better as the demand for power continually increases.

Yet the House of Representatives continues to vote against a project which would do something about it: the Dickey Lincoln School Power Project in Maine. It was authorized by the Congress in 1965. To date two point one million dollars has been appropriated for pre-construction planning. An additional one point four million is needed to complete the pre-construction planning stage. The current budget recommendation is \$807,000.

Despite the crying need for additional power in this country, and especially along the East Coast, the continuing appropriations for the project have been defeated in both the 90th and the first session of this current 91st Congress.

Maine's Congressman William Hathaway has been leading the fight in the House and has won many converts, but not enough. He finds that the private investor owned utilities—which cannot meet the current needs—are proving to be a powerful foe. There is no federally financed power project East of the Mississippi and North of the Mason Dixon Line, and the private utilities are determined to keep it that way.

Yet today there is a desperate need for more power, power which could be generated at Dickey Lincoln. The brown outs are coming, all the experts warn us about them. The House of Representatives can cast a vote to help ease those brown outs by supporting the effort to increase the power potential of New England.

INDOCHINA: SOME SPOOKY QUESTIONS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, this Nation's involvement in Indochina—first in Vietnam and now in Cambodia—is requiring that we in Congress rethink some of the basic tenets of that involvement. We have all wrestled with this problem on numerous occasions, and, as men acting in good faith often do, we have come to conclusions which place us in disagreement with one another. Many of us, Mr. Speaker, have in fact arrived at conclusions which differ from those which we originally had on the subject—such is one of the “risks” of reevaluation.

This concern of the Congress and the American public with our military engagement in Vietnam and Cambodia shall soon be put to further test in this Chamber as various antiwar bills and amendments are offered. In considering these proposals, I suggest that we shift our attention from those reasons which originally propelled us into Indochina and, rather, concentrate on the viability of the reasons which presently are advanced for the prolongation of this war.

I am aware of course of the seemingly ultimate intention of the President to withdraw from Vietnam and until Cambodia, I was convinced that his plan would allow us to withdraw rather quickly and without excessive additional loss of human life. But the decision to send American troops into Cambodia—apart from the military achievements flowing from that decision—could put the United States one step closer to additional forays into that country and one step closer to a possible commitment of troops to Cambodia if perhaps Phnom Penh should fall to Communist forces.

I believe that we must now consider our role in Indochina not in terms of our original reasons for involvement, but rather in terms of what is presently our objective—considering the huge internal costs this war has visited on us during the last 7 years. In helping us try to do so, I offer the following editorial from the June 8 Wall Street Journal for the consideration of all Members prior to the time that we must take a position on further legislative efforts to establish our military picture in Southeast Asia:

INDOCHINA: SOME SPOOKY QUESTIONS

After a number of Presidential addresses on Indochina, many listeners must be left with highly ambivalent feelings: While Mr.

Nixon is talking, what he says seems to make a lot of sense. Yet, later, mulling over our whole involvement in Southeast Asia, one can uneasily conclude that present American policy leaves more questions than answers.

Let us assume that the Cambodian intervention is already the great military success the Administration claims. Assume further that failure to intervene would have cost many additional American lives. That the U.S. forces will be withdrawn from Cambodia on schedule by the end of this month. That troop withdrawals from Vietnam—the Vietnamization program—will proceed as promised. (We ourselves have long thought that Vietnamization was probably the best of the available alternatives.)

When all that is granted, the questions still nag.

One concerns the President's insistence on putting the Cambodian action in the context of U.S. credibility in the world. Mr. Nixon expressed it this way the other night: “If an American President had failed to meet this threat (from the Cambodian sanctuaries) . . . would those nations and peoples who rely on America's power and treaty commitments for their security—in Latin America, Europe, the Mideast, other parts in Asia—retain any confidence in the United States?”

Now it is true that a precipitate withdrawal from Vietnam most likely would have serious international repercussions, perhaps encouraging the Soviets or the Chinese Reds to new adventures, among other things. But Cambodia? The initial reaction at home and abroad, when it was not revulsion, was stunned disbelief. In general, it would seem that if the U.S. could achieve an acceptable disengagement from Southeast Asia, its image in the world would measurably improve.

Can it achieve that disengagement, though? For despite all the delineation of withdrawal timetables, there lingers the spooky question whether America is actually getting in deeper rather than getting out.

Thus the Administration correctly argues that it will take the enemy months to rebuild the shattered Cambodian installations and replace the equipment captured or destroyed. Unquestionably the enemy has been dealt a stiff blow, but what happens after those months have elapsed? The enemy can rebuild the installations, or their equivalent deeper in Cambodia, and replace the equipment—so long as Hanoi is willing to expend the manpower and Moscow is willing to supply the equipment. There is no evidence of unwillingness either place.

So the U.S. could quite possibly face another Cambodian threat (not to mention the continuing threat in Laos) some months hence. By the current logic would it not have to go in again? And after that? The unhappy fact seems to be that the Communists, especially the Soviets, can make it exceedingly difficult for the U.S. to extricate itself from Southeast Asia. And it might suit their purposes very well to keep us stewing.

Meantime the U.S. has inevitably to a certain extent become involved in the maintenance of the present fragile government of Cambodia; to that extent it is more, not less, mired in Indochina. Washington is trying to foster the cooperation of other Southeast Asian nations to help on the Cambodian problem, and this development is one of the more hopeful elements in the entire picture, but it is by no means certain much will come of the effort. Yesterday's reports of spreading warfare in Cambodia are hardly reassuring. The U.S. might still find itself holding the bag.

All this is the more bothersome in view of the widespread impression that participating in a land war in Asia was a mistake in the first place. How wildly American foreign policy has been distorted since the

Johnson Administration Americanized the war five years ago. (What the war has done at home hardly needs elaboration.)

Nowadays the President makes speech after speech about Indochina, it dominates the headlines, TV and the public discussion; you would think the U.S. had few other major interests in the world. The truth of course is that its other interests—in Europe, in trying to avoid a big-power war in the Mideast—outweigh its interests on the periphery of Asia.

Conceivably these misgivings are exaggerated, and gradual disengagement will succeed. President Nixon is right when he says he is determined to end the war in a way that will bring an era of reconciliation to our people, not an era of furious recrimination. Yet the implications of wider war, the specter indeed of perpetual war, cannot be dispelled by brave talk of military gains in Cambodia.

INDIANA DEMOCRATS SPEAK: 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues two speeches heard by Indiana Democrats at their State convention held June 15 and 16.

My Indiana colleague, the Honorable ANDREW JACOBS, JR., noted the changing season in the fight against crime in America.

His remarks, as well as mine, follow:

REMARKS OF ANDY JACOBS

The national administration has now passed from the promising season into the all-biting season.

Back in the promising season, the administration was saying that it would change things in this country. It would enforce the law.

Well, it has changed things—mostly for the worse, but it clearly has not enforced the law. It has not brought the crime rate down. The crime rate has gone up. And the administration knows the public is fed up.

Would you like to know why the administration has not kept its promise to curb crime? Ready for their first alibi?

Well, according to the administration, it would like to enforce the criminal laws, but it says Congress won't let it.

The administration says it can't fight crime until Congress passes some criminal laws.

Well, I hope this doesn't surprise anybody, but—

Bulletin. There is already a law against murder.

Bulletin. There is already a law against rape.

Bulletin. There is already a law against robbery.

Bulletin. There is already a law against mugging.

Bulletin. There is already a law against riots.

Bulletin. There is already a law against vandalism.

Bulletin. There is already a law against arson.

All these laws were on the books when the city, state, and national administrations came into office.

Do we need more laws? Or do we need administrations that will enforce the criminal laws we already have? And all the alibis in the world won't answer this question.

Surely you remember the glowing promises made to the American people by these administrations. But they have only succeeded in proving the political adage that, "while it is true that you cannot fool all the people all the time, if you can do it once you're good for four years."

REMARKS OF LEE HAMILTON

1968 was a difficult year for Democrats. If we did not always know, after 1968 we know that:

When we bicker among ourselves, we can not win.

When we let the one thing that divides us captivate our attention, instead of the many things that unite us, we cannot win.

When we try to shortcut fair procedures in party matters, we cannot win.

When we lose sight of the larger goals which are the reason for this Democratic Party to be, we cannot win.

When there is factionalism over Vietnam or Chicago or party procedures or personalities, we cannot win. But 1968 is behind us, and 1970 is before us. And in 1970 all of us are beginning to feel better about being Democrats.

We observe ancient truths once again—the Republicans can win elections from time to time, but they cannot effectively govern the state or the nation.

The Democrats can lose elections from time to time, but when they are not in power, the economy goes haywire, the country drifts and does not meet its problems, and the people call the Democrats back to power to set the state and nation on a steady course.

You and I have a message to tell to the people—a message of promises unkept, promises undelivered, and promises unexecuted. The President promised unemployment would go down—but it has gone up.

He promised an imaginative farm program—but he has delivered no farm message and no farm program.

He promised efficient government by Cabinet officers with an extra dimension, but he has given us resignations, reshuffling and disarray in high places.

He promised more housing, but he has delivered less.

He promised major improvements in rural life, but he has delivered nothing.

He promised us no student protests, but he has delivered the greatest student protests of the decade.

He promised not to shortchange education, but he delivered drastic cuts in the education budget.

He promised us research and development but he delivered a sharp cutback in heart and cancer research.

He promised no inflation, but he has delivered the sharpest inflation in recent years.

He promised to bring us together, but he has delivered polarization and discord.

He promised us a sharp reduction in the rate of crime, but he has not delivered as the crime rate soars—and now he blames the Congress for his own failure.

He promised peace, but there is no peace.

Let us, then, be relentless in our struggle back to power.

Let us debate public policy among ourselves, agree as a party when we can, differ when we must, but put aside our minor differences and unite behind our major agreements, and go on to victory.

Let us listen to our friends and neighbors, and take their hopes and frustrations and desires and mold them into state and national policy.

Let us serve in the state and nation as loyal opposition, not hesitating to support action in the best interest of Indiana and the nation, and not hesitating to condemn when it is not.

Let us do all we can as a party to make

the winds of adversity blow more gently upon the people of this state and nation.

Let us stand as a symbol of hope, reaching out to all in this state who need a champion.

Let us serve to soften the rough edges of America's fabulous diversity, and remember that above political party is country and the unity of free men in a free land.

Let us take pride in our party and the handiwork of our labors, because without political parties, there is no politics, without politics there is no democracy and without democracy there is no America.

A rare opportunity comes to us in Indiana this year. We can elect two, 3, 4 or more new Democratic Congressmen from Indiana and they will help supply the necessary and critical margin in voting power to put this Party and nation on a steadier course.

We have an exceptionally able group of Congressional candidates, and if you and I do our part and get them elected, Indiana and the nation will benefit.

ACHIEVEMENT AWARDS FOR COLLEGE SCIENTISTS FOUNDATION, INC.

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 1970, George M. Low, Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, spoke at the annual scholarship awards dinner of the Houston Chapter of the Achievement Rewards for College Scientists Foundation, Inc. Mr. Low's speech put the space program in perspective and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time so that all Members of the Congress can read it:

REMARKS BY GEORGE M. LOW

It is a great pleasure to be back in Houston again this evening, to be with you on the occasion of the Annual Awards Banquet of ARCS. I am particularly pleased to be able to participate with you in tonight's events and to be able to honor the young men and women who have just received their awards.

I well remember last year's Awards Banquet, when Frank Borman gave the address and spoke of his adventures on Apollo 8, man's first expedition to lunar orbit. At that time, we had not yet landed on the moon. In fact, we were to make another flight around the moon before Apollo 11 was to land in July of 1969.

Perhaps this seems like a long time ago now, and it is if you think in terms of the achievements of 1969. Since last year's Awards Banquet, we have not only been to the moon once, but we have been there four times—once around the moon on Apollo 10, then two highly successful landings, and finally in Apollo 13, just a few short weeks ago, we made another attempt at a lunar landing but were unsuccessful. Nevertheless, astronauts Lovell, Swigert and Haise circled around the moon in their damaged spacecraft on their way back home to earth.

But let us look back even further, to the beginning of the space age. The first Sputnik was launched in October 1957 when those of you who are freshmen were entering kindergarten, and the seniors among you were in third grade. This may seem like a long time to you, in your young lives. But it is a very short time in the span of history.

Let us look this evening at how our world has changed since the dawn of the space age—since that year when you entered kindergarten.

THE FIRST TWELVE YEARS IN SPACE

America's first satellite, Explorer I, was launched in January of 1958. It discovered the earth's Van Allen Radiation Belts. And less than two months ago, it returned to earth, after circling the globe 58,000 times.

Explorer I weighed 30.8 pounds. Apollo 13 placed nearly 300,000 pounds, 10,000 times the weight of Explorer I, in earth orbit on the way to the moon.

Let us look at a few other statistics of America's first twelve years in space.

The speed of manned flight has increased from 1900 miles per hour to 25,000 miles per hour. The altitude that man has reached has increased from 25 miles to 250,000 miles. Our astronauts have logged more than 6,000 hours in space and have flown more than 72,000,000 miles.

Twenty-six astronauts have flown in space. One of them has flown four times; 4, three times; and 10 have flown twice. Fifteen Americans have flown around the moon, and four have walked on the moon's surface. In the same period of time, 154 unmanned satellites have been launched by NASA to explore the universe around us and to help us to predict our weather and aid in communications from one continent to another.

While we were doing all these things in space, our world changed also. And, in a large measure, the expansion of human knowledge was brought about by the challenge that our space program has given our nation.

Arthur Clarke, the noted British science fiction writer, said a short time ago, "The road to the stars has been discovered none too soon. Civilization cannot exist without new frontiers. It needs them both physically and spiritually."

Many historians have pointed out that the energy and the exuberance, the inquisitiveness and the daring, the inventiveness, initiative and drive toward wider fields of enterprise were essentially pioneering responses to the opening of new frontiers that marked our history. And the consensus of many of these same historians had been that the beginning of our last geographical frontier marked the end of the nation's youth, and that the fresh, confident outlook of youth would never come to us again.

But these historians did not foresee, nor did anyone else, that we were on the threshold of a new pioneering age—that we were about to open a new and endless frontier, the frontier of space.

The opening of new frontiers has not been the only stimulus to our people. Another catalyst, another forming function, has been global war, and a national dedication to win that war.

During the 1960s, without a new land frontier, and without the anguish of global war, the American space program combined the forcing functions of both and did it with noble motivation: exploration of the unknown, the expansion of knowledge, unselfish sharing of the new for the betterment of all, and reduction of international tension.

The endless physical, psychological, technical, and scientific frontiers of space have stimulated development of entirely new transportation, communication, and management systems: manned and automated spacecraft, launch vehicles, cryogenics, tracking systems, computer networks, data links, ground support facilities, and global institutions to manage them.

A STIMULUS TO TECHNOLOGY

An excellent example of space-stimulated technical progress is the impact of new space requirements on the computer industry. The exploration of space demands very large com-

puter systems of great complexity, size and speed. More importantly, space needs demand new flexibility in the use of computers, ranging from automated check-out functions to real-time monitoring of space missions; from inventory management to aircraft and spacecraft simulated controls; from computing planetary trajectories to modeling global weather patterns. NASA has to receive advanced hardware, meeting rigid specifications, on schedule to meet unyielding planetary launch window dates. We need new kinds of computer programs, and we know that complex software programs require lead-times as long as the hardware. NASA does get advanced computer hardware and software on schedule. Without them, Mariner, OAO, Apollo and other missions would not have flown successfully.

The need for rapid progress has been relentless. In Project Mercury, ground-based computers were only required to determine quickly and accurately booster cut-off conditions. In Apollo, however, computers are used throughout the mission in real time, to calculate the trajectory to the moon and back, to compare three separate solutions for the lunar descent, to record and analyze thousands of bits of telemetered spacecraft information, to compare these to predicted values to detect trouble, and, at the same time, to monitor the well-being of the crew. For Mercury, the computer program contained 40,000 computer words; for Apollo, a 1,500,000-word program was needed, while, at the same time, the speed of the computers has increased sevenfold.

Challenging the best talents of our nation in this way, to produce both hardware and the programming that makes it useful, has helped the U.S. computer industry to attain its present dominant world position. The industry engineers who developed our Mission Control Center computer system for Apollo tell us that without the forcing function of NASA's requirements, they would not have been able to exploit fully the inherent capabilities of their own machines to meet other requirements. Today, virtually every on-line, direct access, commercial computer system in the world is American and reflects the space guidance and check-out requirements of some years ago.

Today, the U.S. computer industry does about 8 billion dollars worth of business each year. It pays the highest average wages of any U.S. industry and is one of the most rapidly growing, and contributes a large, positive international balance of trade. Let us look at a few statistics: In 1960, the U.S. exported 48 million dollars worth of computers. In 1969, this had reached a value of 728 million dollars. In other words, U.S. computer exports have increased by over 1400 percent in the first decade of the space age. This impressive record was built on excellence of performance through continuing technological superiority. In a large measure it was the stimulus of NASA's requirements that brought about these technological advances in the computer industry.

I could cite other examples where space technology perhaps more directly affects our daily lives. Take, for instance, one from the automotive industry. In order to meet the new Clean Air Act, the Chrysler Corporation reworked their automobile ignition systems, designing distributors to operate within much closer limits. To assist in this, they called in their own people who had developed the automated check-out and launch sequence equipment for the Saturn launch vehicle. Today, at Chrysler's Indianapolis plant, every distributor is dynamically tested for final acceptance, through its entire range, on computer controlled equipment derived directly from the Apollo Program check-out equipment.

Another example is an automotive safety device which originated in the shock absorber that is used today on the couches in the Apollo spacecraft. The device consists of essentially an inner tube with "O" rings around it, fitting tightly into an outer tube. When compressed or extended, the rolling "O" rings absorb considerable energy. The device is rugged, cheap, resettable, and reusable. The Bureau of Public Roads has tested it in connection with highway guard rails and found that it cuts down a 60-mile-per-hour impact to the equivalent of a 5-mile-per-hour impact. Perhaps the most impressive testimonial to its utility is the Ford Motor Company's intensive development effort aimed at incorporating this device into an automobile bumper that can safely withstand a 5-mile-per-hour direct impact, and will of course minimize damage at higher speeds. Ford hopes to offer this bumper as soon as possible, perhaps even on its 1972 models. The economic significance of this becomes apparent when you relate it to the Allstate Insurance Company's announced collision premium reduction of 20 percent for cars so equipped.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS FROM SPACE

But, there are even more direct benefits and impacts of our space program. Take, for example, the field of meteorology. It is rare for a new field of technology to produce practical application in its first few years, but this is just what happened in the early 1960s when the space program developed and put into operation revolutionary new tools and information systems for weather forecasting. These included satellites to track storms, measure wind, record the temperature at different heights, and report on the moisture content of the atmosphere. They included, also, solar observation satellites to monitor the Sun's cycle of activity, and computer systems, mathematical models and software programs that can receive and analyze vast amounts of global data from many sources to make possible more accurate forecasting.

The first weather satellite was launched April 1, 1960. Since then, progress has been rapid. The first satellite merely took pictures of the clouds. Now, satellites take pictures not only in the visible light, but also in the infra-red, and show clouds during the daylight as well as at night. Last year a satellite was launched that could take the vertical temperature profile through the atmosphere. This year, less than a month ago, the second satellite of this type was launched, with even more sophisticated instruments. With it, our weather forecasters can tell the temperature at given heights in the atmosphere any place around the globe. Previously it had taken tens of thousands of balloon soundings to get the same information—information that is vital in long range forecasts.

But, forecasting is only one part of the weather picture in our daily lives. Probably the most dramatic impact of weather satellites is their ability to detect and track major storms, hurricanes, and threatening weather patterns, early enough and precisely enough to permit timely warning and decision. Examples include routing of air traffic, marine navigation, agricultural warnings, water management, and protection or evacuation of threatened flood or storm areas.

Hurricane Camille, last August, was first observed and then tracked by satellite. The hurricane's path, force, and extent were predicted early and accurately enough to permit authorities to evacuate some 70,000 from the Mississippi and Louisiana Gulf Coast. Camille was one of the worst storms in our nation's history. Without early warning, without tracking, without the credibility provided by actual satellite pictures and data, ESSA esti-

mates that 50,000 people might have perished in this devastating storm.

This is not an isolated case. Many other instances could be cited. In November of 1969, Hurricane Laurie also threatened the Gulf Coast. Observation and tracking by satellite provided the basis for safely predicting that Laurie would not strike the coast. The savings here from the decision not to evacuate and not to protect property are estimated to have exceeded \$3 million.

Since 1966, U.S. weather satellites have watched every major storm threatening the nation. In 1969 alone, 12 Atlantic hurricanes, 10 Eastern Pacific hurricanes, and 17 Western Pacific typhoons were identified and tracked by satellites. We now have the first atlas of Pacific cloud and weather patterns covering the period of 1962-1969, assembled from data available only by satellite. Color TV cloud pictures from NASA's experimental Applications Technology Satellite are now being used in near real time. The Navy uses weather satellite pictures for ice patrols and to schedule Antarctic resupply, and airline pilots at Kennedy Airport routinely receive a weather photo of their trans-Atlantic route. The weather satellite today virtually affects every aspect of our daily lives.

Next, let us look at the area of communications. Before discussing communication satellites, let me cite a few telecommunications statistics to put this important development into perspective. In 1960, there were less than 75 million phones in America; we now have about 120 million. In 1960, Americans made 18 billion calls; last year we made nearly 200 billion. Before the end of this day about 485 million phone calls will have been made in this country. The value of the U.S. telecommunications business, including service equipment, grew from \$22 billion per year in 1960 to over \$47 billion now. This industry has doubled its circuit mileage every ten years since 1935.

New uses for continually being found for telecommunications. Banks, stocks exchanges, hotel reservations, cable TV, hospitals, computer centers and other new customers are appearing at an increasing rate. We are literally in the midst of a global communications explosion.

The newest development that can help meet this demand and increase service is, of course, the communications satellite. It can supplement cable, radio, or microwave links where they exist, can provide their equivalent where they do not, and can, literally, interconnect every part of the world.

This new benefit from the space program is obvious to TV viewers. The Olympics were first televised internationally in 1968 from Tokyo and made available in real time to U.S. audiences. The largest audience in world history—over half a billion people, one-sixth of the world's population—saw man's first steps on the moon. In 1960, you could not send live TV across the Atlantic; by 1965 it was possible but expensive; by 1969 the quality had been improved and the cost reduced to 19% of the 1965 rate.

At present, communication satellites are largely used for transoceanic traffic, providing economical links across the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans. They are having a major impact. Before satellites, a West Coast-to-Japan cable circuit cost \$15,000 per month; Comsat today offers this service at a charge of \$4,000. The recent decision by the FCC to entertain suggestions for a U.S. domestic satellite system opens a whole range of potential new services, including low cost message, data, and television transmissions coast-to-coast—and anywhere in between. The feasibility of domestic service has been well demonstrated—and the response from industry to the FCC invitation indicates that the potential for the application of satellite technology to U.S. internal communications is very high.

The benefits to society of NASA's communication satellite work are widespread. Communications are the nervous system of organized society. Good global communications are not a luxury today—they are a basic building block for economic and social progress. From our first experiments in the early 1960s to today, we have come far. Even the 240-circuit Syncom of 1964 already looks antique beside its 1971 descendant, the 5,000-circuit Intelsat-4. NASA has led the already dynamic electronics and telecommunications industry into a new age and provided them with a major new technology. All of this has been accomplished and the 70-nation Intelsat organization created within 10 years. That fact, of itself, may be unique. The application of new technology has usually required far longer—it took a century for the electric motor to graduate from a scientific curiosity to a utilitarian device. The NASA contribution has been to challenge and stimulate technical advance, forcing new inventions into the marketplace and making them work. This has a national value without a price tag. In my opinion, it is worth, simply, the difference between continuing national progress and falling behind into a position of "second-best," never again to catch up.

I have talked about some of the practical applications and results from our efforts in space. I have purposely not talked about manned flight, even though it is a subject near and dear to my heart, because I am sure that here in Houston, there is little that I can tell you about it. I also have not talked about the many scientific results and discoveries that have come about from our exploration in space. But it is certainly true that we learned more about the moon in a few hours after we were able to examine the lunar samples brought back by the crew of Apollo 11 than we had previously learned in our entire history. And we learned more about Mars from the pictures sent back by Mariner last summer than we had previously learned since the invention of the telescope. I could go on and on, but perhaps it is time now to turn toward the future, to look at what lies ahead in space in the decades to come.

OUR FUTURE IN SPACE

Our space program might be thought of in terms of three general purposes. One purpose is exploration. Man has always insisted on venturing into the unknown despite his inability to predict precisely the value of any given exploration. He has been willing to take risks, willing to be surprised, willing to adapt to new experiences. A great nation will always be an exploring nation if it wishes to remain great.

The second purpose of our space program is scientific knowledge, a greater systematic understanding about ourselves and our universe.

And the third purpose of the United States space effort is that of practical applications, turning the lessons we learned in space to the early benefits of life on earth. I have already given many examples of these applications.

These purposes were expressed in a recent statement by President Nixon in terms of six specific objectives. These objectives are:

1. We will continue to explore the moon. We have learned a great deal about our satellite from Apollo 8 and 10 and from our lunar landings in Apollo 11 and 12, but we have also raised as many new questions as we have found answers. We will therefore continue to send Apollo flights to the moon, to exciting new sites, with new equipment, to gain a better understanding of the moon and, through it, perhaps a better understanding of our earth itself.

2. The second objective is the continued and extended exploration of the planets of the universe. In 1971, we will send two orbiting spacecraft around Mars, and in 1975 we will launch an unmanned Mars landing mission. We will send a probe to Venus and Mercury and another to the planet Jupiter. At the end of the decade, we will have a special opportunity to visit all of the outer planets on a flight called the Grand Tour. In the period between 1978 and 1980, the geometry of the planets will be such that we can send a spacecraft from one to the next with far less energy than is normally required. This opportunity will not arise again for 179 years. We will explore the mysterious outer planets—Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto. The flight time to Pluto will be nine years, and it will take nine hours for a signal to go from earth to our spacecraft and back to earth again!

3. As a third objective, we will make the use of space more economical. We will develop a space transportation system to bring men and equipment and supplies to and from space on a routine basis. This system will include the space shuttle—a vehicle that takes off like a rocket, but looks more like an airplane. It will be able to glide back into the atmosphere, and land at an airport.

4. We will seek to extend man's capability to live and work in space. In the 1972 and 1973 period of time, we will have our first experimental space station, using Apollo hardware, in our Skylab program. Men will work in space, in Skylab, for nearly 2 months. Toward the end of the decade, we hope to launch a giant permanent space station in which men will live and work for many months at a time.

5. We will also expand the practical applications of space technology. An exciting new development with high potential here is the Earth Resources Satellite, a satellite which can help in such varied tasks, as surveying crops, locating mineral deposits, and measuring water resources; a satellite that will enable us to assess our environment and use our resources more effectively. And, of course, we will continue to pursue our other applications, such as weather satellites, communications satellites, and we will see also navigation satellites, air traffic control satellites, and satellites for other purposes.

6. The last of the six objectives enumerated by the President, is that we should encourage greater international cooperation in space, including the participation by foreign astronauts in our space flight programs when we have the space shuttle and the space station.

These goals are not overly optimistic. History too often has shown us that our predictions fall far short of what actually happens. In less than a generation we may have progressed well beyond these forecasts.

We have discussed some of the results of the space age—of America's first 12 years in space. We have seen how the world of 1970 is a vastly different world from that of 1960—and that many of those changes that represent improvements stem directly from our efforts in space.

We now come to the inevitable question: how much does it cost? Or: can we afford to do all these things in space while we have so many problems here at home?

Last week the House of Representatives passed a bill authorizing \$3.6 billion for NASA in the next fiscal year. This is \$267 million more than we requested! It represents a tremendous vote of confidence. But how much is \$3.6 billion dollars?

In terms of the federal budget, it represents 1.7 percent of the total—roughly \$17 per person in one year.

Compare this with \$400 per person we spend on social actions—like federal ex-

penditures for education, health, housing, social security, and veterans benefits. (In Fiscal Year 1971, we will be spending slightly less for national defense than for the human resources programs.)

Or, compare this with the \$35 we spend per person, on alcoholic beverages, \$17 on tobacco, or \$16 on cosmetics.

When you consider that each of us is spending nearly 25 times as much each year on the human resources programs than on space, it becomes quite clear that even if we had no space program—even if every dollar spent on space were spent instead on health or housing or education—the difference on those programs would hardly be noticeable.

But, can you imagine where America, and the Western world, would be today had we not undertaken to meet the challenge of space?

And perhaps there is a lesson to be learned from NASA's way of doing business, from Apollo, that applies in the solution of our social problems as well:

In Apollo, we established a goal: land on the moon. We set a timetable: before the end of the decade. We said how much it would cost, at the outset. And, then we carried out our goal, in the open, with the world to see, to measure our performance.

Perhaps we should tackle our social problems the same way: Specify what the national problem is; state before the public what we propose to do; tell the public how much it is going to cost; and then with the public and the press looking over the shoulder, demonstrate that it is being done.

Certainly NASA has demonstrated to the American public that they can greatly increase the standards of their demands for performance by the Government, and that they can expect to see results.

This may indeed be the most significant spinoff from our space program!

THE LATE CLIFFORD R. HOPE

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of former Representative Clifford R. Hope came as a shock to his many friends, in and out the Congress. It brought sadness and renewed appreciation for a truly great American and a valuable friend of agriculture in this country.

The virtues of Cliff Hope and the contributions he made are becoming legend. Few if any men in this century have excelled this Kansas lawmaker in terms of understanding and knowledge of problems related to the producers of livestock and farm products. As ranking member and as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture Mr. Hope commanded solid, continuous respect from practically every Member of this body. In presenting his views and his own ideas of how problems could best be solved, he was always honest, sincere, and completely devoid of demagoguery.

Above all, Cliff Hope was devoted to his country. He was a patriot in every sense of the word. In the Congress he could always be counted upon to rise above partisanship when the well-being

of the Nation was involved. He was a true statesman and a valuable, enlightened, and influential lawmaker. The country has suffered a great loss in the passing of Clifford Hope.

CRISIS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Roger A. Freeman, Special Assistant to the President, spoke last Friday to the Washington State Research Council. His address was most provocative and upon careful review should stimulate some rethinking of some of our traditional concepts of education and the role of the Federal Government.

I have included the complete text below:

CRISIS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(By Hon. Roger A. Freeman)

I cannot adequately tell you how thrilled I was when I received your invitation to serve as your speaker at this luncheon. I left the State of Washington nearly fifteen years ago and thought that I had long been forgotten here. While David Swenson's letter was still on my desk, bathing my face in its reflected glow, I began getting telephone calls from Herb Miller, Ben Ehrlichman and others, urging me to accept the invitation. So here I am.

Having spent some of the most precious and most exciting years of my life in the Pacific Northwest, I am humbly grateful to you for letting me know that I made some lasting friends during the decade I lived and worked here.

If I were at liberty to do what I feel like doing, then I would now recognize my old friends in the audience, reminiscing about our common exploits in the legislative wars of the 1950's and tell the new generation tales of battle scars that have long since healed.

But you did not come here for that. You came to hear me speak about the "Crisis in American Education." So, in fairness to you, my hosts, and to make sure that you don't make me pay for my own lunch, I shall address myself to the assigned subject.

But before I do so, I want to pay tribute to the man who brought me into public life here over twenty years ago, to whom I owe most of what I know about public affairs, and whom I served as an assistant for more than five years. I mean, of course, Governor Arthur B. Langlie whose untimely death was a severe blow and grievous loss to all of us. I am most happy to hear that a biography of this great man, the only man ever to be elected Governor of Washington three times, is now in preparation and will soon be published.

For as long as anyone of us can remember there has always been talk about a "crisis in education." Those within the educational establishment usually saw the crisis in financial terms, denounced the existing support level as lamentably inadequate and predicted dire consequences and disaster if available funds were not promptly multiplied. That no such crisis ever developed does not necessarily mean that our educational spokesmen had only been crying "wolf." It may well be that because their warning came early

enough and their appeal for remedial action was sufficiently forceful and effective, their crisis predictions never came true.

That experience caused me in past years to place a question mark behind the phrase "crisis in education" whenever I used it. Somehow I felt certain that our schools and colleges would turn the corner in fine shape before they reached the critical stage.

I no longer feel as confident as I once did, and I no longer place a question mark behind the term "crisis in education." For the first time in history it appears that the profound faith of the American people in their educational institutions has been shaken and their belief in the wisdom of our educational leaders and in the soundness of their goals or practices has turned to doubt and even to outright disapproval. If a vote of confidence were asked for today from the people across this nation in the management and policies of their educational institutions, it would in most states no longer be as favorable as it would have been twenty, ten or even five years ago.

This is true above all in regard to some of our most prominent universities and colleges, but also of many high schools and elementary schools. This is evident not only from the growing number of failures of school tax and bond elections—which in most areas offer the people the only organized way in which they can vote their displeasure—but also from numerous independent polls, letters and many other sources. How are schools and colleges to weather the onslaught to which they are now subjected, how are they to cope with their current and future problems, to progress and prosper in the years ahead, if they can no longer count on the affection and trust of the great majority of the American people upon whom their very existence depends?

So far, the flow of funds into education has not declined and continues to show a healthy rate of growth. Yet there are many voices heard, mostly from inside the establishment, which assert that inadequate financial support is at the root of their trouble and that lack of money is the most urgent problem in education which could be solved by the addition of several billion dollars in federal funds. Congress is being criticized for not appropriating enough money for education and the President is attacked for having vetoed an education appropriation earlier this year and for not having proposed the new and expanded programs which his critics urge upon him.

The President stated his reasons clearly in the Veto Message of January 27, the Message on School Reform of March 3 and the Message on Higher Education of March 19. Let me summarize them briefly:

1. Inflationary pressures, generated largely by eight years of deficit spending to the tune of \$57 billion, are still so intense that demands for federal funds for all purposes must be restrained and their total kept approximately within the frame of prospective revenues. To pursue an expansionary fiscal policy at this time would add fuel to the fires of inflation and could wreck serious harm, none the least on education.

2. Certain costly school programs introduced with great expectations a few years ago are not yielding the promised results. In fact, the entire concept of a clear-cut positive cost-quality relationship in education has been called into question by recent research.

3. The label "education" is not enough to justify claims for federal funds. There must be evidence that a proposed program offers the most effective solution available and a tangible return to the taxpayers.

The President criticized that "we are not getting as much as we should of the dollars

we spend," recommended several programs to correct existing shortcomings and promised:

"As we get more education for the dollar, we will ask Congress for more dollars for education."

Some of our critics claim that the budget is tight only because military outlays have been tremendously increased and that arms swallow most of the federal tax revenue which otherwise could be allocated to education and other social purposes. The facts are to the contrary:

In the current three-year period—FY 1968 to FY 1971—defense spending is being cut 9 percent, outlays for education and other social purposes boosted 47 percent, all other federal expenditures increased 21 percent. But the record of defense costs should probably be reviewed in a broader historical perspective:

Immediately after World War II, the military establishment was largely dismantled and outlays fell precipitously from \$80 billion in 1945 to between \$12 and \$13 billion annually from 1948-1950. This unilateral disarmament was one of the causes of the Korean action which shot defense costs up to \$50 billion in 1953. Since that time—that is between 1953 and FY 1971 as proposed by the President—defense expenditures increased 49 percent—approximately equal to the simultaneous rate of price rise. Spending for health, education, welfare and labor increased 944 percent, for all other functions 182 percent (see table).

More than half of the \$129 billion increase in Federal expenditures between 1953 and 1971 was applied to social purposes, less than one-fifth to defense. Defense meanwhile shrank from 64 percent of the Federal budget to 36 percent, from 13.6 percent of Gross National Product to about 7.2 percent.

In other words, the share of Federal revenues and of the Gross National Product allocated to national defense has been cut almost in half since 1953. Most of the huge savings were applied to social purposes, with education one of the main gainers. To slash our badly depleted defense establishment even faster or further in this troubled and hostile world would risk the nation's very existence in an irresponsible manner and be an invitation rather than a deterrent to war.

With only 6 percent of the world's population and between one-fourth and one-third of its developed resources, the American people now invest in educational institutions annually almost as much as all other nations combined. Nothing testifies more eloquently to the American faith in education than the priority which the people have granted it in financial terms. Over the past twenty years the support of schools and colleges from all sources has multiplied about eight times while personal consumption expenditures or business or personal investment multiplied only slightly more than three times. Expressed in dollars of constant value, personal consumption doubled while educational spending expanded five-fold.

Over the same period, the number of employees in private industry increased 38 percent while it tripled (+203 percent) in public education. In the rest of government, manpower grew 87 percent. These are impressive facts which make charges of neglect or starvation of education look plain silly.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES 1953 AND 1971

(Dollars in billions)

	National Defense	HEW- Labor	All other	Total
1953.....	\$49.4	\$7.1	\$20.4	\$77.0
1971*.....	73.6	74.3	57.6	205.6
Increase in percent.....	+49.0	+944.0	+182.0	+167.0

INCREASE IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, 1953-71

[Dollars in billions]

	Amount	Percent
National Defense.....	\$24.2	19
Health, Education, Welfare, Labor.....	67.2	52
All other.....	37.2	29
Total.....	128.6	100

*President's proposals as revised May 19, 1970

To be sure: school enrollment grew faster than the population as a whole. Twenty years ago the impending "tidal wave" of post-war babies faced the schools with a grave challenge. Would schools be able to obtain the resources required to expand their staffs and facilities in proportion to students? Would the American people be willing to provide the huge funds by traditional methods? Few observers thought at the time that the job could be done without a massive intervention of the federal government.

The task was truly stupendous: Between 1950 and 1970 public school enrollment nearly doubled, jumping from 25 million to 47 million pupils (= +88 percent). Nobody expected in 1950 that school support would multiply seven-fold in the succeeding 20 years, from \$5.4 billion to \$38.5 billion; but it did. Expressed in constant dollars, the increase equalled 350 percent—while enrollment, as mentioned, went up 88 percent, national income or product 125 percent.

What did this accomplish? While enrollment grew 88 percent, the instructional staff expanded 131 percent: classroom teachers +119 percent, non-teaching professional staff such as administrators, counselors, psychologists, nurses, librarians, etc. +358 percent. The ratio of the instructional staff to pupils was reduced from 1:26.1 to 1:21.3, which means that there are now 4.8 fewer pupils per teacher in the public schools than there were in 1950.

In his first education message in 1961 President Kennedy, in proposing federal school construction aid, suggested that 600,000 classrooms ought to be built during the 1960s to take care of all needs and that state and local governments would be unable to meet that goal unaided. Actually, about 700,000 new classrooms were constructed in the 1960s—without a federal construction aid program. There are now about five children fewer per classroom than there were in the early 1950s. The most amazing fact is not that these reductions in class size took place in a short number of years but that this was accomplished during the time of the sharpest enrollment expansion that America's public schools ever experienced, and that it was done largely by action of the people themselves, in thousands of tax and bond elections.

Of the \$33 billion that were added to the support of the public schools over the past twenty years, 93 percent came from state and local governments which were then as now alleged to be "hanging on their financial ropes." No program of general federal aid for school operations or construction was enacted, in spite of truly heroic efforts of its protagonists, in a campaign begun well over a century ago. Nothing testifies more clearly to the continued effectiveness of the traditional American way of government by the consent of the governed. In the current school year, 1969/70, the federal government supplied only 6.4 percent of the public school support, according to the National Education Association,¹ with most of it closely earmarked for special programs and little available for general support.

¹ According to other sources, 8%.

The time of enrollment growth in the public schools is over. Current projections suggest little or no increase in the 1970s—unless mass closings are forced on the private schools which still accommodate almost 6 million children. Barring such a development, the task of providing adequate support for the public schools should be far easier in the 1970s than it has been for several decades. There is one big IF in this expectation: IF the public schools can retain—or, in many cases, regain—the confidence and goodwill of the communities they serve.

So far we have recorded only the "input" into the schools: dollars, teachers, classrooms. It has always been customary to measure educational progress and quality by "input" factors—such as dollars expenditure per pupil or teacher-pupil ratio—not by "output" factors, that is improved skills and knowledge of the students.

Unfortunately, we have no record of "output" because school administrators have always strenuously resisted demands to introduce qualitative yardsticks into the schools by which the progress of students in essential skills and knowledge could be measured, recorded and compared.

In his School Reform Message, the President stressed the need for objective measurement of educational results. He added:

For years the fear of "national standards" has been one of the bugaboos of education. . . . The problem is that in opposing some mythical threat of "national standards" what we have too often been doing is avoiding accountability for our own local performance. We have, as a nation, too long avoided thinking of the productivity of the schools.

Many years ago we had at least a tentative gauge in the percentage of pupils held back. But the practice of having lagging pupils repeat a grade was largely abandoned when the schools discovered the secret of perpetual promotion.

Achievement test data on pupil skills in the 3Rs are now available only from research projects and from a few cities. James S. Coleman of Johns Hopkins University, who in 1965/66 headed the largest and most thorough examination of American public schools ever undertaken, was amazed to find: "The evidence revealed that within broad geographic regions, and for each racial and ethnic group, the physical and economic resources going into a school had very little relationship to the achievement coming out of it." He concluded that "if it were otherwise we could give simple prescriptions: increase teachers' salaries, lower classroom size, enlarge libraries, and so on. But the evidence does not allow such simple answers."

Reviewing the ensuing national debate in the New York Times Magazine of August 10, 1969, Christopher Jencks of the Harvard School of Education, summarized his conclusions: "Variations in schools' fiscal and human resources have very little effect on student achievement—probably even less than the Coleman Report implied."

The most detailed report now available on any city school system (New York City School Fact Book, City University of New York 1969) found:

"The evidence we have accumulated is somewhat surprising. We have recorded traditional variables that supposedly affect the quality of learning: class size, school expenditure, pupil/teacher ratio, condition of building, teacher experience and the like. Yet, there seems to be no direct relationship between these school measurements and performance. . . . Statistical data in that report show that reading and arithmetic achievements in the highest expenditures schools (\$1100 per pupil and up, median \$1330) average between 5 and 7 months behind those in the schools with the lowest expenditures (below \$600 per pupil, median

\$551). The teacher-pupil ratio was 1:25.9 in the high-achievement schools, 1:12.3 in the low-achievement schools.

But the belief in the educational magic of the dollar dies hard. Five years ago Congress enacted a \$1¼ billion-a-year program to raise the achievement level of millions of children from low-income backgrounds who were reported to lag one or several years behind national norms (averages) in basic skills. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for "compensatory education" and a few related programs now account for about half of all federal school funds.

Two years ago the Associated Press found in a nationwide survey: "Title I, the federal project on which \$3 billion has been spent in the hope of answering the educational needs of deprived children, is not working out. On this point, critics and supporters alike are agreed."

After reviewing the major "compensatory education" programs since 1957 the U.S. Civil Rights Commission found that "none of the programs seems to have raised significantly the achievements of participating pupils."

In his Message on School Reform, the President reported that:

The best available evidence indicates that most of the compensatory education programs have not measurably helped poor children catch up. . . . Recent findings on the two largest such programs are particularly disturbing. We now spend more than \$1 billion a year for educational programs under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Most of these have stressed the teaching of reading, but before-and-after tests suggested that only 19 percent of the children in such programs improve their reading significantly; 13 percent appear to fall behind more than expected; and more than two-thirds of the children remain unaffected—that is, they continue to fall behind. In our Headstart Program, where so much hope is invested, we find that youngsters enrolled only for the summer achieve almost no gains, and the gains of those in the program for a full year are soon matched by their non-Headstart classmates from similar poor backgrounds.

The records of thousands of projects from "Higher Horizons" and "More Effective Schools" in New York to "Banneker" in St. Louis, from "Madison" in Syracuse to the Berkeley schools—all of them started with great enthusiasm—tells a story of consistent failure to produce the educational improvement among so-called "deprived children" which their sponsors hoped for and promised.

What this adds up to is, of course, not that we should quit increasing school resources every year. The President made that abundantly clear—he recommended, in fact, several programs to bolster school support in certain critical areas besides proposing a system of federal revenue-sharing which will aid state and local governments generally.

The basic approach of the School Reform Message is: let us pursue methods, through research, that will accomplish what we are aiming at. But let us not go overboard until we know how what will work with children from slum backgrounds. Just spending billions of taxpayers' money is no adequate substitute for tangible achievements.

The New York City Master Plan (1969) declared: "The plain fact is that no one yet knows how to make a ghetto school work."²

² My colleague, Daniel P. Moynihan, commented on this a few months ago: "The plain fact is that nobody knows how to make a real ghetto school—that is one made up of European Jewish students—not work."

This has not kept New York City from multiplying its outlays generally, but particularly in schools in poverty areas, to the point where it now spends on the average about twice as much per pupil as other large cities. But students in New York City schools lag, on the average, far behind national norms—and they slipped back another two months in reading last year. What was the Board of Education's response? It demanded a 30 percent increase in operating funds—\$380 million—for next year (1970/71) besides a \$600 million appropriation for new construction. Not surprisingly, New York City authorities expect this to be paid by the rest of the country.

Most compensatory and similar programs for educational improvement place their main emphasis on reducing class size, although it has long been known from hundreds of research studies that there is no correlation between class size and pupil achievement. The Encyclopedia of Educational Research reported twenty years ago that:

On the whole, the statistical findings definitely favor large classes at every level of instruction except the kindergarten . . . the general trend of evidence places the burden of proof squarely upon the proponents of small classes.

Three years ago the Coleman report found that the teacher-pupil ratio "showed a consistent lack of relation to achievements among all groups under all conditions". But the myth that pupils learn more in smaller classes still flourishes and the demand for cutting class sizes continues while resistance to technological progress such as programmed learning with the help of machines or television and films grows. Could the explanation lie in a fact brought out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics last year? Commissioner Geoffrey H. Moore reported at a Congressional hearing last December that "the aggregate supply of trained teachers is expected to significantly exceed demand, if recent entry patterns in the occupation continue." He projected job openings between 1968 and 1980 at 2.4 million, the new supply of teachers at 4.2 million.

Youth unemployment has long been severe—one out of seven people between 16 and 21 is out of a job, and one out of four among non-white youths. In no other industrial country in the world is there a comparable problem of youth unemployment. But we have so far failed to study why we do so badly. Since the belief that education is the best answer to poverty has virtually become part of the American Creed, we might well look to the schools for a remedy.

Among the country's worst school systems by any yardstick save expenditures per pupil are the District of Columbia schools. But, there are exceptions. For example, Bell Vocational High School, 60 years old and almost all black, has little if any of the troubles that beset most other Washington schools and its graduates have no difficulty in landing jobs. So what does the Board of Education plan to do about it? You guessed it—it intends to abolish Bell and the other four vocational high schools.

There used to be an excellent academic high school in Washington, Dunbar. Some twenty years ago eighty percent of its graduates, almost all black, went to college. Reorganized under more recent rules, Dunbar is now as bad as Washington's other high schools. I should mention that my son has been attending a Washington public high school this past year.

Amidon was among the country's best schools—and many D.C. schools maintained at least a semblance of good education under the four-track system. The four-track system was abolished, Amidon was equalized with other D.C. schools—equal, that is, to the lowest schools in the country measured by pupil achievements.

It has widely been suggested that schooling should be started earlier so that disadvantaged children do not lag behind others when they reach first grade. Results of the massive Headstart program have so far not been convincing and efforts have been started to begin schooling even earlier, e.g., at three years. The number of 3 to 4 year olds in school has risen from 800,000 five years ago to 1.2 million—with the attendance among whites 15% and among non-whites 21%.

This may be all to the good. Would it help the educational process to begin at birth, as some have suggested? Nobody knows. Available studies have shown that the I.Q.'s of adopted children correlate with their natural parents from whom they have been separated since birth and bear little relationship to the foster home. Also, the I.Q.'s of identical twins reared apart are almost as closely correlated as the I.Q. of identical twins reared together. This seems to suggest that intervention at birth may come about nine months late.

Several research projects are now being sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which aim to find and identify methods of teaching "disadvantaged children" effectively. One project farms out the teaching of reading and other core subjects to independent contractors whose compensation varies according to the measurable progress of the students. Another project provides parents with vouchers, giving them a freedom of choice among schools, public or private, which they wish their children to attend.

Ventures of this type aim to stimulate imagination and, above all, competition among schools, which has so sadly been lacking under a system of virtual monopoly that left parents and students no practicable choice. How would you like to shop if there existed just one grocery store for your neighborhood and your only recourse were a complaint to a distant and quite independent board of grocery store supervisors? How good would service and values be under such a system?

To expand, intensify and systematize educational research, the President recommended to Congress the formation of a National Institute of Education. It will sponsor projects at schools, colleges and research centers as well as of individual scholars and also have some studies conducted by its resident staff. Ideas about improved education, no matter how attractive, must be tested before they are translated into huge undertakings. Some ventures in recent years did more harm than merely waste money. They were like the psychoanalyst who blamed his patient's appendicitis on early life experiences and tried to cure it on the couch.

Lavish promises to parents and taxpayers about improvement in educational achievements which went unredeemed have aroused widespread disappointment and deep unhappiness. Bitterness and recriminations have in many locations led to violence and senseless mob action whose consequences will plague us—and the affected children—for years. In numerous cities, well-intentioned men and women have raised demands or taken steps which not only split communities and multiplied civic strife and hatred but permanently damaged the education of millions of youngsters. Such action was often encouraged, sponsored or carried out by governmental authorities. I am reminded of a warning that Mr. Justice Brandeis gave more than four decades ago:

Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal,

well meaning but without understanding. (*Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 478.)

In many locations, action intended to improve the education of large numbers of children has actually worked to retard their progress, to create conflict and chaos and to alienate large numbers of residents from the public schools. Some schools have been virtually ruined and some cities could be destroyed in the process if it continues much longer.

There is dynamite all over the place and if we do not "cool it," if we permit it to heat up more, it may blow up in a major conflagration. The main losers then might be the schools but the victims will be the children whose hope for the future depends on getting an education in schools that can operate only if there is no disruption or turmoil.

I have always been a great believer in community control in education and in other public services. This is why I regret that neighborhood control of schools was never given a fair chance in the sections of New York City where it was intended to be tried out. Intensified scientific research for finding more effective methods combined with greater influence of the parents on school policies might well offer the most promising solution. Actions and policies strongly opposed by the parents or lending to a diminished role of the parents in school affairs are unlikely to help the children. By pursuing a course that alienates their communities, some public schools may well be sawing off the branch on which they are sitting.

Grave problems loom ahead for the schools, public and private, and some of those problems are of a financial nature. This is why the President established by Executive Order a Commission on School Finance, which will report to him within two years. But the financial problems of the public schools don't amount to a crisis—unless the schools themselves, by their actions further weaken the affection and confidence of the parents and taxpayers upon whom their support inescapably depends. At this time, the danger of a deep and lasting split between the American public and its school system is present, but not immediately threatening. It is imminent and grave in the case of universities and colleges. I will therefore devote my remaining time to the ominous developments on campuses from coast to coast, which jeopardize the future of higher education in the United States.

The administrators of colleges and universities no less than those of elementary and high schools tend to view finances as their most pressing problem. "The most critical question facing higher education today is how to find sufficient resources", declared the Association of American Universities in April 1968. Considering the growing wave of campus revolts in recent years, some of us may doubt that finding sufficient resources truly is "the most critical question facing higher education today". Finding leaders capable of coping with the violent uprising could be more crucial.

Enrollment at Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) multiplied about three times over the past twenty years, revenues ten times. With the rate of enrollment growth certain to diminish in the years ahead, the task of obtaining sufficient income should also turn easier. In all likelihood, though, it will not.

While enrollment was about evenly divided between public and private institutions until about 1950, there has since been a decided shift evident toward public IHL; seventy to seventy-five percent of the new students now enroll at state and city colleges, largely because of the ever-widening tuition gap. State institutions now charge less than one-fourth of the tuitions of private colleges. The latter depend on private donations to make up the difference between

instructional costs and charges. But their gift receipts have not been rising as rapidly as the state taxes which support public IHL.

If present trends continue, most of the 1500 private colleges—about two-thirds of all IHL in the country—may within the next two decades have to close their doors or turn public. This would, to all appearances, not break the heart of those who set the tuition policy of public colleges.

General operational support of all IHL, from Federal or state sources is unlikely to materialize because two-thirds of all private IHL are church-connected. This raises constitutional questions that have so far proven insuperable. To provide federal funds only for the operation of public IHL would, of course, sound the death knell for the private colleges which Congress most assuredly does not want to do.

This is one major reason why the President in his Higher Education Message of March 19th stressed aid to students rather than to institutions. In his presidential campaign and in earlier years, Mr. Nixon has strongly advocated tax credits, for donations and for tuitions, as a means of aiding higher education. The Senate adopted such proposals on several occasions and a bill of that type could pass Congress any time with broad bipartisan support. The President has not changed his views on educational tax credits but has not pushed the proposal because higher education associations, with some exceptions, have taken an equivocal, and in some cases a negative attitude. Heads of institutions prefer direct grants which enable them to spend the sums according to their own judgment; they dislike indirect aid such as tax credits which would confer on parents and other college supporters greater powers in the decision-making process. Sponsors of educational tax credit plans, though they constitute a commanding majority, according to several polls, have so far not effectively organized to get their program adopted.

In recent years the urgency of pleas for the grant of direct federal funds to institutions has sharply intensified. This expresses the fear of the heads of institutions that their established supporters have become increasingly disillusioned and alienated and can no longer be depended upon to increase the funds as rapidly and as unquestioningly in future years, as they have in the past.

Mass riots, violence and wanton destruction that have taken place on about 500 campuses over the past six years—the most serious ones within the past two years—the forcible disruption of studies and abject surrender of orderly administration that have occurred and been permitted to continue, have seriously eroded the respect, affection and genuine pride which the American people have traditionally accorded higher education and its leaders. Outright hostility shown by faculty and students on many major campuses toward all efforts that would tend to strengthen the defense capacity of the United States, and violent action against defense research and ROTC activities, have widened the chasm between town and gown and turned admiration into suspicion, antagonism and scorn.

I can obviously not, in this context, adequately discuss the record and far-reaching implications of the campus revolt that started in Berkeley six years ago. But, neither can I avoid talking about the impact these events are likely to have on the future support of colleges and universities.

Several polls within the past few months suggest that the American public disapproves, with a ratio of between 3:1 and 5:1, of the student disruptions or closing down of colleges and universities by mobs of students, faculty and outsiders, that it favors the calling of law enforcement agencies and the National Guard on campus where college and administrators are unable to maintain orderly operations.

According to a Gallup Poll in March 1969, 94% of the public wants Federal aid with-

drawn from campus lawbreakers. Administrators were not listening.

Possibly the most significant indicator of the public's resentment was expressed in a Gallup Poll on May 13-14 for *Newsweek* (May 25) in which respondents were asked who was primarily responsible for the deaths of four students at Kent State University: 11% blamed the National Guard, 58% the demonstrating students, 31% gave no opinion. Since the facts at Kent State are not yet fully known—the President has appointed a commission to investigate the tragedy—the vote expresses the "gut reaction" or basic attitude of the public more than its judgment in the particular case.

The public sentiment is along being reflected in adverse votes on education issues on state and local ballots and is beginning to show in a diminished flow of incoming gifts. Sooner or later it may also be reflected in the treatment that colleges and universities can expect at the hands of state legislators who, after all, must shape their votes to conform with the wishes of their constituents, if they want to continue in public office.

This is why administrators look increasingly to the federal government for funds. But the prevailing sentiment in Congress bodes no good. According to latest reports, the President's recommendations and other proposals to aid higher education may not be acted upon by the 91st Congress—except for the establishment of a secondary market in guaranteed student loans—largely because of the campus revolt.

The public's ire is directed at the militants who have engaged in orgies of vandalism and destruction, but also at trustees, administrators and faculty members who have permitted them to do so with impunity. Those campus authorities have defaulted on their duty to protect the civil rights of other students and faculty, an overwhelming majority, to pursue their education, teaching and research without being subjected to coercion, intimidation, and physical assault.

It is difficult to recall now that the campus revolution started as a movement purportedly for free speech. Before long it manifested itself in preventing all who would disagree with the militants—faculty, students or public officials—from speaking. High officials of the U.S. government, such as then Vice President Humphrey and Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, were physically attacked when they tried to speak. Neither the President nor his top advisers would now be able to speak on most major U.S. campuses. Is this an example of dialogue or free speech?

Does anybody really believe that the student revolt would end or abate if the war in Vietnam and Cambodia ended tomorrow? The leaders of the action would invent some other cause. They do not want reform—they seek bigger ends.

The President of Stanford University and the president of its student body have recently acknowledged that behind most action is a small hard-core of revolutionaries who are "bent on nothing less than the destruction of the university, primarily as a way of bringing down the society itself."

Acts of arson, burglary and vandalism were committed on the Stanford campus in recent months. 45 policemen were injured in just two nights. The beautiful building in which my office is located—completed less than three years ago—was and still is partially wrecked. But it is in a better shape than the nearby Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences which was firebombed. An Indian scholar's life work there was destroyed. More than 30 ROTC buildings were fire-bombed and many other structures burnt on various campuses. Non-conforming faculty and staff were beaten up.

There are laws against such acts on the books of every state, imposing long prison sentences. Are the criminals who committed

these acts now serving time in penitentiaries? How many of the faculty and students who participated have been expelled? Blackmail and violence have often been rewarded by college administrators with concessions and surrender. Most of the time, little effort was exerted to apprehend offenders and if identified they were usually granted amnesty. Small wonder that a reign of terror continues on campuses. Nor will it end until either the presidents and trustees of colleges and universities live up to their responsibilities—or somebody else does the job for them, which would, of course, be far less desirable.

Nobody questions the rights of students, faculty or administrators to make their individual disagreements known with any action of the U.S. government, foreign or domestic. But a university which takes a stand on a political issue—and a violent stand at that—destroys its value and forfeits its claim to be a center for impartial study and teaching. It transgresses upon the rights of the members of the academic community with different views.

It is too often forgotten that most parents send their children to college to learn, not to decide public policy. If students were mature enough to exercise such judgments, they would not need to go to college. But even if all seven million students on U.S. campuses disagreed with official U.S. policy—which, of course, they do not—what makes anybody think that they would have the right to force the hand of the lawful government and the duly-elected representatives of 205 million Americans? What makes the dissidents think that they can run the country—without subjecting themselves to the inconveniences of having to run for elective office to gain the consent of the governed before they try to usurp the right to govern? What the leaders of this movement really want is, of course, not to run the country but to ruin it. Shall we let them do it?

A society that does not defend itself is bound to destroy itself. To yield to mob rule is to end government by the people.

Less than two months ago I spent a week of discussions in Moscow. Soviet officials were quite frank in saying that they expect American foreign policy to be influenced and largely governed by domestic events, including violent mob action on our campuses. The Soviets expect that they can sit back and wait until we give in. They are, I believe, mistaken. But I am not surprised that they feel this way.

There are now signs that the patience of the American people is wearing thin. If aroused groups resorted to vigilante action as their last resort, as some did in New York a few weeks ago, the results could be tragic for our colleges and for the free institutions we cherish. A "backlash" could gravely harm our system of higher education, built up by the dedicated efforts of generations of Americans in more than three hundred years. Let us not forget that Rome was built in seven centuries, destroyed in a few days. There is still time to keep our higher educational institutions from going down. I hope and trust that it will be used well.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK HORTON
COMMENDS SLOVAK ORGANIZATIONS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as representatives from Slovak organizations across the country gather in New York this week, I am pleased to call my col-

leagues' attention to the Slovak World Congress.

Freedom-loving people of all countries take pride in the struggle of the Slovak nation toward national self-determination. The history of the Slovak independence movement is long and troubled. In many respects it reflects the democratic traditions of the United States.

I applaud the goal of the Slovak World Congress to work for the right of the Slovak nation for self-determination and to continue to struggle against the Communist threat.

The American people, who often take the privilege of a democratic society for granted, certainly respect the Slovak national experience and support their goals.

Another goal of the Slovak World Congress is to promote among the Slovaks throughout the free world a concentrated effort in taking a greater part in the public life and contribute in every way possible to the countries of which they have become citizens.

Because of the upheavals of the Slovak nation, the Slovak people are now scattered throughout the world. Yet they endeavor to preserve their collective identity as Slovaks. At the same time, they have made invaluable contributions to the world and have become part of the community they have chosen as their second home.

Mr. Speaker, the goals of the Slovak World Congress are indeed commendable. The experience of the Slovak nation for independence and unity can serve as an example for all of us.

PHILIPPINE WEEK IN CHICAGO

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the week of June 12 to 19, the Filipino Community in Chicago celebrated Philippine Week in that city. The dates for this celebration were chosen to coincide with memorable dates in the history of the Philippines. June 12 marked the 72d anniversary of Philippine independence from Spain and June 19 was the birthdate of one of the Philippine's national heroes, Dr. Jose Rizal.

Throughout the week, there were many exhibits at Chicago's Museum of Science and Industry featuring Philippine art, antiques, handicrafts, and various commercial and industrial products of the country. The day of June 13 was devoted to a highlighting of the cultural aspects of Philippine society. Folk dancers demonstrated native dances from several periods of Philippine history, a fashion show presented models wearing traditional and regional costumes, and typical Filipino music was performed. The highlight of the week was the State Street Parade on June 20 in which decorated floats depicted historical events and geographical features of the Philippines.

Today I want to congratulate the Filipino citizens of Chicago for their suc-

cessful observance of Philippine Week. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, I have long been deeply interested in the Philippines and have valued my friendship with the Philippine Ambassador in Washington. Festivities such as Philippine Week should be praised and encouraged not only for helping to preserve traditions and customs of one nationality group but also for helping to promote a greater sense of international understanding among all peoples.

SMUGGLING NARCOTICS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, article 5 in the Christian Science Monitor series dealing with drugs gives a great deal of insight into how drugs get from the growing fields to the markets. Apparently much of these processed narcotics are carried by young drug users who are amateurs in the area of smuggling. This article serves as warning to those who might feel compelled to try his hand at the illicit drug traffic that the penalties are most severe in a number of nations—nations where parole and commutation of sentences are relatively rare.

The article follows:

YOUNG PEOPLE ON POT TRAIL GRADUATE TO
NARCOTICS SMUGGLING

(By John Hughes)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—All along the "pot trail" the story is the same.

From Istanbul an American girl mails her friends a few hashish-plant leaves "for a joke." Turkish authorities do not find it so funny. They jail her for three years for narcotics possession, with another 10 years for exporting.

A Peace Corps worker saves a Norwegian hippie's life. The Norwegian tried to jump off a building while on a "trip."

An American dope addict goes on a shooting spree, killing three Turkish policemen and wounding seven other people before he is himself shot and killed.

In Thailand a young American, already jailed on a narcotics offense, seriously mutilates himself with a razor blade while on a "trip." Thai authorities gave him medical treatment, but resist American Embassy pleas for his release.

Into the American Embassy in Afghanistan staggers a young girl. Her mind is "blown" by drugs. She is pregnant. She has been used as a prostitute for months. In response to the embassy's cabled appeal for help, her parents disown her.

STORY GROWS COMPLICATED

The length of the "pot trail" is littered with tragedies such as these. They are by no means unrepresentative. All are traceable to narcotics.

Drug usage by these youthful wanderers through Asia and the Middle East is often tragic enough. But the story does not end there. A new and more serious factor is the extent to which many are trafficking in narcotics across international borders.

Some have been recruited by big-time narcotics merchants to smuggle drugs into the United States on a professional basis. One such team of couriers is working for a nar-

cotics ring on the American West Coast. They carry round-the-world tickets. They stay at luxury hotels like the Intercontinental in Karachi. If caught, bail and legal defense are quickly forthcoming. They keep quiet. They do not tell the name of their employer.

At present, hashish is the main merchandise they carry. Derived from the resin of the cannabis plant and with much more "kick" than marijuana, it fetches hefty prices on the American market.

Earlier this year, American customs agents made one of their biggest hashish hauls ever at Boston's Logan Airport. Ripping into wooden crates of musical instruments airfreighted from India, they found false bottoms filled with 600 pounds of hashish. Smart follow-up work by Indian customs officials and police uncovered another 745 pounds in New Delhi, ready for shipment.

The focus of this series is mainly on "hard" drugs like heroin. But the booming hashish trade is ominous. Hashish users are formerly marijuana smokers seeking a stronger "kick." When hashish begins to pall, it is to the "hard" drugs that the confirmed user must next look.

BIG-TIME PROSPECTS LOOM

If the demand for opium increases, or traditional sources are pinched off, experts foresee Afghanistan leaping into the big-time illicit narcotics business.

Technically illegal in Afghanistan, opium production is rife, particularly in such provinces as Badakhshan, Herat, and Nanghar. Already, perhaps 150 tons a year is smuggled over the border into Iran. Across Afghanistan's border with Pakistan, wild Pathan tribesmen roam with contemptuous disregard for authority, running opium, guns, gold, transistor radios, and whatever else makes money.

If the demand for Afghan opium (and its end product, heroin) grows in the West, the channels for smuggling already are being established. The hippie hashish couriers are paving the way.

The International Narcotics Control Board of the United Nations says it is "much disquieted" by the opium situation in Afghanistan. The Afghan Government admits that illicit production is beyond its control. But, says Foreign Ministry spokesman Amanullah Hasrat, "We don't have the equipment for detection and control. We need help, and we've appealed to the United Nations."

If opium production is to be wiped out in Afghanistan, the whole economy needs a sharp uplift. So far, there is no sign of the kind of broad, foreign-aided program that would make that possible.

The "pot trail" begins in Europe and winds down through the lands where drugs are cheap and easy to come by: Turkey, Lebanon, Iran, Afghanistan. Kabul, the Afghan capital and a haven for drug users, is known as the "Big K."

The trail continues through the Khyber Pass to Pakistan and on through India to Nepal, another pothead paradise. For some the trail goes even farther, to Thailand and Laos.

EASY PROFITS TEMPTING

Surging back and forth along this trail, on foot, hitchhiking, or by train or rickety bus, are thousands of young people from Europe and the United States. Some are students, seeing the world during vacation time. Others are hippies, bearded flower children, and dropouts from society, with no plans to go home. Not all are potheads.

But users and nonusers alike are tempted by the quick profits to be made from smuggling a kilo or two of drugs from a country where the supply is great to one where demand is high.

They move through countries where, despite official tut-tutting, the attitude toward narcotics is largely permissive. Drugs come easier than chewing gum.

Outside the Afghan capital of Kabul, the opium poppy sprouts in valleys almost within eyesight of government ministries. In adjacent Pakistan, children buy opium both from government-licensed dealers and illegal merchants.

Government spokesmen argue that drug taking is alien to local culture and has been stimulated by the inflow of Western hippies. Says one Pakistani official: "We are still modernizing ourselves. Alcohol and narcotics are equally taboo in our society."

Nevertheless some government officials in Pakistan themselves smoke hashish. So do Army generals in Afghanistan. Technically illegal, hashish is nevertheless readily available. At one party in the Pakistani capital of Islamabad, the host sent out for a kilo. The price: \$15.

Hashish (known as "charas" in India and Pakistan) is the more potent product of the cannabis plant, derived from the resin. But the milder cannabis leaf ("bhang") is not controlled. Ground up with almond and pistachio, and diluted with milk, it is guzzled by the gallon.

TRUCK DRIVERS INVOLVED

Pakistani truck drivers are usually good for a couple of lumps of hashish. Their transport network makes it easy for them to move it from one end of the country to the other. They also use it themselves. One explained:

"The only way we can make any money is by driving round the clock. We use hashish to stay awake at night."

Hospitable policemen in both Afghanistan and Pakistan sometimes offer hippies a joint of "hash."

With this lax approach to drug use, some hippies have scented easy money for little risk. A couple of kilos of hashish, bought cheaply in Pakistan or Afghanistan, may fetch enough in the United States to support them for a couple of years. Some students have sought to finance their college studies with the profits from hashish smuggling.

GROUND RULES VARY

In many cases, the risk is greater than they imagined. Some countries are easy-going on drug users but throw the book at traffickers. Some countries still give a wrist slap for narcotics offenses. But others like Iran have introduced capital punishment—and apply it.

Some governments are particularly rough on foreigners. They go looking for them to show that foreigners, and not local citizens, are responsible for their narcotics problem. Often the pusher who sells drugs to the foreigner tips off the police.

In Pakistan—a good source of hashish—penalties for trafficking are still light. Karachi's police chief, Deputy Inspector General Mahommed Yusuf Orakzai, says he thinks they should be tougher. But at present, an offender spends only a few months in jail.

In Afghanistan, the foreigner caught trafficking by customs officers may simply be given a scare, then get sent on his way. Some hippies found with drugs at Kabul Airport have got off with a night at the police station, seizure of their baggage, and expulsion on the next plane.

The story is much different in Turkey, Lebanon and other countries where a foreigner may get 10 years to life imprisonment for trafficking in narcotics.

More than 400 Americans are currently in foreign jails for narcotics offenses. The conditions are often indescribable. Cells are overcrowded, filthy, ridden with rats. Food is foul. Homosexual assault is common. Parole and remission of sentence are rare. Says one observer in Lebanon:

"In this country they don't give prisoners time off for good behavior. They give them more time for bad behavior."

Foreign embassies can do little when their citizens fall foul of the narcotics laws in

such countries. Though harassed by influential parents, congressmen, and senators, American consular officials explain that there is little alternative but for American youths to serve their sentences.

SPREADING THE WORD

What some governments are trying to do is drive home in advance to young travelers the ominous consequence of drug smuggling. In British and American embassies, notices warn visitors of the penalties. Visitors collecting mail are given similar information slips. In some countries there now are warning boards at the borders.

Last year the American consul general in Istanbul devised a plan to warn American hippies that Istanbul was not a "friendly and congenial place" for drug users and traffickers.

A retired Peace Corps worker circulated in hippie haunts explaining legal risks and penalties. He probably saved a number of Americans from being arrested. The American embassy in Spain sent one of its officers on a similar educational tour of hippie-frequented areas.

With many hippies, the narcotics smuggling is relatively small-scale stuff.

In Pakistan, hashish comes in a sole-shaped pack about half an inch thick. The hippie tries to get through customs hiding a kilo for himself, and perhaps a kilo or two to sell.

Methods are amateur. Many hide hashish in their portable transistor radios. But the word has gone out to customs officers. Now that is often the first place they look.

Many hippies travel barefoot, or in sandals. One with boots may have his heels full of hashish.

Others roll hashish in their prayer beads. Or stuff it in the back of picture frames.

One Dutch hippie in Afghanistan was even caught with a plaster cast on his foot full of hashish.

PROS ENLARGE SHIPMENTS

As the professionals take over, the shipments get bigger. Recently Pakistani police found 160 pounds of hashish stuffed in a leather Oriental cushion, consigned as part of a furniture shipment. Other shipments range up to 60 or 70 kilos.

A bomb scare at Beirut Airport cost one syndicate two suitcases full of hashish. Carried by a girl courier en route to Geneva from Kabul, the bags were held by Lebanese airport officials for additional excess baggage charges.

Then a bomb scare triggered a luggage search. Police found no bombs—but did get the hashish.

Here and there, the professionals lose a shipment. But there are loopholes and contradictions enough in the narcotics laws of different countries for them to weave their way through. Professional traffickers are usually better able to exploit these than the amateur, hippie smuggler caught with a kilo or two of hash.

India, for example, has been complimented on its opium-control system. Some 170,000 Indian farmers grow opium legally, according to D. P. Anand, chairman of the Central Board of Excise. They sell it to the state, which makes \$10 million a year shipping it abroad for legitimate, medical purposes. For higher yields per acre, the farmers get more money. This incentive system has apparently done much to curb illicit diversion.

Foreign law-enforcement officers are enthusiastic about the thoroughness of Indian police on major antinarcotic investigations.

Yet hashish flows like a tidal race through India from neighboring Nepal. From the seaport of Calcutta it is shipped clandestinely to destinations all over the world. The Indian Government makes representations to Nepal.

But these are muted because India's relations with Nepal are delicate nurtured. Just

the other side of Nepal lies Communist China. It too is wooing the border-straddling country.

SUNFLOWERS SUBSTITUTED

In Lebanon, authorities have cut back heroin production. In hopes of eradicating cannabis production for hashish, the government has substituted sunflowers. Their seeds, for vegetable oil, fetch good prices. Lebanon has won international plaudits for its enterprise.

Mahmoud el-Banna, director general of the internal-security force, says he hopes cannabis will be completely wiped out by next year. But influential Lebanese politicians are substantial landowners in the cannabis-growing area around Baalbek.

Sunflowers are certainly being grown—but in between them are rows of cannabis. Some experts say this year's cannabis crop is a bumper one.

In countries like Pakistan and Afghanistan the narcotics trafficker who gets caught serves only a short sentence, perhaps only pays a fine, before he is back in illegal business. One American found smuggling out two kilos of hashish in his shoes was told by Pakistani customs officers: "Next time, don't carry so much."

Without tighter laws and stiffer sentences, the narcotics flow out of this part of the world seems destined to continue and probably grow.

THE CASE FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORMS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks this House will be considering legislation of historic importance. The subject will be congressional reforms and the issue may well determine the fate of our present system of representational government. If strong reforms are not adopted to make the House of Representatives more responsive to the needs of the people, I fear that its power to affect policy may be eroded beyond redemption.

The subject of congressional reform was recently explored by the Washington correspondent for the McClatchy Newspapers of California, Michael Green.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Green's series on reforms is excellent journalism and I would encourage all the Members of the House to give it a careful reading.

The series follows:

FRUSTRATION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES' YOUNG TURKS—I

"The House of Representatives is absurd and aloof in its insistence that it need make no dramatic changes at all in procedures and machinery developed to understand and solve problems of an agricultural, rural America of the 18th Century."

—Rep. Jerome R. Waldie, D-Calif.

(By Michael Green)

WASHINGTON.—Plato used his famous allegory of shadows on the wall of a cave to prove divine existence.

Proof that most members of Congress actually exist also rests on a resort to analogy.

For until congressmen are well into their fifth, sixth or seventh terms and beyond, they are invisible to the naked eye, their existence confirmed only by the quiet shadows they throw across the floor and walls of the congressional cave and occasionally across a TV screen in cities in their home districts.

The discovery made by the larger world that these congressmen actually exist, made whenever one of them bursts into the ebbing twilight of congressional seniority, recalls the moment of recognition that so delighted the early thinkers like Plato.

"Behold! human beings housed in an underground cave . . . here they have been from childhood, and have their legs and necks chained so that they cannot move and can only see before them."

Members of Congress express it in more modern terms today.

"Being elected to Congress is like going into retirement," said one junior, four-term member recently. "I consider myself retired."

SOME ADVANTAGES

Looking forward to campaigning hard for his fifth term, he was candid about the job's numerous advantages.

"I make about \$25,000 from my law practice, but I don't have to practice law anymore. And I make \$42,500 from being a member of Congress, but I don't have to practice Congress much, either."

He smiled and shook his head as if in disbelief that all the idealistic hopes and dreams he had had when he first entered Congress had come to this. "It's a great life."

Agreed another young member: "As some guy said, it beats heavy lifting."

He, too, plans to run for re-election. But the time when he may decide to shuck it all and get out draws closer. The thought, he confides, becomes increasingly attractive.

Both young congressmen share a number of common traits. Each, despite his portrayals of soft indulgent congressional living, is a hard-working, conscientious member, more than earning his pay and wishing only that he had been able to do and accomplish more.

Each is frustrated by a system he believes is hopelessly outdated in its procedures and unresponsive to the times. It is a system in which power in the House has become fragmented and scattered into the hands of aging committee chairmen who administer their committees like so many medieval baronies, each with its own special interests, domestic policies and sometimes, foreign policies, as well.

The result is that the House resembles a sort of drunken centipede, all legs going in opposite directions at the same time.

The two hard-working congressmen who picture themselves in "retirement" were really using shock terms to portray what they felt was the obscurity and irrelevance to which members are assigned who have not yet neared seniority.

A congressman from Los Angeles, Rep. Thomas Rees, put it this way in a recent statement to his constituents:

"When we refer to ourselves as the 'younger' members, I should explain that most of us are in our 40s, and that, while we are not considered young by those outside the environs of Capitol Hill, in the House we are considered to be in diapers when the Speaker is 78 years old and the chairman of the Rules Committee is 80.

"In fact, if there was ever a lost generation, we are it. The kids don't trust anyone over 30, and the old bull elephants of the House don't trust anyone under 60. Those of us in between are the limbo generation."

Rees tried to explain to his constituents that the House of Representatives was "not like the outside world":

"Nothing changes. A congressman has his set place in the fixed galaxy which is ruled by the all-high-holy principle of 'seniority'. The only changes of position in this medieval paradise occurs when: 1. A member dies. 2. A member is defeated for reelection. 3. A member actually decides to retire voluntarily—a rare occurrence. Other than these terminal contingencies, the system remains the same."

While seniority and experience are im-

portant factors, he says, the system at present denies "ability, competence, knowledge, ambition, vigor, youth, awareness and education."

Recalling his experience as a freshman when he first met the seniority system head-on, he compares it with "taking a dip in the Arctic Ocean in December." Seniority, he noted, determines a member's committee assignment, his seat at the committee table, when he is allowed to ask a question of a committee witness, the size and location of his office, the location of his parking space, and when he is given recognition to debate a bill or offer an amendment on the floor.

"We all knew when we ran for Congress that a seniority system existed, but we didn't know that it was completely, 200 per cent inflexible and covered everything on Capitol Hill except the use of the public restrooms. There at least we have equal rights."

The inflexibility of the seniority system, the young congressmen believe, is only one of the basic ills which slowly erodes the energy, idealism and hopes of dedicated men who enter Congress and strive thereafter, sometimes for years, to try and solve urgent national problems before succumbing, at last, to either the system or to their own frustrations.

WALDIE'S CONCERN

Rep. Jerome Waldie, the two-term Democratic congressman from Contra Costa County who recently challenged Speaker John W. McCormack in the House Democratic caucus, is more concerned over the diffusion of power and the absence of any effective central leadership.

Though other reformers like Rees and Rep. Allard K. Lowenstein, D-NY, disagree with him, Waldie would give the Speaker full power to appoint and remove committee chairmen on any basis he saw fit. Party caucuses would pick the rest of the membership of the committees.

"When you know who exercises power, you can fix responsibility and remedy abuses," Waldie argues. "But when power is so diffused that nobody knows who exercises it or fails to exercise it, there is no remedy."

Nor, he continues, can Congress function truly as a separate branch of government and in balance with the executive. Though Democrats overwhelmingly control the House, nonexistent leadership and the diffusion of power among the committee chairmen has made the fact of a Democratic majority as irrelevant as Waldie feels Congress itself has become in confronting national problems.

"Insofar as anyone now exercises leadership in the House, I would say it is exercised by the President and Jerry Ford, the Republican minority leader."

Formerly the majority leader of the California Assembly, Waldie would model the House after the body he knew under the tenure of Jess Unruh as Speaker, with all the modern, up-to-date research facilities and other devices Unruh introduced to strengthen the Assembly as an independent branch and with the kind of party discipline and cohesion necessary to produce effective legislative programs.

For at least a few California congressmen, the contrast between their earlier service in the Assembly under Unruh and the system they have encountered in Congress is a basis for much of their present disillusion and zeal for House reform.

"In the Assembly, you really felt you could get something done if you had a good idea, and you didn't have to wait forever to do it," says Rep. Robert L. Leggett, D-Vallejo, one of the "Fearless Five" on the House Armed Services Committee who has futilely but consistently challenged the autocratic rule of Chairman Mendel Rivers, D-SC.

Rep. Rees was another who found his talents and energies quickly put to good use in the California Assembly and who, like

Leggett, Waldie and others, is determined to modernize procedures in the House.

"I've had it with House customs," he declared after three years of working behind-the-scenes to change the system. "I see no other way than by direct challenge of changing the House to become the vital and responsive body that it must be."

Lowenstein, the young reformer who launched the "dump Johnson" movement in 1968 and was elected to Congress that fall, quickly learned that the possibility of leadership—or even a voice—in national affairs, was even more remote in the House than it had seemed when the political pros had first told him he had no chance of dislodging an incumbent president.

NO RECOGNITION

He was appalled upon reaching the House to find that issues were seldom debated, votes often not recorded, little seemed being done to confront urgent problems, and that militants such as himself were not even defeated by the Establishment—they were merely ignored.

"All the tests people use to decide whether you are a good congressman have almost nothing to do with whether you are a good congressman," he said. Attending roll calls, co-sponsoring bills, putting speeches in the Congressional Record furnished a way to appear busy while avoiding quieter, more substantive accomplishment.

He quickly identified himself with the young reform congressmen like Rees, whom he admired for trying to bring about basic reform, becoming one of a dozen or so leaderless members who meet regularly with each other on reform issues.

"I want the power in the caucus," Lowenstein argues. "Let the members decide who the committee chairmen should be."

Leggett agrees, fearing that putting too much power in the hands of the Speaker could produce a dictatorial leadership which would be even more autocratic than the present committee chairmen.

Though Waldie's fellow reformers prefer "participatory democracy" in choosing committee chairmen, his own remedy of strengthening the House leadership finds apparent support in the view of at least one historian.

In his book "Power in Washington," Douglas Cater traced the present diffusion of power and resultant weakening of Congress as the product of earlier reforms which produced consequences opposite those intended.

Thus, the revolt against the tyranny of Speaker Joe Cannon and the House Rules Committee early in this century resulted not in eliminating the abuses of power but rather in dividing the power among equally autocratic but more invulnerable committee chairmen.

Later, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which reduced the number of committees over which the autocrats held sway, did little more than concentrate the power of remaining committee chairmen. Additional weakening of the rules committee made the Speaker no less weak and the committee chairmen no less invincible.

The result, Cater recounts, is that even so strong a personality as the late Speaker Sam Rayburn never dared challenge the chairmen openly, and McCormack has lacked even Rayburn's capacity to get his way at least some of the time on major issues through sheer force of presence and legislative skill.

Thus, the young reformers find the House in the 1970s to be irrelevant and impotent in the face of the revolutionary changes taking place in the country at large and the urgent problems they create. Says Waldie:

"Crime is increasing astronomically; our cities are literally decaying; our environment is being lost; our people are losing confidence in themselves and in their institutions and are being overtaken by fear of many things—"

all symptoms of a deterioration in America and its institutions of stability."

HOUSE REACTION

In the face of this, he notes despairingly, the House "too often does not seem to even note the existence of those problems, let alone appear to be seeking means of responding."

Some, like Rees, Lowenstein, Leggett, Waldie, and others, are trying. But grounds for optimism seem remote when young congressmen can confront the kind of everyday experience one member did.

After serving actively for several years on one committee, the congressman was startled the other day to learn that when the clerk called his name at a committee session, the aged chairman leaned forward and inquired, puzzled: "Who is he?"

YOUNG CONGRESSMAN INTRUDES UPON CUSTOM—II

"The timing is bad."

—Rep. Morris K. Udall, D-Ariz.

"The timing is always bad if you have to stand up."

—Rep. Jerome R. Waldie, D-Calif.

(By Michael Green)

WASHINGTON.—They all work within yards of each other in one of the three busy House office buildings that stand in a row across the street from the Capitol building: The quasi-respectable, traditional reformers of the House, like Rep. Richard Bolling, D-Mo., and Rep. Morris K. Udall, D-Ariz.; the new young reformers—more impatient and less respectable, and the senior members of the congressional establishment who understand neither group and are the most respectable of all.

Within the work-a-day world of Congress, members of the three groups mix continually in more or less good-natured fellowship and rivalry. Mortal disagreements over legislation and policy on the floor quickly fade in the personal, face-to-face socializing that attends congressional existence in hundreds of daily, commonplace encounters.

But when members retire to the privacy of their offices, the differences that separate them in political philosophy and the jockeying for position and power surface.

On a given morning, a tour of the offices provides a bird's eye view of the unsettled state of Congress early in 1970 and of the competing groups of men who make it so.

The anxious talk and quiet struggles taking place on the particular day center around a resolution that 45-year-old Rep. Jerome R. Waldie, a two-term Democrat congressman from Contra Costa County, has just announced he plans to introduce at the next House Democratic caucus.

The resolution is brief and simple. It calls for a vote of no confidence in the House Democratic leadership headed by 78-year-old Speaker John W. McCormack.

A symbolic gesture of defiance everyone knows is doomed at the outset, nevertheless it touches exposed nerves everywhere and quickly becomes the chief topic of conversation in the privacy of the inner offices, in the corridors, at breakfast in the members' dining room, on the miniature subway car that shuttles back and forth between the House office buildings and the Capitol.

There are few people the resolution does not worry, from the loyalists who hover around McCormack to his traditional enemies who fought for reform in past years.

It is disturbing in its unexpectedness. Waldie is virtually unknown. There has been no particular plan or scheme by the traditional reformers of which this was to be a part. The leadership, too, is taken by surprise. The motives behind the resolution are unclear and its capacity for mischief uncertain. Older reform leaders and House establishment leaders alike are on the spot.

Of no one is this more true, perhaps, than

Mo Udall, the tall, lean, high cheek-boned younger brother of former Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall. More clean-cut than his brother and lacking his five o'clock shadow, he speaks with the same Western twang and timbre, but each syllable and vowel is perfectly pronounced, as would befit any graduate of elocution classes at a Boston finishing school. In addition to his intellect, he is highly regarded for his flashes of formidable wit by House colleagues. Today, his mood is all business.

He sits forward on the edge of the big, brown, high-backed leather chair in his office, laces his fingers together on the desk and gazes with clear, steady eyes.

At 48, re-elected to Congress five times, he wants to be Speaker when McCormack retires or is forced out next January. Last year he tried and failed, getting only 58 votes. It was a futile, last-minute effort. He found colleagues already had given pledges to McCormack because they thought he would be unopposed.

This time Udall thinks he can piece together the fragile coalition of North, South, East and West. Few share his belief. But now he has time to plan it right and try to put it together.

What haunts him is the possibility of a replay of the events and forces that humiliated him last time. He has become more cautious, doing nothing to antagonize potential supporters. Making waves now could dash the whole thing.

"The timing of Waldie's resolution is bad," he says. "I just think it's going to do more harm in the long run than any good that might result in the short run. Ordinarily, members wouldn't make any commitments to the Speaker this early. But I'm afraid they might be forced into committing themselves to him now. If they have to choose sides in the middle of a session, they'll choose the sitting Speaker."

He is asked if he is aware a group of new, young, reform-minded congressmen is coming up in the House, playing the militant role he once played and playing it without him at their Tuesday morning breakfast club.

Udall replies with controlled impatience and a hint of suppressed anger behind the hard smile. "Yes, I know."

CLUB MEETS

It is Tuesday morning. Across the street from Udall's office building, the young members of what is unofficially and unsubversively called "the Tuesday morning revolutionary group" gather in the office of Rep. Abner Mikva, D-Ill., elected to Congress only two years ago but already active in the effort to reform House procedures.

The weekly meetings rotate between the offices of the six or seven congressmen who make up the steady membership: Rep. Thomas M. Rees, D-Calif., Rep. Andrew Jacobs, D-Ind., Rep. Patsy Mink, D-Ha., Rep. Allard Lowenstein, D-NY, Rep. Lee Hamilton, D-Ind., and occasionally others. There is no leader.

Militants on the Republican side have a counterpart group.

The breakfasts are light. The conversations range from light to earnest.

Today, Waldie attends. Normally, he does not belong to the group. For one thing, the regular breakfast of California's Democratic congressmen, which he always attends, meets on the same morning. Secondly, until now Waldie has not thought of himself as a revolutionary. Having always considered himself a part of the Establishment, his new role seems to surprise him only slightly less than it does his colleagues.

If there was an exact turning point, it came after long months or even years of sitting quietly on the floor of the House, absorbing it all, taking it in, watching the Vietnam war drag on and on and listening to the excuses and justifications pour in; then, watching the steady decay of cities while Congress

did little, and finally, feeling that nothing was happening in general in response to the problems confronting the country, and that the failure of the House Democratic leadership to lead and the unheeded cries for House reform were responsible.

The explosion came spontaneously at the closed Democratic caucus in December when Waldie listened to the sycophants and hangers-on parade before the leadership with paens of praise for its few small accomplishments, until, he recalls, he could listen no longer.

Rising, he denounced "the dismal lack of leadership" that resulted in putting House Democrats on record as seemingly in favor of President Nixon's Vietnam policy which, Waldie believed, only served to drag out the war.

"It was scary," he said afterward, remembering the way colleagues turned to stare at him.

But he had crossed a mental bridge after four years in Congress. Now he sat with the Tuesday morning revolutionary group. He already had stopped by the breakfast of California Democrats and read to them the text of his resolution and a letter he had sent to Speaker McCormack. More blank stares. Some tried to explain that his timing was wrong.

LITTLE ENTHUSIASM

The reaction elsewhere around the Capitol varied from avoidance to studied nonchalance. Behind his back, he was denounced as a publicity-hound and trouble-maker. Older colleagues who had been gaining in seniority and were waiting to come into their own were outraged by his attack on the seniority system.

The revolutionary group listens quietly as Waldie reads the same resolution and letter. Some are ready to cross the same mental bridge. Tom Rees looks back over three years of quiet, behind-the-scenes efforts to achieve reform that produced nothing. Now, he agrees, only public opinion and pressure from the outside can ever force the House to reform itself. Others agree something has to be done now but are fond of McCormack and indebted to him for small personal kindnesses. The meeting is inconclusive. Someone, it is felt, should do something to put the case to the public in a dramatic way. But no one volunteers.

Waldie buttons his suit coat and walks out with only moral support for his own resolve. Later, some of the group will join him actively, as will a few not of the group, like Rep. Robert L. Leggett, D-Vallejo.

MC FALL IS ANGERED

In a third office building, another Californian, Rep. John J. McFall, D-Manteca, with 14 years' seniority and a post as zone whip for the leadership, is angry.

"Waldie couldn't do a better job to help Republicans get control of Congress next fall if the White House had sent Lynn Noziger down here to introduce that resolution."

What, he wants to know, are the young reformers complaining about, anyway?

A stronger Speaker, similar to what Jess Unruh had been in the California Assembly, is one demand.

"Does he want a dictatorship?" cries McFall, who is helping McCormack put together his rebuttal to Waldie's attack. "Is that what Waldie wants—a dictatorship?"

Waldie also feels oppressed by what he feels are autocratic committee chairmen.

"Why, this is the most democratically-run parliamentary body in the world!"

There is the Vietnam resolution that, Waldie believes, forced House Democrats either to vote for a policy many of them did not trust or, by opposing it, appear unpatriotic, and offering no opportunity for amendment.

"What was wrong with that resolution? Almost every member of Congress and almost every Democrat voted in favor of it. They must have agreed with it."

McFall admits he doesn't understand the young reformers.

"I really don't know what they're talking about. I really don't."

HOUSE REFORM MEASURE IS UNDER CONSIDERATION—III

(By Michael Green)

"It looks as if we'll finally get a reform bill out of the Rules Committee soon . . ."

—Rep. Allard K. Lowenstein, D-N.Y.

WASHINGTON.—There is beginning to be a gradual awareness among some senior Establishment congressmen that the American people no longer go to Congress to be saved, that the rhetoric of past legislative glories no longer addresses itself to current problems, and that some change is required. But the awareness is not widespread.

Thus, the words of the New Deal spirituals still are sung lustily by the House Democratic establishment and Speaker John McCormack, like a Chautauqua rider, still rocks and rolls with the fervor of the old faith. Indeed, the new Democratic "populism" on which many candidates will campaign this fall goes back even further, to William Jennings Byran.

But young, reform-minded congressmen know, if their senior colleagues do not seem to, that the days of the political faith healers are done and that the old catechisms have lost their magic. The past has not delivered to the present. Sick cities have not responded to a touch and a sigh. The poor have not shaken off their hunger in response to the summons to deliverance, and the young still are enraged by the spectres of injustice and war.

A recognition of the need for modernization and reform has been acknowledged by the House establishment and, as a result, talk of reform is in the air. When the reform deals specifically with reorganizing the House of Representatives, however, the air is likely to be similar to the stale, dim variety found in the cocktail lounge of the Congressional Hotel and the talk little more than talk.

The officially appointed Establishment reformers also are apt to seem a bit pale in contrast to the young non-Establishment militants whose quixotic charges more readily capture public attention.

A slightly overweight, middle-aged staff man who works with a subcommittee of the House Rules Committee studying the thought of reform, leaned back in a chair in the darkened bar of the Congressional at lunchtime the other day.

Conservative in politics, religion, dress, temperament and drinking habits, he was not the kind of man likely to be mistaken among reformers as a zealot.

Hands folded in his lap, he reviewed the work of the subcommittee on reform to date, including its consideration of seniority, of which his chairman has amassed 16 years.

"We decided," he said, frowning thoughtfully, "not to get into the question of seniority."

"We decided that seniority was a function of party and that our subject was the reorganization of the House rules, and these have absolutely nothing to do with the question of seniority."

The decision to appoint committee chairmen and members on the basis of seniority, he explained, is made independently by each party in its respective caucus, and either party is absolutely free to change the system any time it wishes under the existing rules.

This was only one of the important decisions reached by the official reformers, however, he said.

For months he has been working on the intricacies of the various reform proposals being considered by the subcommittee, winnowing and sifting through scores of ideas

submitted by reform-minded congressmen over the last several years.

Out of them will come a single reform bill which the House is expected to take up this month or early in April.

It must be approved first by the House Rules Committee, headed by 80-year-old Chairman William Colmer, D-Miss. More militant reformers do not envision sweeping recommendations or serious challenges to the present system.

AGREEMENT

The staff aide, still frowning thoughtfully, acknowledged that this was so. Maintaining an expressionless face, he scanned the menu.

What about new legislation to require members to disclose fully their financial interests and clamp down on conflict of interest?

"No, we didn't get into that."

What about tougher laws dealing with lobbyists?

"Well, now," he said, leaning back in the chair again, "we decided that our subject was legislative reorganization and therefore we didn't get into the question of lobbyists. We decided we would report out a bill under an open rule (allowing any amendments members wish to offer from the floor) and let the House work its will. If it wants to deal with some of these other questions, it's completely free to do so."

Any chance of outlawing secret committee sessions from which the public is barred?

It was decided, he said, not to eliminate closed committee sessions but give the authority to do so to a majority of committee members instead of just to the chairman.

He could be no more encouraging on another basic demand made by younger and more militant reformers—that votes of members be recorded in meetings of the House acting as a committee of the whole. At present, a member may pass up the aisle and be counted bodily for or against a measure on a teller vote, but his constituents need never know how he voted.

"The subcommittee had denied that it would only come out with a bill that all its members could agree on," he explained. Because some members opposed recorded votes, the subject was dropped.

The requirement that the subcommittee be unanimous on all items included in the reform bill applied to all its provisions. There were, in addition, two other ground rules: Only reform proposals considered to be constructive would be considered, and the reform had to have "a reasonable chance of being politically attainable."

Between these three considerations, most of the reforms demanded by militant young members, as well as by some of the older non-Establishment warriors of reform like Rep. Richard Bolling, D-Mo., were dispensed with before the serious work of the subcommittee even began.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that the official reform bill that finally emerges will not contain any serious proposals.

As outlined by the staff aide, the subcommittee draft offers two significant and potentially far-reaching reforms which, though they do not begin to meet the minimum needs for reform seen by the young militants, might eventually alter procedures in the House to some extent.

For this reason, the most controversial of the two—a proposal that would, on paper, anyway, weaken the power of a committee chairman, probably faces a doubtful future.

The subcommittee voted to place control of the committees into the hands of the members instead of the chairman and ranking minority members in determining the conduct of committee business.

This would mean, theoretically, that a chairman no longer would have absolute power to decide when and if to hold hearings

or conduct an investigation, whom to hire, what legislation to consider, or when and whether to report out a bill.

In addition, a majority of the committee members belonging to the minority party would speak for the minority instead of, as at present, having the ranking minority member do so.

Recommendations also are included that would make it impossible for a chairman to stymie committee business by being absent. The new rules would allow any three committee members to request a special meeting in a chairman's absence, subject to approval of a majority of the committee. The ranking majority member would preside.

BASIC RIGHTS

Practically, such rules might mean little actual change in committee operations if chairmen can still stack the committee membership in their favor and if the tendency of members still will be to go along in order to get along. It would, however, establish basic rights of committee members which they could assert in extreme circumstances.

The other major reform proposal is less controversial but potentially more important and far-reaching.

For years Congress has suffered vis a vis the executive branch in not having the type of staff and research facilities that would enable it to make independent judgments on executive proposals or to understand and cope with the mass of information involved in running the federal government.

Individual congressmen, similarly, have had little in the way of research and services to help them cope with the tide of complex information that sweeps in on them.

To help remedy this, the new rules would establish a modern congressional research service in the Library of Congress with a network of legislative analysts assigned to congressional committees in close working relationship.

A computer operation would be placed under the complete control of a joint House-Senate committee and would help furnish the kinds of information on, for example, the federal budget, that the average congressman cannot now get.

In addition, closer liaison would be established with the General Accounting Office, the congressional watchdog on government spending, which has special expertise in such areas as defense expenditures and contracts.

The model for much of the proposed operation has been the type of research services and modern equipment introduced into the California Assembly when Jess Unruh was Speaker.

The House reform subcommittee had the benefit of the advice and recommendations of the Assembly's legislative analyst, Alan Post, in trying to adapt portions of the California system to meet the needs and problems of Congress and its myriad committees and subcommittees.

THIRD PROPOSAL

Still a third major proposal—to open the House and its committees to live TV coverage—was outvoted in subcommittee. In this instance, an attempt will be made to reverse the decision in full committee and send the recommendation to the floor even though members of the subcommittee are not agreed on it.

Worthwhile and sensible as these modest reforms might sound to casual and approving observers, the handiwork of the subcommittee cannot be considered outside the political context in which it will be presented.

Thus, for a subcommittee supposedly intent on honest reform, even in the limited area it dealt with, the proposed bill is curious in two ways:

It is striking for its absence of sweeteners—the kind of sugar-coated inducements normally added to reform bills to make the

palatable to those congressmen only lukewarm to the idea of reform. Without such sweeteners, there will be little reason for many congressmen to take the bad medicine.

The subcommittee aimed a direct slap in the face at the Senate, which also must approve the bill as drawn.

For years, the House has fumed because the Senate amends House bills that would not have been germane if offered under House rules. Much of the most progressive legislation to come out of Congress in recent years only emerged because of this method.

The new rules would bar the House from considering such nongermane Senate amendments unless two-thirds of the House members agreed, a number impossible to muster on virtually all major legislation.

There is at least some suspicion the official reformers have placed a self-destruct button in their modest reform bill.

When the full committee acts on the subcommittee report, it will be behind closed doors. Anyway, the more militant reformers are not holding their breath in anticipation of the result.

MCCORMACK SEES TROUBLE ON RIGHT, LEFT AS HOUSE'S YOUNG REBELS GROW RESTLESS—IV

(By Michael Green)

"I believe there is a weakness of the Democrats which we should now exploit, and which would materially assist us in attaining majority status in November. This is the seniority system."

Rep. Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., R-Calif.

WASHINGTON.—The House is a place of waiting. Young members wait for their colleagues to die, retire or be defeated at the polls. Older but still junior members wait to move up the ladder on their committees. Even older members, some who have waited for decades, wait longer for the few, cherished top jobs finally to open up. And the most senior members of all wait out the remaining years in hopes of prolonging the moments of power and influence they waited so long to attain.

Many now wait on Speaker John W. McCormack, 78; Rules Committee chairman William Colmer, D-Miss., 80; Judiciary Committee chairman Emanuel Celler, D-N.Y., 81; Interior Committee chairman Wayne N. Aspinall, D-Colo., 74, and on others.

When McCormack looks to his right from the speaker's chair, toward the Democratic side of the House chamber, he sees a smattering of Young Turks who have proclaimed themselves tired of waiting. But he has become accustomed to their fervent, frustrated outbursts. In the past, the danger they have posed has been minimal, he knows.

When he glances to his left, toward the Republican side of the chamber, he might find cause for more alarm. The faces there, on the average, seem somewhat younger. House Republicans proclaim themselves the vigorous, modern-type leaders Congress and the country so badly need.

Seated at the desk reserved for the Republican minority leader is Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Michigan. He is 57 and looks 10 years younger. He, too, McCormack knows, is waiting. He would like to be sitting in the speaker's chair next January.

The prerequisite is that voters this fall send more Republicans than Democrats to the House. Ford believes he has found a plan which may persuade them to do just that. It is to convince the electorate that Democratic leaders and committee chairmen in the House simply have become too old and tired to respond to current problems.

If McCormack and other powers in the Democratic hierarchy have not yet perceived the scope and seriousness of the challenge, reform-minded younger party members have. They successfully prodded the

leadership to undertake at least a study of the seniority system which keeps so many waiting.

But the party leaders quashed an effort to come up with recommendations before the fall elections. McCormack, in the meantime, busily began lining up votes to re-elect him to the speakership for still another term well in advance of the choice to be made next January. He would be 80 at the completion of it.

For the first time in his benign non-reign, there now may be cause for him to sense danger when he looks to the right at his own party ranks.

POSTPONEMENT

The move to postpone a report from the seniority study group until next January proved too much for 19 reform-minded Democrats. The chance for public awareness of the issue and pressure for reform would be lost and with it, they feared, all chance for reform.

Led by two Californians, Reps. Thomas M. Rees, D-Los Angeles, and Jerome R. Waldie, D-Contra Costa County, and by Rep. Allard Lowenstein, D-NY and Rep. Brock Adams, D-Wash., the rebel group called a press conference to announce its intentions.

They no longer could be counted on, the reformers said, to vote automatically for the Democratic caucus choice for speaker next year. They would keep their options open. Some, like Waldie and Rees, went as far as threatening to vote for a Republican if a reform program failed to emerge from the Democratic side.

They asked others to join them. A switch of only 30 Democratic votes, given the present party division in the House, would be enough to elect a Republican speaker.

It had become, in the words of one congressional aide, a game of "guts ball."

M'CLOSKEY NAMED

Ford was not, Waldie noted, his idea of "the nation's most ardent reformer." He suggested the Republicans put up a candidate for speaker like Rep. Paul N. McCloskey Jr., R-Calif, instead.

But there was at least the calculation that Ford could be counted on to act as a political animal. Observed one rebel.

"Jerry Ford would agree to reform the House clear down to the subway system if he thought it would get him the votes to make him speaker."

The calculation became quickly confused, however, with published reports that a number of Southern Democrats have been negotiating privately with Ford to see what they might get if they, too, were to bolt their party and vote for a Republican speaker.

Clearly, reform-minded House Democrats would find little solace in being part of that arrangement. But it could make their own votes more precious to the Democratic leadership.

Ford is aware of the discontent at both ends of the Democratic spectrum in the House. He sat in one of the deep leather chairs off the House floor last week and studied with obvious fascination a newspaper clipping handed him about the threat of Democratic reformers to vote for a Republican speaker.

He did not want to make any public comment on it yet.

"I want to think about it," he said.

Laying the clipping aside, he began praising the work of a new House Republican task force also studying ways to change the seniority system. Unlike the Democrats, he observed, the Republicans will be coming up with their recommendations before the fall elections.

He looked at the newspaper clipping again, frowning. "Can I keep this?" he asked before strolling thoughtfully back onto the House floor.

There will be time and opportunity later

to maneuver for the speakership, he knows. The fall elections come first and he already has charted that course.

The idea came not from him but from young "Pete" McCloskey, the freshman congressman from San Mateo. It was to exploit the aged appearance offered by the House Democratic leadership.

Like many of the junior members on the Democratic side who banded together to work for reform, Republicans like McCloskey also have a reform group.

In the waning days of the last session of Congress, they conducted what came to be known as "The Children's Hour," keeping the House up all one night with lengthy quorum calls and other parliamentary devices to try to force Democratic leaders to call up a pending reform bill. They failed then, but this session Democratic leaders grudgingly agreed to write their own version of a legislative reorganization measure. A weak effort—even its drafter, Rep. B. F. Sisk, D-Fresno County, agrees it does not merit the label of "reform"—it still has not emerged from the Rules Committee.

PLAN IS BORN

The idea of gaining a Republican advantage by pointing to the weakness of the Democrats on the issues of reform and seniority occurred to McCloskey early last winter. In a letter to GOP national chairman Rogers C. B. Morton, he noted that the average age of Democratic committee chairmen under the seniority system was well over 70 and that three chairmen would be in their 80s this year.

"I would propose that the Republican members of the House and Senate agree that in the event the Republicans achieve a majority in either house, we will adopt a rule whereby committee chairmen are selected on the basis of administrative and management skill, rather than on seniority alone."

The average age of the presidents of the 25 largest corporations in America, he observed, is 57.

Encouraged by Morton to take the idea to Ford, McCloskey wrote again. He proposed specifically that the Republicans promise to elect chairmen on a merit basis. It could be done by picking from among committee members under the age of 70 but with five years experience on the committee, he suggested. All members who had served on the committee the previous session would vote to pick the chairman.

"It seems to me that a firm Republican declaration of this position, properly timed, and coordinated with the processing of the congressional reform bill, would capture the enthusiasm of the younger generation, and would enable us to capitalize on the serious vulnerability of the Democratic leadership's age and unresponsiveness to the problems of the 70s."

TV TELLS ALL

"A few more nationally televised joint meetings of Congress, with the President backstopped by the speaker, will get the point across better than any written argument."

In replying, Ford was careful not to commit himself to any specific proposal for changing the system, or even to any change at all.

But he obviously was delighted by the tactic suggested.

There automatically would be a substantial switch to a younger generation, aside from any changes in the seniority system, if Republicans won control of the House, Ford noted.

"I have not figured out the precise age differential but it would be an over-all improvement both in age and quality. In my opinion," he wrote, underlining the passage, "Republicans should use this in the 1970 campaign, particularly among our youth and

in the academic community. It is a legitimate campaign issue."

As for the seniority system, Ford promptly agreed to the appointment of a GOP task force to study the issue. It is headed by Rep. Barber Conable, R-NY, one of the leaders of the Republican reform group in the House. He will work under the GOP House research and planning committee headed by Rep. Robert Taft, R-Ohio, one of the leaders of the "Children's Hour."

The two task-force groups studying reform—one Republican, one Democratic—have set about their work.

There are no guarantees either will produce recommendations for meaningful change, nor whether one of them will make recommendations before the elections. Nor will they study other areas of reform badly and equally needed, in the view of reformers, in order to make the House a modern institution.

All there is so far is the agreement to take a look at the seniority system and to do so at a time when the voters are watching and the winds of change are blowing elsewhere in the country.

The reformers are still waiting.

HOUSE REFORMERS LACK PUBLIC'S AID

"If we can build a national awareness of what's at stake in something that sounds as dull as 'reforming Congress' we may really get somewhere eventually."

—Rep. Allard K. Lowenstein, D-NY.

(By Michael Green)

WASHINGTON.—The small band of young reformers who agree among themselves that bringing the House of Representatives into the 20th century not only is a good idea but an absolute necessity are not holding their breath.

Few in number and almost totally ineffective in the face of the indifferent congressional system, they know the only real hope for reform rests in public pressure from the outside.

Indeed, the 58 votes garnered by Rep. Morris K. Udall, D-Ariz., when he challenged John W. McCormack for the speakership last year represented a sort of high point in the meager fortunes of congressional reformers.

Since then those who have kept up the daily battle for reform probably number no more than a dozen or so members of both parties.

Their condition was very nearly described by Prof. Bergen Evans in the "Natural History of Nonsense" when he wrote in general that until very recently "rational men lived like spies in an enemy country. They never walked abroad unless disguised in irony or allegory. To have revealed their true selves would have been fatal.

"Today, their status is more that of guerrillas. They snipe from cover, ambush stragglers, harass retreating rear guards, cut communications and now and then execute swift forays against detached units of the enemy. But they dare not risk an open engagement with the main force; they would be massacred."

AN EARLIER VOICE

The analogy bears striking resemblance to language used by the late Rep. Clem Miller, D-Calif., to describe his own disillusionment with House procedures shortly before he died in a plane crash in 1962.

"The committees with their chairmen are like a string of forts," he wrote to friends back home. "The attackers are spread out, with poor communications and hence poor coordination. They have no base of power from which to menace the chairmen.

Nor do the reformers have the leverage of informed and active support by the public. It does not occur to constituents who make their voices heard with their congressmen on a myriad of public issues, from crime to

taxes, that they have the power to influence the House to move toward basic reforms in its own procedures.

Somehow it has escaped public notice that the way the House conducts its affairs is as much the public's business as any other issue and may have more long-range impact on their lives and on the health and well-being of the country with its over 200-million Americans than any other.

In great measure, the difficulty lies in adequately communicating complex and often seemingly dull issues to the public. There is a general awareness, due to the repetitions of the reformers over the years, that a seniority system that places aging, Southern autocrats in charge of powerful committees somehow works to the disadvantage of the country as a whole.

Equally, the public can grasp the issue involved in the continued rule of Speaker McCormack, who, at 78, is third in line for succession to the presidency.

But the deeper failures created by the ills of the present system are more complex. And though there may be a general public understanding that the seniority system needs overhauling, exactly how a committee chairman uses or misuses his power in dozens of quiet ways, and the impact this may have on the daily lives of millions, escapes public attention.

Yet these abuses are customarily more outrageous and do more harm to the country than the mere fact McCormack continues to preside over debates in the House.

OTHER OUTRAGE

Nor are the evils limited to the committee chairmen or the seniority system. Parliamentary procedures make it convenient for the average congressman, as well, to avoid recording his vote on an issue of concern to his constituents, or to seem to have voted in favor of a bill when actually he may have tried to kill it.

On some of the most crucial votes cast—those in closed sessions of committees where legislation is "marked up" and billions of dollars allocated—no one need ever know whether he acted for or against the public interest.

House procedures can stack a floor debate so that time for argument is equally divided between those who favor a bill and others who also favor it, with opponents given the right to speak only by the whim and generosity of the bill's supporters.

These few examples serve to illustrate a longer list of legislative evils, all of which lie in the murky realm where it is difficult or impossible for the public to understand and follow what goes on.

This mystery which shrouds the process by which the House arrives at a final decision on a given bill can only contribute to the public's feeling of impotence in influencing its elected representatives.

The impotence is more than a feeling. It is a fact. At crucial waystations along a bill's course, public awareness and thus a public voice simply does not exist.

Nor can responsibility for a bill's fate be fixed later by the public. A citizen's best direct link, his own congressman, is only one man in a crowd of 435 elected representatives. The citizen may always hold his own congressman accountable. But perhaps he supported the legislation they favored, and perhaps most congressmen did, and still it failed in the murkiness of some secret committee room or through some parliamentary device. So, in the end, for all practical purposes, no one was really responsible and the public can find none to hold accountable.

LITTLE UNDERSTANDING

As a result of this lack of public awareness of the detailed extent, range, nature and

importance of abuses resulting from the way the House conducts its business, the potential for strong public support for basic reforms also is removed, since the need for it is only vaguely and uncertainly understood.

It is here the press bears a great measure of the blame for congressmen and their activities are essentially uncovered by the press except in gross form. The great gaps in coverage of personalities, procedures and events lie in the heart of the congressional process and its impact on American life.

It is more than the absence of reportorial digging, which is also serious, but at least recognized by the journalistic profession itself. More importantly, it is the absence of reporting and writing that humanizes the legislative mechanism and its people so the public might have reason to be interested. This lack is not recognized.

Thus, the real news may not be "news" at all, at least not the kind editors will recognize as such and devote space to. The quiet, scarcely noticed crucial turning point in the growth or death of legislation may escape notice entirely. Yet this may be the very point when public awareness and action is most called for.

NO SHARING

In a broader sense, the human maneuverings of congressmen and their aides, with all the day-to-day expressions of small and petty human foibles, or small hidden triumphs, mirror the forces at work in the population as a whole. They color the story and reveal it. But the public will not be allowed to know it and share in it. Readers will be told only in dry, clipped accounts, the numerical fate of legislation. They will be told only the score, never shown the faces of the players. In the ordinary course of events, the daily weather report is more interesting and revealing.

There are many reasons for this. In part, it arises from journalistic tradition which holds that certain kinds of writing and a certain style are appropriate only to certain categories of coverage. Thus, there is business writing and sports writing, political writing and garden columns, and one shall never be confused with another. Everyone knows Red Smith belongs on the sports pages. No one wonders what might emerge in terms of newfound public interest in Congress if he directed his attention to it, suddenly, and appeared in the first section of the paper. Or if Damon Runyon had covered Capitol Hill and given nicknames to all the committee chairmen.

By the same token, if the present style of government reporting were extended to the coverage of sports events and personalities, the American public would lose interest in the sports pages overnight.

ONE HOPE

What is offered is a general hope that the more open Congress becomes and the more accessible to public view, the more interested and concerned the public will become, increasing the pressure for broader reform it alone can exert.

Thus, two proposals pushed by the young reformers are key. One is to open the House and its committees to TV coverage. The other is to ban closed committee sessions unless national security is involved.

The reformers, however, are not optimistic. Dismally, they find little reason to suppose that they can prevail against the House establishment in pushing even these two basic reforms.

Asked what the average citizen can do to help, they can only give the reply most citizens' groups in the country give their numbers on other legislation:

"Tell them to write their congressmen."

MALCOLM EPLEY HITS THE NAIL ON THE HEAD

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Malcolm Epley is a venerable editor and columnist for the Long Beach, Calif., Independent-Press-Telegram newspaper. His perceptive barbs are usually squarely on target. Such is the case with the following which appeared in his Beach Comb column June 18:

BEACH COMBING

(By Malcolm Epley)

If war can be called fun, it must be fun fighting the United States the way Hanoi has been doing it in recent years. And it has to be getting merrier all the time.

For example, the commander-in-chief of the U.S. forces is badgered and harassed by other Americans into announcing time-tables for such strategic actions as troop withdrawals from certain areas and from the entire theater of action. That's the sort of information, in another war, that would be sought through elaborate spy services.

If the President tried, as is done in other wars, to bamboozle the enemy by withholding information or other devices, he is accused of causing a credibility gap. The cry goes up he's not being frank with the people, the people evidently including the enemy.

What more could anyone hope for from the opposition? Well, Hanoi has gotten a lot more than that, with numerous Americans, including some well-known public figures, acting as if they were allies of Hanoi rather than supporters of their own country.

What a lovely spectacle it must be for Hanoi to watch while some Americans spew venom—not at Hanoi—but at their own commander in chief, ridiculing and insulting him and threatening, through Congress, to cut off financial support for the military effort beyond arbitrarily chosen deadlines.

From Hanoi's standpoint, it has to be regarded as a perfect war. From some other points of view, it may be rated a perfect crime.

Just 2 days earlier, June 16, Mr. Epley also rang the bell with the following column:

Even a casual observer of the so-called opinion polls knows that answers can be heavily pre-influenced by the way questions are worded.

Hence both the proponents and opponents of almost any public issue can manage, by cleverly wording questions, to get the results they want from a sampling of the citizenry.

Or a pollster, by careless use of terminology, can prejudice the answers, even though unintentionally.

Let's turn now to the Cambodia issue, which has the pollsters at work.

But first let's take a look at Webster, and the definition of the word "invasion":

"A hostile entrance or armed attack on the property or territory of another for conquest or plunder."

Now let's suppose the question a pollster asks goes like this:

"Does the President have the right to invade another country without first consulting Congress?"

Answers to such questions have been overwhelmingly negative.

But word it like this:

"If the President finds it necessary to send troops into another country, which has a

friendly government and which has already been invaded and is being used by hostile forces that are threatening American troops and lives, should he have the right to do that without consulting Congress?"

It's a good guess the answers would be sharply different.

As the Webster definition above indicates, the term "invasion" in reference to the American action in Cambodia is of questionable validity.

Cambodia had already been invaded by outside forces. They were using its territory as a sanctuary and a staging ground in military operations. They had already constituted it a part of a theater of military action in which American forces were involved.

Moreover, the Cambodia action by Americans was not against Cambodians or the Cambodian government, facts which clearly deny it is an invasion in the normal understanding of the term. It is not an "armed attack" against Cambodia for purposes of conquest or plunder.

Critics of the Cambodia move know that Americans inherently dislike the thought of our "invading" another country. Their continued misuse of the term is a shrewd, though unconscious, tactic in the battle for public opinion.

And to avoid bias, pollsters should delete the term from their questions about the Cambodian issue. They're supposed to be testing public opinion, not influencing it. Sometimes one wonders.

As a conclusion on this general subject, I have at hand an excerpt from a letter written by Lt. Col. Harold J. Shea, brother-in-law of Mrs. Leonard Shea, 1000 El Mirador Ave., L.B.

"As you know from TV and the papers, we have all been pretty busy with the new push into Cambodia. It is the first smart thing that has been done since this conflict started. I'm behind President Nixon 100 per cent on this decision and so is every other member of the military over here."

This, I think you'll agree, is informed opinion. It is from Col. Shea's last letter home. It was dated on May 30. On May 31 he was killed in action, his letter arriving after the notice of his death.

IMPROVEMENT IN THE INFLATION PROBLEM

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, informed observers of the Nation's economy are noting significant signs of improvement in the inflationary problem and are praising President Nixon's efforts at alleviating it without causing a major recession.

At this point I insert in the RECORD two editorials discussing the President's economic policies, as spelled out in his recent address to the Nation on the economy. The first one, from the Philadelphia Inquirer, talks about the "responsible road" to a sound economy, and emphasizes the important fact that this road must be traveled by all Americans—business and labor leaders, private citizens, and Members of Congress—if success is to be achieved.

The second editorial, from the Wall Street Journal, discusses the gradual progress being made in the fight against inflation, noting that in this kind of effort, gradual progress with a "minimum

of risk" is the safest course to follow. The signs of encouragement noted by this leader of financial newspapers throughout the country should be good news to us all. I commend both of these editorials to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 18, 1970]

THE RESPONSIBLE ROAD

President Nixon, in his address to the American people Wednesday on economic policy, went to the heart of the matter when he said: "The fight against inflation is everybody's business."

Inflation can, indeed, be checked—without plunging the nation into a major recession—if there is cooperative effort by government and business and labor.

Whether that cooperation will be forthcoming is the key question.

The President referred to his anti-inflation policy as "the responsible road" to a sound economy.

It will be the responsible road only if all segments of the economy, both public and private, act responsibly.

In essence, Mr. Nixon's speech was an appeal for responsible economic behavior by all concerned.

It is an appeal that should be heeded.

Congress should respond by taking early action on bills listed by the President, some of which have been languishing in Capitol Hill pigeonholes for many months, that would strengthen unemployment compensation, manpower training and other programs.

Most of all, as President Nixon emphasized, Congress should make a constructive contribution to the fight against inflation by holding federal spending to reasonable limits and reducing or eliminating budget deficits.

A prolonged period of big spending and big borrowing at all levels of government has been a primary cause of the present inflationary crisis.

Business and labor need to cooperate by holding the line on prices and wages in relation to quality and productivity.

The National Commission on Productivity to be created by President Nixon focuses attention in an appropriate direction. When labor and other production costs rise, without a corresponding improvement in the quantity or quality of output, prices spiral and inflation soars.

Mr. Nixon has conceded that all is not well with the present economy, especially the unemployment rate, and hopes to make fine-tuning adjustments with delicate manipulation of the money and credit supply.

He has wisely rejected government-imposed wage and price controls or guidelines—courses of action that, in the past, have been largely ineffective or have merely postponed economic adjustments and made them more painful in the end.

The responsible road to economic stability will not be an easy road. The potholes left by years of fiscal irresponsibility will not be repaired overnight.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 17, 1970]

FOUR YARDS AND A CLOUD OF DUST

Wayne Woodrow Hayes, football coach at Ohio State University, long has held that the idea is to get there with a minimum of risk. It's better to be slow and sure than merely swift.

It's just possible that football fan Richard Nixon, who addresses the nation on the economy today, has been taking a cue from Woody Hayes. The Administration's economic program, at any rate, does have elements of the "four yards and a cloud of dust" philosophy.

It's slow, there's no doubt about that. Progress against inflation up to now has

disappointed the Administration and angered some of its critics. Yet there are indications the situation is improving.

Earlier this week Paul W. McCracken, chairman of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers, told the economic policy committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development that evidence of improvement includes a slowing of the rise of wholesale food and commodity prices and a lower rate of wage increases.

As a story in this newspaper reported yesterday, a growing number of private economists, though still probably a minority, believe the worst of the inflation is over. That alone would be encouraging.

Mr. Nixon's go-slow approach clearly was the result of careful calculation. There were several ways to cool the overheated economy that the Administration inherited, and many things to be considered in choosing a course.

First, there was the matter of monetary policy. Super-easy money had done a lot to get the economy into its inflated state, so obviously more restraint was in order. But how much more?

As recently as 1966 the Federal Reserve System had tightened up, abruptly and briefly, and had caused something approaching a money panic. So the Federal Reserve this time moved much more gradually. In fiscal policy the Administration also opted for the gentle approach—budget surpluses, but not very big ones.

Now the execution of the plan has left something to be desired. The Fed probably tightened money too much and for too long in 1969. And the Administration, together with Congress, has managed to convert those small budget surpluses into deficits.

Yet progress is surely being made. The economy is cooling, and before many more months pass the trend will show clearly in the price indexes. Those who looked for price declines earlier forgot that such developments are usually the last signs of an ebbing inflation, not the first.

Some companies, institutions and individuals are being hurt; no one has invented a painless way to restore a shaky economy to stability. Many more would have suffered much more, though, if the inflated economy had been allowed to roar on into eventual disaster—or had been halted suddenly by slamming on the fiscal and monetary brakes.

Everyone may wish that the Government's plans were producing results more swiftly and smoothly, but most of the public appears to be adjusting to a changing situation with considerable aplomb. One of the more interesting features of the sharp plunge of the stock market in April and May was the scarcity of anything resembling panic selling.

Volume on the New York Stock Exchange in recent weeks has usually tended to rise when prices rally and to subside as prices decline. The mood of investors and traders certainly is not overwhelmingly optimistic, but it does appear to be hopeful. When prices turn downward there generally is a reduction in orders to buy—but no evidence of deep pessimism.

Thus gradualism does seem to be working, even if it isn't delighting everybody. Businessmen should realize now that to make plans on the basis of never-ending inflation is only to invite serious trouble.

The Administration fortunately seems to realize that wage-price controls or other crash programs against inflation would not only accomplish nothing constructive. They would also undo much that has been done—by persuading the public that monetary-fiscal restraint is a failure, that inflation will indeed persist.

In the circumstances the Government's course still should be to move slowly, steadily, avoid shocks. Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns indicates that is what he has

in mind—providing enough money for the nation's needs, not enough to fuel more inflation.

There may be more spectacular ways to play the game, but somehow we feel safer with four yards and a cloud of dust.

ROTC PROGRAM AT FURMAN UNIVERSITY

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in recent years ROTC programs all over the Nation have come under a great deal of unjust criticism and abuse. In the main, this criticism has come from misguided students and campus radicals. A few colleges in the country which have bowed to this criticism have abolished the ROTC programs from their campus curriculum.

Mr. President, on June 19, the Greenville News, a leading newspaper published in Greenville, S.C., published a very fine editorial assessing the ROTC program at Furman University, one of the outstanding institutions of higher learning in the Nation. Furman University has met this criticism headon and has revamped its ROTC curriculum to make this experience more meaningful to the individual cadet. This, of course, means that the ROTC graduate at Furman will be better qualified to serve as an officer and leader in the service of his country.

Mr. President, I wish to commend Furman University for the fine work that it is doing.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "A New Look for ROTC," from the Greenville News be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A NEW LOOK FOR ROTC

An experimental ROTC program at Furman University appears to have bridged the military-civilian gap that has plagued the program in other institutions. It is worth close examination as an example of constructive compromise.

The key to the program, which is ending a two-year trial at Furman and 10 other colleges and universities, is integration, rather than segregation, of civilian and military elements. Proof of the program's success, at least locally, is Furman's decision to continue it past the trial period.

The program is the Army's answer to long-standing complaints from students that ROTC courses are boring, non-academic and a waste of time. Under the experimental plan, freshmen are allowed to take military history courses for four hours credit and sophomores take political science and national security courses instead of the traditional military courses which come in the junior and senior years.

Civilian professors are utilized through appropriations from the Army. The new program underlines the fact that strictly military subjects are taught better outside the Furman classrooms. Students go to summer camp to learn about the "nuts and bolts of the Army," according to officials.

Other changes at Furman include complete revamping of the curriculum from the two-semester system and the shift from mandatory ROTC to optional. Previously a student who signed up for ROTC had to complete two years. Now he can enroll and then drop the program if he finds it not to his liking.

The new system is a compromise in the sense that it is a break with the old ROTC traditions of march and drill and a leaning toward allowing students more individualization.

But at the same time it still operates on the theory that the military is an integral part of society and—whether it is good or bad—this is a fact. The new program continues to offer the college man who is faced with meeting a military obligation the best way to utilize his talents, rather than be drafted and serve as a private.

HEROIN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the sixth article in the Christian Science Monitor series on narcotics traffic traces the route of narcotics through Southeast Asia. One of the difficulties in stopping the flow of narcotics from this area is that some of the producers are mountain fighters who are friendly to the U.S. efforts against the North Vietnamese and who in turn are keeping the Communists out of Laos.

Additionally, in this geographic area there seems to be significant involvement by high government officials in the opium trade and, therefore, a firm governmental policy to stop the illegal production of that narcotic is difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, it is an area at which we must direct our attention because as European sources of supply are dried up, these sources in Southeast Asia may pick up the slack. In view of the American presence in these nations, we ought to be able to exert pressure to curb the production of these illegal narcotics.

The article follows:

THAILAND: FOUR-LANE DRUG HIGHWAY

(By John Hughes)

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—For the junk merchants of Southeast Asia, Thailand is the corridor through which their illegal merchandise must pass to Hong Kong and the lucrative markets of America.

But to many, Thailand seems less a corridor than a four-lane highway down which narcotics shipments roll with ease.

Of course, there are tolls. The police must be paid off. Experts in the business say the going price is \$5 per kilo of opium at each of five checkpoints between the opium-growing borderlands of the north and the capital city of Bangkok. But \$25 a kilo in payoffs is small enough overhead in a business where the profit rolls in by hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Some Thai officials are clearly in this business up to their elbows. One recent incident illustrates the point.

Thai residents of a Bangkok suburb noted suspicious activity at a godown (warehouse) in their neighborhood. A helicopter kept fluttering down. There was furtive unloading. They told the police and the police, suspecting an illegal liquor racket, raided

the warehouse. Instead of liquor, they found it stocked with fresh opium.

The embarrassing point of the story is that in Thailand only the border police and the Army operate helicopters.

In earlier years, the opium traffic in Thailand was practically a monopoly of the police. Involvement in the trade extended into the Cabinet. Just where it stops today is difficult to state. Says one Thai official warningly: "There's a line above which you cannot investigate the business."

Publicly the government has set itself against the opium traffic. Thailand has 200,000 drug addicts of its own. Heroin addiction is increasing sharply, particularly among young Thais. The government is, as a United Nations report puts it, "alive to the problem."

It has cut back imports of acetic anhydride, a necessary agent for processing heroin. An Anti-Narcotic Drugs Association has been set up to combat addiction. There are drug seizures by the Thai police. But the UN report concludes gloomily that the "situation has not materially improved" in recent years and has ever been "exacerbated."

THAI OUTPUT RATED LOW

The Thais argue that their country is a transit route for illicit narcotics and that their neighbors are much bigger opium producers than they are.

The argument is valid. Of the 400 to 600 tons of opium which comes out of Southeast Asia each year, Burma and Laos grow the bulk. Thailand produces only between 15 and 50 tons. In Burma the government is incapable of halting production, while in Laos the Army is engaged in the opium traffic and the Air Force helps transport the crop.

For much of this production, Thailand is the conduit. Some Thais are profiting handsomely from the passage of opium through their country. Law-enforcement officers elsewhere in Asia are divided as to how much more the Thai Government could do to pinch off the traffic. Some credit Thai authorities with increased effort.

Others are harsher in their judgments. Says the narcotics chief of one Southeast Asian country:

"There are only three main routes running down Thailand. If they really wanted to, the Thais could stop a lot more narcotics."

So far as the United States is concerned, Southeast Asia till now has been a minor producer for the American heroin market. Eighty percent of American heroin originates in Turkey. Perhaps another 15 percent comes from Mexico. Experts calculate that the remaining 5 percent comes from Southeast Asia.

Now some think they may have underestimated the Southeast Asian figure.

One obvious danger: as American pressure cuts back production in countries like Turkey and Mexico, the demand for opium and heroin out of Thailand will grow. The morphine content of Southeast Asian opium is lower than that of Turkish. But the price is competitive with the European product.

International narcotics rings are already buying export-quality heroin in Bangkok at \$2,250 a kilo for shipment to the United States. Once there, its wholesale value jumps to more than \$10,000 a kilo. By the time it is "cut," or diluted, with milk, sugar, and quinine, it will fetch \$225,000 in individual shots.

The opium road in Southeast Asia begins in rugged hill country where four countries converge: Thailand, Laos, Burma, and Communist China. Borders are ill defined. Across them roam the Meos and the Yaos in Laos and Thailand, the Karens and the Shans from Burma.

They practice primitive slash-and-burn agriculture. They know little about the glit-

tering world of Bangkok, let alone the junkie's way of life in New York City.

What they do know is that for growing opium poppies they can get the old Burmese silver coins which represent affluence in their society.

The opium seeds are planted in August. They need little weeding or care. By December or January the plant has grown to about 4 feet. The poppy flowers. The pink, white, and mauve petals fall.

BURMA IS TOP PRODUCER

Then the remaining pods are slit, not horizontally as in Turkey, but vertically with a three-pronged knife. The resin which oozes out is allowed to harden overnight. Next morning it is scraped off.

Most of the crop comes from Burma. The Burmese Government talks bravely of stamping out the production. The problem is that the opium grows in tribal areas over which the Rangoon government has little control. Tribesmen in northeast Burma move their opium crop out over jungle trails directly into Laos and Thailand.

If their government in Rangoon poses no threat, there are nevertheless other hazards along the route.

This is wild and lawless country. The opium moves in caravans of 50 to 100 ponies and is worth a great deal. There is the danger of attack and hijacking by rival groups. Thus the caravans go heavily armed and protected, with escorts carrying machine guns and sometimes mortars.

Dominating the protection business are Chinese Nationalist soldiers left over from the war with the Communists.

They hire out units 100- to 200-strong to guard the opium caravans winding their way into Thailand. They bring forceful persuasion to bear on opium runners who try to do without their services.

A few years ago small-scale warfare broke out between the Chinese and tribesmen over opium dues. Casualties were heavy. Fighting spilled into Laos and ended only after air strikes by T-28's of the Lao Air Force.

The Laotians are not entirely disinterested parties. They, too, are deeply engaged in the opium business. Their hill tribes have long grown the opium poppy and continue to do so. At about 180 tons a year, it is the poverty-stricken country's best export.

One problem is that the tribesmen who grow it in the non-Communist part of Laos are some of the most effective resistance fighters against North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao troops in the Communist-held areas. These tribesmen are the special allies of the United States Central Intelligence Agency. Clearly the CIA is not eager to alienate them demanding they stop growing the opium, which has become part of their tribal culture and livelihood.

MOVEMENTS BY MILITARY

The Lao Army is deep in the money-spinning opium business, and Lao Air Force planes transport opium. Some private pilots say the Air Force's opium runs are made with CIA "protection."

During this year's Communist offensive, the military cut back on its opium activities. The main reason was not, according to one well-placed source, because they were preoccupied with the Communists. It was concern lest a wave of newspaper correspondents, in town for the crisis, got wind of the opium operations.

The Communists in Laos must be beset by a similar situation. Tribesmen in their areas are of the same culture and inclination as those in the non-Communist regions. It is difficult to imagine the Communists have persuaded them to abandon the opium poppy.

The same problem presumably challenges the Chinese Communists in their province of Yunnan.

In Peking, the Communist regime has imposed stiff penalties for drug usage and

illegal production. But that Peking can effectively police the opium growers of Yunnan seems doubtful. There must also be substantial authorized production for the medicinal needs of more than 700 million Chinese. This affords the opportunity for diversion to illegal use. Thus China undoubtedly makes its contribution to the illegal narcotics traffic.

But there is no evidence of a massive and calculated campaign by Peking to flood non-Communist countries with debilitating narcotics. Some Westerners have charged the Chinese with just such a plan. But interviews with hundreds of narcotics experts in the past five months have failed to produce the proof.

Says one non-American expert: "With their U-2's, their satellites, the Americans would soon have evidence of any large-scale opium production in China. Presumably they would be happy to make it public. Certainly, drugs come out of China. But there's no proof the Peking regime is organizing it all."

Thus the opium comes down the trails through Burma and Laos. Some bypasses Thailand. It is flown out of Laos by pilots of fortune of various nationalities operating a fictitious airline called "Air Opium." Some cargoes are dropped in watertight bags in the Gulf of Siam and picked up by rendezvousing ships. Others are flown into Vietnam. Opium worth \$100 a kilo in Bangkok sells for three times the price in Saigon.

But the bulk of the opium heads on into Thailand. The town of Tak is a main collection center. Other shipments funnel into Chiang Rai and Chiang Mai. After that the destination is Bangkok, or sometimes on down the Malaysian Peninsula. Small boats operating from islands off Malaysia move the cargoes from there.

Some opium is packaged specifically for smoking. Addicts in Southeast Asia have favorite brands, like Lucky and OK. A packet of Lucky brand I handled was colorfully labeled, with its own promotional advertising in Chinese.

CONVERSION INTO MORPHINE

Part of the opium crop is converted into morphine base at crude laboratories in northern Thailand. Then, about a tenth the weight of the original opium, it moves on in yellow block form bearing the "999" stamp distinctive to morphine from the Southeast Asian region.

In Bangkok's twin city of Thonburi is hidden a clandestine laboratory which converts morphine to heroin. Local addicts buy red or purple, or No. 3, heroin about 60 to 70 percent pure. White, or No. 4, heroin is purer and of export grade. This is destined for the American market.

White heroin is smuggled to the United States by couriers on commercial or military flights. Purple heroin, morphine, and opium destined for such local markets as Hong Kong travels by sea. Usually it goes on deep-sea trawlers from a fishing port near Bangkok.

How to reduce the traffic?

A decision by Lao authorities to get out of the opium business would help. More vigorous action by the Thai Government against traffickers would contribute.

A United Nations survey recommends upgrading the living standards of the hill tribes and substituting cash crops like peas, tobacco, tea, and coffee for opium. But this is a long-term program and would cost millions. With present uncertainties in Indo-China, great areas of opium-growing country would remain unreachable.

For the moment, eradication seems unattainable. Hope must be placed on seizures by Asian narcotics officers and on American narcotics agents assigned to such cities as Bangkok, Singapore, Saigon, and Hong Kong to gather and coordinate intelligence on traffickers. The other part of the solution lies in the education and reform of drug-users themselves.

But that is another story.

STUDENT ON COLLEGE DISSENT

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 5, 1970, an article entitled "To Learn or To Burn," was published in the Aiken Standard & Review, of Aiken, S.C.

This article was written by Cheryl McNair, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James M. McNair, of Aiken. Cheryl is a student at Aiken Junior High and first published her remarks in the student newspaper called The Buzz.

It is obvious from her comments that Cheryl feels a sense of responsibility to her community and fellow students. It is encouraging to read the views of this young lady for they reflect teaching which inspires responsibility and discipline.

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

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

TO LEARN OR TO BURN
(By Cheryl McNair)

To learn or to burn? That seems to be the popular question among college students today. For a pitiful minority, the latter choice evidently looks the brighter one.

I always feel a surge of anger when I see one of these campus dissenters. They aren't hard to spot, for their dress and appearance bring them the attention they need. The most common ones are long haired (preferably shoulder length and stringy) bearded, sideburned (the classiest meet under the chin) and-or mustached.

And as far as their way of individual clothing, it all looks alike to me: dirty, stinky, and unkempt. Because their appearances spell out nothing but the need for a bath, this group should be delved into deeper.

The demonstrators preach love, peace, brotherhood, and unity. The Constitution gives them the right to demonstrate their views peacefully. And yet, what do they do? They yell dirty words at policemen and throw stones at the Establishment. They burn the place that educates them and hurt the home that instilled the very beliefs in them. They protest the war in Vietnam and yet they wage a war at home with the law. They simply don't practice what they preach. I believe that the dissidents weren't sincere in the first place.

They argue that the world should be cleaned up and changed. One probably couldn't find a single radical not in some way connected with the free sex revolution and the abuse of drugs.

I think that those kids aren't fighting for a cause. This is just a facade. The real game is their trying to gain attention by throwing away morals, supposedly in a legitimate way. After years of morals that separate civilization from barbarism, students have decided it's time for a change.

My big question is: "Who do they think they are?"

A majority of this minority are spoiled brats who have always gotten what they wanted from their parents.

Naturally, they are sent to college by their parents' desire, not especially their own. They think they are on top of everything, even that which is right.

I say, the minute they start their destruction of things, cut off all their money and

send 'em home. This is justifiable, since they are hurting the unheard-from campus majority: the workers, the thinkers, the doers. They are our future leaders. They should be the ones to get the advantages, not cancelled classes because the building is being taken over. To insure a good future for America, we must clean out the shallow, immature, disquieted few.

The rioters explain that they want to change the country by solving the problems. The only thing they've accomplished is the adding of one more problem: campus unrest.

The whole crisis stems from students' disrespect. They don't respect other people, property, or laws. I think that, no matter how, student radicals must be taught respect.

We, as students, can fight campus rebels by maintaining high standards of morals and respect and by working hard in school.

Campus demonstrators are biting the hand that feeds them, but hopefully, in the near future, they will get bitten back.

EFFECTS OF WATERSHED TREATMENT ON STREAMFLOW

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, an article in a recent issue of Soil Conservation magazine describes the progress being attained at the Washita River project under the direction of the Southern Great Plains Watershed Research Center in Chickasha, Okla.

Written by Windell R. Shockey, Monroe A. Hartman, and Dolly R. Hunt of the Agricultural Research Service, the article, entitled "Effects of Watershed Treatment on Streamflow" explains how land use changes and conservation treatment have greatly altered the watershed in the past 30 years. I believe that the following article deserves attention because of its timely comments on ecology:

EFFECTS OF WATERSHED TREATMENT ON STREAMFLOW

(By Windell R. Shockey, Monroe A. Hartman, and Dolly R. Hunt)

How does upstream flood control affect streamflow in water-short areas?

Such facts become more important each year to farmers, communities, and industries alike.

Finding the answer, by observing the flow of a river through varied land-resource and climatic regions within its basins, poses a complicated research problem.

The problem is further complicated by river water moving underground to the surrounding aquifer, or from the aquifer to the riverbed. This research resembles the problem of a man trying to determine how much water he can carry downhill in a leaky bucket if—

... he started with the bucket partly filled;

... more water was dumped in at several points en route;

... and water occasionally sloshed over the side.

The man needs an accurate measurement of the water he has at the end of the trip. In addition, he must know the total amount of water that was in the bucket at any time during the trip, where it came from, and what happened to it.

Studies on the Washita River basin in

Oklahoma and Texas seek to answer the question. The Washita River basin, one of 11 watersheds authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 for USDA sponsored watershed protection, is particularly well suited for research of this nature.

The authorized program, consisting primarily of land-treatment measures, such as pasture and range reseeding and improvement, crop rotation, land terracing, stream-channel improvement, and floodwater-retarding reservoirs, initiated in 1946 is now a continuing program by the Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with local landowners and operators.

Land use changes and conservation treatment have greatly altered the watershed in 30 years.

In 1930, 55 percent of the drainage area was in poor pasture; in 1960, 76 percent was in pasture, of which 70 percent was classified as "good." By 1965, 800 of the 1,200 planned flood-retarding structures had been built. In addition, Chickasha Lake, Fort Cobb Lake, and Foss Reservoir provide a combined conservation-storage capacity of 364,000 acre-feet.

The Agricultural Research Service started hydrologic research in 1961 on a 1,130-square-mile segment of the Washita River basin, with headquarters at the Southern Great Plains Watershed Research Center in Chickasha, Okla. The Soil Conservation Service Oklahoma State University, University of Oklahoma Research Institute, Oklahoma Water Resources Board, Environmental Science Services Administration, and other federal, state, and local agencies cooperated in the research.

At the beginning, only nominal soil conservation practices had been applied in the study area, thus enabling researchers to record streamflow and channel behavior before and after application of intensive watershed protection and land-treatment measures.

Research planners recognized that watershed-improvement measures could affect more than just the waterflow in the river. Further, the Washita River research would need to yield methods for predicting the flow behavior of other rivers whose basins had been treated similarly. Comprehensive research objectives were adopted, therefore, to include:

(1) Determine how regulated flow resulting from combined land treatment and structural measures in tributary watersheds affect flood flows, annual and seasonal water yields, ground-water levels, stream-channel stability, and sediment movement along the main channel of the river.

(2) Analyze and interpret available data to determine what might have been the effect along the main stem with alternative treatment programs in the tributary watersheds.

(3) Develop hydrologic procedures for making similar estimates in other river basins.

(4) Develop conservation practices for better overall watershed performance.

An extensive hydrologic data-gathering system established in the study area includes: A network of 225 recording rain gages, 30 stream-gaging and sediment-load stations operating continuously, 250 ground-water wells, six reservoir study areas, weather stations, and stations to observe soil moisture accretion and depletion.

Numerous stream channel cross sections and reaches have been surveyed and marked for observation and future reference. Geologic and soil maps have been prepared. Records of land use and locations of applied soil conservation practices are maintained. Records are also kept of water levels in stock ponds, floodwater-retarding structures, and other reservoirs. Results are still incomplete because the studies in the Washita basin

are necessarily long-term, but some significant and interesting things have already been found.

For instance, studies in Sugar Creek watershed, a 203-square-mile tributary within the study area, indicated that flood peaks declined by 25 to 70 percent, depending upon storm size and patterns and number of floodwater-retarding reservoirs in operation.

One impressive finding thus far is the large volume of streamflow absorbed by the streambed and adjacent flood plains. About 28,000 acre-feet of water was absorbed in the 80-mile reach of river channel between Anadarko and Alex during the 10-day period in late September 1965. Information about such abstractions of streamflow are basic to an understanding of the downstream effects of treatment measures in upstream tributaries.

Thus, it does not follow automatically that water held on the land to increase crop production or to aid in stabilizing critical sediment-source areas reduces downstream water supplies. Under many climatic and geologic conditions, much of this water would have been absorbed in stream channels and added to ground water or dissipated by evaporation and phreatophytes. Elsewhere, of course, the reverse is true and water infiltrated upstream returns to sustain or increase tributary and riverflow downstream.

Land-treatment and flood-control measures in the Washita River watershed above Durwood, Okla., have reduced the volume of flow occurring at rates above 1,900 cubic feet per second (c.f.s.) and below 300 c.f.s. The volume of flow in the intermediate range (300 to 1,900 c.f.s.) has increased and offsets the reduction to the extent that the total volume of flow remains unaffected by land treatment.

Flow rates below 300 c.f.s. persist for 30 percent of the time for both the treated and untreated conditions of the watershed. Yet, the flow rates for the treated condition are much less during this time than for the untreated condition. Use of water for irrigation and increased use of water by industry probably have been a factor in reducing the flow rates in this 30-percent time period. These uses amount to 30 to 100 c.f.s. daily.

Flood frequency has also decreased at Durwood with change in land use and treatment. During this same period there has been no change in flood frequency on the nearby Kiamichi River where few land use changes have been made. Although large floods still occur after treatment, they occur less frequently. Instead of a 100,000-c.f.s. flood every 20 years, indications are that this size flood will occur only once in more than 100 years.

TWO MONUMENTS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during the course of ceremonies held on June 20 and 21, 1970, in the cities of Lagarde and Damphères, France, two monuments will be unveiled. The monuments will commemorate the 30th anniversary of the beginning of activities by the Polish Army in France during World War II. The valiant soldiers of the Polish Army fought for the freedom of France and Europe. Hundreds of these veterans now make their homes in the United States and have become productive citizens of our country.

The two monuments which have been unveiled in France will serve as a tribute and constant reminder to the heroic men who made the supreme sacrifice on behalf of the freedom of their fellow men.

I am happy to join in paying a tribute to the valiant members of the Polish Army in France during World War II.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPILATIONS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the current rate of unemployment in this country is a matter of concern to all Members of Congress.

However, in making judgments on this issue it is important that the facts surrounding unemployment be accurate.

In the June 8, 1970, issue of the News and Courier newspaper, in Charleston, S.C., the editors have drawn attention to a new concept for measuring unemployment in an editorial titled "Labor Market Gauge."

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

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

[From The News and Courier, June 8, 1970]
LABOR MARKET GAUGE

Since the nation's rate of unemployment has important implications to every area of the economy, it is essential that the measure of the labor market be as accurate as possible. For a long time the monthly jobless figures supplied by the Commerce Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics have been questioned by some economists and observers of the economic scene, including The News and Courier.

The government's figures on unemployment from time to time have shown month-to-month variations that cannot be explained by seasonal factors in the labor market or by any other yardstick. Although the Bureau of Labor Statistics has sought to refine its research techniques, the accuracy of its monthly unemployment reports have remained open to question.

A new concept for measuring unemployment has been developed by Alfred J. Tella, formerly an economist for the Federal Reserve Board who later headed labor market research for the President's Commission on Income Maintenance. Mr. Tella is seeking to solve the problem of unpredictable and volatile ups and downs in the nation's monthly labor force as now reported.

Mr. Tella assumes that there is a large group of "hidden unemployed," mostly women and teen-agers, who move in and out of the labor force according to the availability of work. This "labor reserve" is not actively looking for work and, generally, its members are not "hardship" unemployed.

The nation's potential labor force is calculated by Mr. Tella by including these persons, many of whom never have been recorded as unemployed. This he calls the "true" labor force. When reported total employment is subtracted from this force, the nation's unemployment rate can be determined.

This is, of necessity, a somewhat simplified explanation of Mr. Tella's theory. His

labor market gauge, however, results in a smooth labor force curve in contrast to the government's somewhat erratic figures issued monthly. It is, he contends, also a more accurate measure of unemployment levels. He estimates, for instance, that the second quarter of this year will see adjusted unemployment at about 4.2 per cent, up from 3.8 per cent in the first quarter. This would be a higher jobless figure than any quarter of 1969, but lower than any quarter of 1968. It indicates that by normal standards the labor market will still be relatively tight.

Since business gears many of its operations to the reported rate of unemployment, and government adjusts many of its relief and public works projects to it, plainly any improvement in the reporting of the unemployment rate would be welcome. Mr. Tella's system is being studied at the White House, at government agencies and has the support of many economists in the academic community. There is hope, then, that one day economic planners will see an end to the government's confusing zig-zag reports on unemployment.

ARTICLES RELATING TO OUR PRISONERS OF WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of Air Force and Space Digest contains a number of excellent articles on the plight of our prisoners of war in Southeast Asia. These articles are very enlightening and I hope that each Member of the Congress will take time to read them. The articles follow:

THE PLIGHT OF THE PRISONERS—WE HAVE NOT FORGOTTEN

(By Maurice L. Lien)

Mayday! Mayday!

This call, an appeal for help known to airmen the world over, was sounded in the nation's capital the evening of May 1, the traditional May Day.

The plea, uttered from the podium by Mrs. James A. Mulligan, wife of a US prisoner of war in Southeast Asia, was echoed in the hearts of nearly 1,000 other wives, parents, and children at a rally that filled Constitution Hall. They met, along with more than 2,500 others—including Vice President Spiro T. Agnew—to appeal for justice for their husbands, fathers, and sons held prisoner of war or missing in action.

Scores of senior Air Force officers, headed by the Vice Chief of Staff, Gen. John C. Meyer, were present.

The Vice President told the audience that North Vietnam was guilty of "an unforgivable breach of the elementary rules of conduct among civilized people" in its mistreatment of American prisoners of war.

"We shall never forget these men, and we shall never forget how they have been treated," the Vice President pledged.

The purpose of the rally, supported by the Air Force Association's national headquarters and attended by hundreds of AFA members from the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, was twofold: to demonstrate to the wives and families of the prisoners and the missing that Americans care; and to show the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong that their conduct is not condoned by the American public.

May 1 is also "Law Day." It was for this reason that the rally sponsors—a bipartisan congressional group headed by Sen. Robert Dole of Kansas—selected that date for the appeal. Senator Dole said that May first was "an especially appropriate day to pay this tribute" because the joint resolution passed by Congress designating Law Day specifically referred to international justice.

Other rally sponsors included Sen. Peter H. Dominick (R-Colo.); Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.); Sen. Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.); Sen. George Murphy (R-Calif.); Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.); and Sen. John Stennis (D-Miss.). Others were Representatives W. C. Daniel (D-Va.); Martin B. Mc-Kneally (R-N.Y.); Catherine May (R-Wash.); Richard L. Roudebush (R-Ind.); Robert L. F. Sikes (D-Fla.); and Olin E. Teague (D-Tex.).

Speakers included ten members of Congress, six wives of prisoners or missing servicemen, and Capt. James A. Lovell, Jr., USN, who recalled the world's concern over the fate of his Apollo-13 crew on its ill-fated trip to the moon. Captain Lovell asked that "now, again, people of the world unite with prayer and with pressure to bring these brave men home."

Another speaker was H. Ross Perot, the Dallas, Tex., multimillionaire who has devoted much of his time and fortune to arousing world opinion against Hanoi in its treatment of POWs. Mr. Perot, who testified on the issue before a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee earlier in the day, stressed that Hanoi "will not be moved by sentiment" or by "human emotion," but only by the pressure of 200,000,000 Americans.

Also present for the rally were four of the nine US prisoners released so far by Hanoi. Among them were Air Force Maj. Fred N. Thompson and Joe V. Carpenter, both from Maxwell AFB, Ala. They were introduced to the audience, as was AFA National President George D. Hardy.

According to rally officials, relatives of the missing men were present from every state except Hawaii. Many next of kin were flown to Washington in Air Force, Navy, or National Guard transport aircraft. Other relatives came by bus and car, some from far-away states. The morning following the rally, they filled to overflowing the Department of Interior auditorium for the first national meeting called to discuss ways to help their loved ones.

The meeting was organized by the League of Families of American Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia, an organization formed in the spring of 1969 to foster exchanges of information between families. All next of kin who attended the rally were invited to participate in the discussions.

During the meeting, a team of DoD officials, headed by Air Force Brig. Gen. Daniel "Chapple" James, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, stood by to answer questions.

That a major rally for MIA/POWs or a national meeting of their next of kin would be held in the nation's capital was undreamed of by most families just a year ago. Before May 18, 1969, Administration policy for the families had been, "Don't do anything to jeopardize either the delicate negotiations being conducted or the lives of your loved ones." Mrs. James B. Stockdale of Coronado, Calif., wife of a senior Naval officer held in North Vietnam, was not content just to sit and wait. Almost singlehandedly she set out to form a national organization of families. She wanted a better communications net, greater exchange of information among POW families, and more positive action from government officials.

Informal local and regional groups of POW and MIA wives had been formed in many localities where families of men who are

overseas tend to wait it out: near large air bases, Army installations, and Naval facilities, close to friends, medical facilities, and other services. They exchanged information about prisoners, discussed actions being taken by government officials or international organizations; and, most important, acted as morale boosters for each other in what they knew would be many, many months of heartbreaking loneliness and frustration.

In 1968 Mrs. Stockdale began contacting wives in cities across the country, asking them to serve as area coordinators in a new, national organization, and to seek out others to affiliate with them. Her perseverance led to the formation, in early 1969, of the League.

During the League's formative stage, Administration policy had been cautious to the point that neighbors, in some cases children, did not know fathers, husbands, or sons were missing. At that time, many families would not participate—for fear of jeopardizing the lives of loved ones. Since the reversal of Administration policy in the spring of 1969, League membership has grown to approximately 1,000 families and is active across the entire country.

Funds to support activities of the League, and of the many local and regional groups, come primarily from the families themselves. Many have spent thousands of dollars seeking information about their husbands or sons, or in trying to gain public support that might persuade the Communists to release the names of men held prisoner and to abide by the Geneva Conventions.

News coverage of the prisoner-of-war situation in the first few months following the change of Administration policy was localized and spotty. Not enough factual information on the shocking treatment of prisoners, and the doubts and burdens their families had to bear, was published in any single article to enable the American public and the world to comprehend the extent of North Vietnam's inhumanity. This changed in October 1969, when AIR FORCE/SPACE DIGEST published what the editors referred to as "one of the most important articles ever published in this magazine." Even today, DoD officials call it the "most helpful, single article" on MAP/POWs published to date.

The article was "The Forgotten Americans of the Vietnam War," by Louis R. Stockstill.

Response to "The Forgotten Americans" was immediate and dramatic, beginning with a reading of the complete article on the floor of the US House of Representatives by Rep. Roman C. Pucinski of Illinois. In his preamble, Congressman Pucinski said, "I call this article to the House because I consider it one of the most important documents of journalism in recent years. . . . It should shake the conscience of the whole free world." The article has been entered in the *Congressional Record* five times, most recently on March 6 at a hearing before the House Armed Services Committee, headed by Rep. L. Mendel Rivers.

The *Reader's Digest* ran a condensation of "The Forgotten Americans" as the lead article in its November 1969 edition. Circulation of the *Digest's* US edition alone is 17,400,000. More than two-thirds of a million reprints have been requests by *Digest* readers. AFA distributed 50,000 reprints of the original AF/SD article, including copies to every Ambassador to the United Nations and to the foreign press corps in New York and Washington.

In November 11, 1969, the United States urged the UN to exert its moral influence on Hanoi to ensure humane treatment of prisoners of war. The presentation was made by Mrs. Rita Hauser, US Representative to the UN Human Rights Commission. In her presentation, Mrs. Hauser drew heavily on material in "The Forgotten Americans."

THE UPWARD TREND IN LETTER WRITING

	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969 ¹
Number of men classified as POW's or as missing in action.....	22	173	472	878	1,243	1,428
Number of men writing letters during the year ²	1	19	47	73	94	208
Number of men writing letters for the first time.....		18	28	33	23	114
Total number of letters received by families.....	8	35	156	165	256	699

¹ Figures for 1969 are still incomplete, since letters written by POW's late in the year are still being received by families.
² This tabulation does not necessarily derive from the row below it, as a cumulative total, since some families received mail on a 1-time only basis.

Requests for reprints of the AF/SD version of Mr. Stockstill's article had begun pouring into AFA headquarters literally before distribution of the magazine was completed. Telephone calls from families of men missing or held prisoner came in from all parts of the country. It was immediately obvious that families were organized and geared for action. They were ready to tell the world what was happening to their loved ones. "The Forgotten Americans" gave them, for the first time, something they could use to arouse public opinion. Some 13,500 reprints of the article were sent by AFA directly to next of kin, at their request and at no charge.

AFA National President George D. Hardy first spoke on the plight of American prisoners in Southeast Asia in Spokane, Wash., in early October, just as the article was beginning to reach AFA members. Within a week, AFA's Washington office had received requests for copies of his remarks and the article from POW families in neighboring cities and distant states—an indication that their communications net is effective.

In his travels, Mr. Hardy meets with families whenever he can, to learn of ways in which AFA can be of help. Of these meetings, he says, "I am continually amazed that [POW/MIA families] can keep a positive attitude through all this. They know the Communists and some peace groups are trying to use them as pawns, yet they sustain each other and keep up their activities. Every time I meet with such a group, I am impressed by their patience and courage, and I leave more determined to keep up my efforts and those of AFA in behalf of these men and their wonderful families."

AFA efforts in support of MIA/POWs have generally taken two forms: first, to spark a nationwide letter-writing campaign to foreign governments, especially to those that recognize or do business with the government in North Vietnam, and to foreign publications; and, second, to directly support the families of the missing or imprisoned men and assist them in telling their stories to the world.

AFA Chapters and individual members first joined in the campaign by distributing reprints of "The Forgotten Americans" to news media, to other organizations, and to civic leaders in their communities. Many AFA Chapters invited the families to join in their meetings. This gave family spokesmen an opportunity to emphasize that the POW situation was not a remote problem but rather one of direct concern to every citizen.

An outstanding example was the campaign, led by Georgia's State AFA President William H. Kelly, who is a colonel in the Georgia Air National Guard. Colonel Kelly

and his State and Chapter officers developed a plan to distribute reprints through individuals and through regional and statewide groups. Colonel Kelly sent messages and reprints to all members of Georgia's Press and Broadcasting Associations; to 550 top Jaycee members; to 100 key members of the Retired Officers Association living in the state; to religious and youth groups; and to many others. Chapters, meanwhile, concentrated on local media, organizations, and civic leaders.

Other AFA units throughout the country took up the POW cause. In Michigan, for example, State AFA President Marjorie O. Hunt sent out some 600 news releases to all newspapers and radio and TV stations in the state. She included a letter explaining AFA, and a list of Chapter presidents who could be contacted for local information. She also appeared on an hour-long broadcast on radio station WMUZ in Detroit, and made a tape for another station.

Dallas, Tex., Chapter President Brig. Gen. Herbert G. Bench, USAF (Ret.), sent a reprint of the Stockstill article to each Chapter member urging them to write letters to foreign governments and to selected publications, and to keep the reprints available in their offices. In neighboring Fort Worth, Gordon Brownlee distributed 1,500 reprints and got excellent coverage in that city's news media.

In early March, George J. Burrus, III, President of the Cape Canaveral Chapter and Chairman of AFA's Florida State POW Letter Committee, reported that a community-wide project in his area had succeeded in obtaining nearly 25,000 signatures on petitions, and that local school children were writing letters. Chapters across the state are actively supporting this program.

Ten wives of men listed as missing in action or prisoners of war live in the Tucson, Ariz. area. AFA's Tucson Chapter has invited these wives to all its functions. The Chapter has helped raise funds so four of the wives could visit the capitals of the free world to tell their stories.

The Spokane, Wash., Chapter, under the leadership of Vernon L. Gomes, Chairman of their POW committee, and in cooperation with the Armed Services Committee of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, conducted a successful fund-raising drive to help pay expenses for other wives and a mother of a prisoner of war to make a similar trip.

These are only representative examples of nationwide AFA programs to publicize the plight of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia and to assist their families. This report would be incomplete, however, without mention of the outstanding program of the Eglin, Fla., Chapter of AFA.

Col. Harry G. Howton, USAF (Ret.), with the help of Chuck Widaman, Eglin Chapter President, and Herbert "Bud" West, Florida State AFA Immediate Past President, helped develop a model program of action, and published a twenty-four-page brochure describing in detail what concerned citizens can do to help. The program involves the League of Families, the Eglin AFB and Hurlburt Field Officers' Wives Clubs and NCO Wives Clubs, religious groups, the news media, and many other organizations. Colonel Howton serves as Area Coordinator for the program.

The brochure, which has been widely distributed, includes information on MIA/POWs, sample letters and resolutions with suggested addresses, and much other valuable information. The Eglin group also printed bumper stickers to help keep this problem always in the public's mind. Details on the program can be had by writing: Eglin Chapter, AFA, P.O. Box 176, Shalimar, Fla. 32579.

Many other organizations are now involved in the campaign on behalf of the POWs. Included in these are veterans and other

patriotic groups, such as United We Stand, the National Jaycees, and chambers of commerce and local groups in communities across the nation. On April 8, Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, in a letter to the Adjutants General of all states, announced a "Show Your Concern" campaign, to be conducted on a voluntary basis by Guard personnel within their local communities.

Have we accomplished our mission? The answer, obviously, is no.

Have we been of any help? Yes, but it should be borne in mind that we still have a long way to go.

There has been what DoD officials term a "significant increase" in letters received by families of men held prisoner, starting in November 1969, after publication of "The Forgotten Americans," but this is considered only a start. In testimony before the House Committee on Armed Services on March 6, Richard G. Capen, Jr., Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, testified:

"It must be pointed out that the Geneva Convention clearly specifies that a prisoner of war should be allowed to write not less than six letters and cards per month. In the five years our men have been held captive, only about 175 individuals have been allowed to write. Their families have received about 1,100 letters. Usually the frequency for those few letters has been around one or two letters per year.

"If the men we believe to be prisoners were allowed to write as dictated by the Geneva Convention," he continued, "their families should receive some 6,000 to 8,000 letters per month. But there have been only 1,100 in a total of five years."

The provision for treatment of prisoners of war as prescribed in the Geneva Conventions of 1949, which have been signed by more than 120 nations, including the US and North Vietnam, calls for the immediate release of sick and injured, impartial inspection of prisoner facilities, the complete identification of men held, and affirms the right of prisoners to correspond with their families.

According to DoD figures released on May 8 (as of May 2), the total number of US servicemen classified as prisoners or missing in action was 1,546. More than half—783—are Air Force (see list, next page).

Of the 450 servicemen DoD believes to be prisoners, 228 are Air Force. Of the remainder, 144 are Navy, fifty-five are Army, and twenty-three are Marines.

A total of 1,096 servicemen are missing and thought to be captive—555 from the Air Force, 337 Army, 112 Navy, and ninety-two Marines.

In March, an Army sergeant passed his sixth year in captivity. Twenty-one others have been prisoners or missing for more than five years.

A total of thirty-one Americans have been released by hostile forces to date—nine were released by Hanoi and twenty-two by the Viet Cong in South Vietnam.

At the May 1 rally, H. Ross Perot put forth his analysis of North Vietnam's leaders. They are not concerned with prisoners—theirs or ours, he said. They refuse to acknowledge the some 33,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong held by the South Vietnamese, and cannot comprehend that the American public, or our government, would be concerned about "just 1,500" servicemen. Prisoners are useful to the Communists only for propaganda purposes or as pawns.

Mr. Perot emphasized, as did all rally speakers, that the leaders in Hanoi must be convinced that the American people and their leaders are truly concerned over "just 1,500" men. He declared that elected leaders must speak out, and the public must write letters, so that the message will be unmistakable. Permanent alienation of all Americans

by the government in Hanoi is "a risk they cannot take, over 'just 1,500' men," Mr. Perot said. "They're counting on us to protect them from the Chinese over the long haul."

In a recent review of AFA's efforts in support of this campaign, AFA President Hardy said, "We've got to continue to encourage our members, to publicize this problem in their communities, and to get everyone to write to Hanoi and to other governments. I know it takes time, but as we were reminded at the rally, the prisoners have lots of time, just sitting in their cells."

The mission for the future, then, is clear. More Americans must get involved and express their concern. According to the Air Force Judge Advocate General's Office, "There is no public-affairs objection to a military person, as an individual citizen and even using his military rank and/or title, expressing his opinion to a foreign government on the POW issue." It did caution, however, that "actual content of the letters must be restricted to the subject of humane treatment of POWs by North Vietnam and must not invade the political arena."

The government in North Vietnam must be made to believe that 200,000,000 Americans are concerned about "just 1,500" of their countrymen. That is a goal to which AFA is dedicated.

SPEAKING OF POW'S: SERVING THOSE WHO SIT AT HOME AND WAIT

(By John L. Frisbee)

In May 1967, the air campaign against targets in North Vietnam's Red River Valley was going full bore. By that time, the Valley—particularly the part known as Route Packages VI and VI-A, which included Hanoi and Halphong—had become the most heavily defended area in the history of air warfare.

Almost daily, Air Force F-105s, F-4s, and RF-4s flew north against military targets in RP VI. It probably was the most dangerous—certainly the most complex—sustained campaign ever conducted by the Air Force. And it was teamwork all the way.

Col. Howard "Scrappy" Johnson, then Deputy Commander for Operations of the 388th Tactical Fighter Wing at Korat Air Base, Thailand, thought the aircrews of the wings that were working together in the Red River Valley should get to know each other. So on May 22, 1967, the 388th hosted a meeting at Korat for that purpose, and also to exchange ideas on tactics. And also to indulge in some of the kinds of relaxation that fighter crews most enjoy.

Out of that meeting grew the Red River Valley Fighter Pilots Association. Today it's a worldwide organization with more than forty local chapters—or Forces, as they are called. Its membership has been expanded to include Navy and Marine airways who flew missions in the Red River Valley, the crews of the Jolly Green Giant choppers that picked up a lot of downed airmen in the Valley, their A-1 escort pilots, and other airmen who were in combat over the Valley. The members, now some 1,400 strong, call themselves the Red River Rats—or just River Rats for short.

The River Rats held their first Stateside reunion at Wichita, Kan., in April 1969. Colonel Johnson (now stationed at Nellis AFB, Nev.), was elected Head Rat, with several Navy and Marine fighter pilots and other Air Force types filling out the roster of Association officers.

One very important group was absent from Wichita and from the Association's second annual reunion at San Antonio, Tex., last month. That group is the Red River Valley veterans who now are POWs or are missing in action. All have been named life members, and it is to them—directly and indirectly—that the work of the River Rats is largely dedicated.

During the Korean War, an enemy pilot,

complete with MIG-15, surrendered to the USAF. His reason: He had noticed that whenever an American fighter pilot was in trouble, all other aircraft in the area came to the assistance of the stricken pilot. That, he said, wasn't true in his air force. The USAF looked like a pretty good team to him.

Well, things haven't changed in that respect for the USAF or for the air arm of any other US service. River Rats proved it in combat all over Southeast Asia—perhaps most dramatically over the Red River Valley. Now they are proving it in a different way through their support of efforts to get our POWs back. The day that happens, a bronze bell, which has become symbolic of the River Rats' continuing mission, will be rung for the first time, and the name of every returning Rat is to be engraved on its surface.

At Wichita, the River Rats decided there was something else—tangible, immediate, and important—to be done for their missing comrades. Working through Personal Services offices of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, each local Force of the Red River Valley Fighter Pilots Association has contacted families of POWs and MIAs in its area to offer assistance that is beyond the capability or authority of the military services.

Some of the wives and families of aircrew members who are "still out" live with relatives or, for other reasons, need no assistance. But to many families, the River Rats have become a very present help in time of need. To each of those families, a River Rat and his wife are assigned as sponsors. The sponsors—for that matter, the entire local Force—are always there, day or night, to lend a helping hand in domestic emergencies. They have fixed cars, repaired washing machines, driven sick children to the hospital, escorted POW/MIA wives to social events, taken the kids to ball games, and generally helped buck up morale on the home front. Sometimes just being an understanding listener is the greatest of all services.

The River Rats have worked quietly, without publicity. But word gets around. Several aerospace companies have volunteered support, in efforts to speed the repatriation of POW members, and in the work the Rats do with families of missing airmen. The Aerospace Optical Division of International Tel and Tel, for example, has established a scholarship fund, to be administered by the River Rats, for children of Red River Valley veterans who are prisoners, missing, or who were killed in action. Part of the annual dues of each member goes to the fund, which, it is hoped, will be built up by additional contributions from other individuals and groups.

The Air Force Association joins the Red River Rats and the families of missing members in their hope that the bronze bell soon will ring out for the first time. Like the River Rats, AFA is dedicated to that goal—the return of our imprisoned airmen.

The River Rats can be proud of the campaign they conducted in the Red River Valley. That is behind them now, and probably most would as soon forget the MIGs and the ground fire. But they haven't forgotten, and they won't forget, the teammates who were left behind or the families that wait at home alone. The helping hand that River Rats have extended to these families is typical of the loyalty, courage, and compassion of American airmen.

There is a lesson here for all Americans.

WAR PRISONERS HAVE HUMAN RIGHTS TOO (By John F. Loosbrock)

One can make a very good case, in purely military terms, for the missions into the Parrot's Beak and the Fishhook in Cambodia. It is sound military doctrine to strike, and strike hard, at an enemy's supply caches and his command and control centers. One has only to recall the immense contribution to the ending of our own Civil War, made by

Sherman's March to the Sea. The history of war is studded with other examples.

The box score on weapons, ammunition, and food supplies already netted in the Cambodian raids is impressive (see page 14), and it is good to know that a significant though incalculable number of young Americans now serving in South Vietnam will have their fair chance of living to a ripe old age as a result of these operations.

The political side effects of the Cambodian raids are another matter. However, one may feel about the necessity for the action there, its divisive impact on the American body politic is as much a fact of life as are the obvious military pluses involved in limiting the enemy's ability to hurt our own troops and those of our allies.

One of the most distressing side effects we have noted is the increasing tendency to substitute knee-jerk reflexes for the rule of reason, to replace honest debate with the parroting of *ersatz* slogans. It is impossible, we feel, to be moved to sorrow and anger at the unnecessary and tragic deaths of the four Kent State students without betraying in any way one's belief that a Communist-dominated Asia would be a deadly peril, not only to the United States, but to free men everywhere. But the polarization of our society is making it ever more difficult to discuss almost any issue from more than one point of view.

A friend of ours warned us years ago: "When you walk down the middle of the road, you can get hit from either side." He was right, and it saddens us to have to admit it. But because he was right, important issues, on which all Americans, regardless of color, creed, or political persuasion, should be able to unite, get lost in the shuffle.

A case in point is the plight of the Americans who are known to be either prisoners of the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong or who are missing and believed to be prisoners. Only one week before the massive gathering on the Ellipse protested the Cambodian operations to the President, the nation, and the world, a much smaller, less vocal, and less photographed crowd gathered only a block away in Constitution Hall.

Families of the war prisoners and of the men missing in action were there, from all parts of the land. There were speeches, requests for help, calls to action, and promises of support. But media coverage was sparse and, we suspect, the Hanoi government was much more impressed and hardened in its intransigence by what happened on the Ellipse seven days later.

The Air Force Association and this magazine took the lead in the matter of the prisoners of war last fall when we published in our October issue Lou Stockstill's magnificent article portraying their plight. Much has happened since in a positive way, as is outlined in detail beginning on page 32. But what remains to be done shows clearly in the statistics—thirty-one men have been released (nine by Hanoi and twenty-two others by the Viet Cong in South Vietnam); 450 are still in prison to our certain knowledge; and 1,096 more still languish in the shadowy land of "missing in action," leaving behind women who know not whether they are wives or widows.

There is much talk of human rights among those who protest the war. But there also is a basic human right involved in the matter of the war prisoners. Any prisoner, no matter how heinous his crime—whether he is imprisoned for criminal, civil, or political reasons, or whether he is a legitimate prisoner of war—deserves the basic human rights guaranteed by domestic and international law. In the case of a prisoner of war, his family is entitled by the Geneva Convention to know where he is held, and to communicate with him.

The North Vietnamese say our men are not prisoners of war but war criminals, and

hence not protected by the Geneva Convention. That is pure hogwash. The Geneva Convention does not go into the matter of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of a war. If a man is in the military service, is wearing his country's uniform, and is captured, he is a prisoner of war and entitled to humane treatment under the Convention, which North Vietnam has signed.

Surely here is a cause in which all Americans can come together. We can appreciate the purity of motive with which more and more Americans are opposing the war in Southeast Asia. This is their right and their privilege. But we can also hope that the protestors, who say they are so concerned and who say they care so much, will direct at least a portion of that concern and that care toward their own countrymen whose basic human rights are being trodden upon by the country whose flag flew last month on the Ellipse.

If it is all well and good, when one disagrees with the President of the United States, to march on Washington and "tell it to Nixon," is it not even more pertinent and even more constructive to take up the cause of the American war prisoners and "tell it to Hanoi"?

CLEVELAND, OHIO, GREENHOUSE
VEGETABLES ON HOUSE RESTAURANT
FARE FOR WEDNESDAY,
JUNE 24, 1970

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of the House that fresh, delicious vegetable produce from the "Greenhouse Capital of the Nation" will be made available to diners in the House of Representatives Restaurant tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24.

This remarkable center of the greenhouse industry, located in northeast Ohio, has now under cultivation about 400 acres of land, with 2.4 million square feet of glass, which produce from 75 to 100 tons of fresh vegetables per acre.

This Cleveland area industry employs over 1,000 workers with an annual production of vegetables worth over \$15 million.

The vegetables which will be served in the fresh salads in the House Restaurant tomorrow are being provided through the courtesy of the Cleveland Greenhouse Vegetable Growers Association and the sponsorship of their Congressmen, the Honorable JACKSON BETTS, MICHAEL FEIGHAN, WILLIAM MINSHALL, CHARLES MOSHER, LOUIS STOKES, and myself.

The members of the Cleveland Greenhouse Vegetable Growers Association are now cultivating over 235 acres of land under glass. The vegetables which are produced from their hard labor are demonstrative of the careful attention given to this immense greenhouse farming activity so close to the center of one of the Nation's great urban areas.

This Cleveland industry is primarily a small business operation operating without the benefit of any Federal crop subsidies, loans, or insurance.

The entire Greater Cleveland com-

munity is proud of the accomplishments of this industry.

We know you will enjoy this delicious salad from the greenhouses of northeast Ohio.

A BILL TO DETER AIRCRAFT HIJACKERS

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, since May 1, 1961, there have been 85 attempts to hijack American commercial aircraft. Most regrettably, 66 of these attempts have been successful.

All of us agree that something must be done to prevent further acts of air piracy. The question is one of method. Because almost all of the hijacking attempts involved the use or threatened use of a firearm, some people have concluded that new and more stringent gun controls are necessary. I do not believe that this is the answer. Since many of the hijacked airliners began their ill-fated journeys from jurisdictions having very restrictive firearms laws, it would seem that, as a purely practical matter, Government controls on the sale and ownership of firearms have not achieved any worthwhile purpose. Moreover, stringent gun control statutes, such as those which require the registration and licensing of rifles, pistols, and shotguns, are, in my opinion, a great and unwarranted infringement on the right of law-abiding citizens to buy and own firearms. Thus, the challenge is to enact legislation which will deter the illegal use of guns by would-be hijackers without denying the law-abiding citizen the right to travel in interstate commerce with an unloaded, properly cased firearm.

I believe that the bill which I am introducing today will punish those who demonstrate a callous disregard for the lives and safety of others by hijacking interstate carriers. Yet, at the same time, the right of American citizens to use firearms for self-defense and for legitimate sporting purposes would be guaranteed.

Specifically, my bill would make it unlawful for any person, except authorized military, law enforcement, and certain other specified personnel, to carry a concealed firearm or destructive device while traveling aboard an interstate common carrier. Violations would be punishable by imprisonment not to exceed 5 years and/or a fine not to exceed \$5,000. However, with certain exceptions relating to uncured mental incompetents, unlawful narcotics users, fugitives from justice, and certain other categories of persons, the right of law abiding citizens to carry unloaded, properly encased firearms in interstate commerce would be protected. The benefits under this section would extend to any person over the age of 18 years who carries a rifle or shotgun in interstate commerce, to any person over the age of 21 with respect to the interstate transportation of a handgun, and to any other juvenile provided that he is accompanied by an adult who is entitled to the protections of this

measure and who is willing to supervise the interstate carriage of a firearm. This section is subject to the limitation that firearms transported aboard a common carrier must be unloaded, encased, and deposited with an authorized agent. Moreover, the entire bill is qualified by the further proviso that Federal laws respecting the ownership, possession, and transportation of machineguns, sawed-off shotguns, certain other weapons and destructive devices would not be altered. A person who meets the criteria established in my bill would be permitted to carry a firearm through States with contrary laws relating to the licensing and registration of firearms as long as he remains in interstate commerce. However, this immunity would not apply to State and local hunting laws, to laws governing the carriage of concealed weapons, or to restrictions on the ownership and/or possession of firearms by local residents.

Thus, the bill which I am introducing today will give the Federal Government a valuable tool for deterring and punishing those who would hijack commercial aircraft and other common carriers, while, at the same time, protecting the right of law abiding citizens to carry firearms for legitimate purposes in interstate commerce. I believe that both of these considerations are important and should be incorporated as amendments to the appropriate sections of the United States Code. Accordingly, I urge very careful study of the measure which I am now introducing.

MR. ALFRED V. "AL" ATKINSON

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I received the news of the death of Mr. Al Atkinson, a legislative representative for the Communications Workers of America.

Mr. Atkinson succumbed to a heart attack Saturday evening while preparing to return to Washington from Cincinnati where he had been attending the CWA convention with his son, Alfred, Jr.

Mr. Atkinson had served as a CWA legislative representative since 1960 and it was my privilege to meet him soon after coming to the Congress in January of 1963. He was a dedicated trade unionist and very proficient in his duties for the Communications Workers.

But more than this Al Atkinson was a very warm human being. He spent a great deal of time helping others, particularly friends or acquaintances who had suffered some personal misfortune and were in need. He had a warm personality and that rare ability to give and take kidding in a pleasant and inoffensive manner.

Mr. Speaker, Al Atkinson was an individual whom I counted as a personal friend and I will miss him. My full sympathy is extended to his widow, Delphia; his daughter, Mrs. Ann Carolyn Winstead, and his son, Alfred, Jr.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES: COOPERATIVE ACHIEVEMENT ENDORSED BY THE NEW YORK TIMES

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has a real opportunity to bring to fruition a vital conservation project which will serve the whole public, now and in the future. We can enact the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore to preserve a rare and endangered shoreline environment along Lake Michigan.

We have this opportunity now, after 11 years of effort. Four national administrations have worked for this goal, and I am happy to note that it has the backing of the current administration. Governors of Michigan, of both political parties, have endorsed the lakeshore.

The Michigan Legislature, in pledging to fully cooperate with the project, has made a highly significant contribution, again on a wholly bipartisan basis. Members of Congress of all persuasions are working together to save this superb shoreline resource. And, of course, thousands of citizens in Michigan and nationwide have urged prompt enactment.

It is this kind of cooperative effort, built on an overriding recognition of the danger threatening this significant landscape and the urgency for bringing it under balanced protection, that gives me confidence that the lakeshore will win approval in this Congress. We have now a proposal that incorporates the best ideas from everyone. We have legislation which enjoys the strong, urgent, and bipartisan cosponsorship and advocacy of every Member of our Michigan delegation in the House of Representatives.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore legislation has been refined and tempered. Out of the genius of the legislative process, we have evolved an approach that can simultaneously maximize two objectives not easily resolved: To preserve a magnificent, endangered landscape for all the public for all time, but in doing so to protect also the interests of local communities and the rights of established property owners. It is to this achievement that we may credit the wide support the proposal now enjoys in the local area. The tide of local opinion is shifting from either opposition or indifference to advocacy of the national lakeshore. For example, the Board of Commissioners of Benzie County, once on record in opposition, just a week ago approved a resolution urging establishment of the lakeshore.

Mr. Speaker, this is encouraging news, another reflection of the resolution of this matter which has been achieved by cooperative efforts. When this area is added to the national park system—as I am confident it will be this year—it will be a victory of which we may all be proud, a victory to which all have contributed and in which all will share, a victory for the people and for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times in its Sunday, June 21, edition, again expressed its editorial support for the

Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. I include this excellent, concise editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1970]

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

More than eleven years have elapsed since the Sleeping Bear Dunes of northern Michigan were first suggested to Congress as a national lakeshore proposal. Since then, Congressional hearings have repeatedly emphasized the importance of adequately preserving this spectacular shore. Compromises have been made to assure protection of private landowners in the vicinity. Now the Administration has announced its support of the bill to establish this 71,000-acre park.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes, which are perched on glacial moraine bluffs, rise boldly 460 feet above Lake Michigan. Associated with the great white dunes are miles of sandy beaches, inland lakes, winding streams, and wild forested hills. Additional lakeshore acreage would include the forest-covered Empire Dunes several miles to the south and parts of the Manitou Islands.

There is no question that this wild lakeshore is one of the most inspiring scenic areas of the Great Lakes region and, as the Interior Department has stated, that it ranks as "one of the most important remaining shoreline opportunities in the entire country."

Further to postpone establishment of this priceless area can only increase the risk of impairment by commercial interests. It is time to add this unique natural treasure to the national shoreline system.

STILES FARM FOUNDATION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the Stiles Farm Foundation. This 3,200-acre demonstration farm, under the able direction of Calvin A. Rinn, farm manager, and John E. Hutchinson, director of the Texas A. & M. University extension service, has accomplished untold good both in improving farm income and in fostering the high-quality production which enables the people of this Nation to spend a mere 16.5 percent of their income on food—the lowest in the history of man. Since its founding in 1962, the Stiles Farm Foundation has truly represented the best attitudes and promoted the finest techniques available in this most important industry, the industry upon which this great Nation was built.

On June 16, 1970, the Stiles Farm Foundation held its eighth annual field day at the farm, attended by close to a thousand surrounding farmers and their families. I would like to commend Mr. Ethan C. Holt, Mr. John Chapin, Mr. R. J. Hodges, Mr. Luther Bird, Mr. O. D. Butler, Mr. T. D. Tanksley, Jr., and the other representatives of the farm for their enlightening presentation of the latest advances in farm research being demonstrated there. I would also like to commend Mr. Rinn and Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. L. S. Pope, Mr. H. O. Kunkle, and Gen. A. R. Luedicke of Texas A. & M. University, Mr. Calvin Janak and the other members of the Taylor Chamber of Commerce, and all the businesses and

individuals who organized and presented the program for the day and saw to it that no one returned home hungry.

I would like to extend with them a special thank you to Mr. Andrew J. Mair, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., who took time from his busy schedule to deliver the keynote address. The Stiles Farm Foundation considers it a high honor to have had this distinguished agricultural expert as its guest for this occasion. Mr. Mair's remarks are timely and significant, even though his comments on "set aside" might be controversial. We can all agree that the biggest thing going for the American farmer is his continuing efficiency.

THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, graduation from any of the U.S. service academies is an honor aspired to by many of America's young men. Not only do the men attending these academies receive a fine scholastic education with a college degree, but they also have instilled in them the discipline and training which enables them to be the leaders of our Nation tomorrow.

We, here in the Congress, can, to some extent, help a young man enter most of the academies by a congressional appointment. However, we have no such jurisdiction over admittance and acceptance to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy at New Haven, Conn. Acceptance there is based solely upon the physical and scholastic abilities of the individual candidate.

It is for that reason I am singularly proud of one of my constituents from the 20th Congressional District in Pennsylvania. I salute Thomas B. Rodino, who graduated earlier this month as an ensign in the Coast Guard and with a bachelor of science degree.

Ensign Rodino is a son of Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence P. Rodino of 110 Constitution Circle in Clairton, Pa. He graduated from Clairton High School in 1966 and immediately entered into competition with more than 3,900 other young men across the Nation to secure his appointment to the Academy.

The Coast Guard Academy, Mr. Speaker, seems to be especially appealing to young men from the Clairton steel community. There have been several who won their appointments on merit alone. Two of them, I know, Ensign Rodino and Ensign William G. Pavlik of 23-D Lincoln Avenue, Clairton, marched in the inaugural parade for President Nixon in January 1969. Ensign Pavlik graduated from the Academy in June of last year and now is on duty in Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I know these two young men have brought pride to their parents, but I would like them to know, too, they have brought pride to the city of Clairton and to me, their congressional repre-

sentative. They are men of great potential whose qualities of leadership, determination, and courage may be greatly needed in the world of tomorrow.

FLAG DAY

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, in these days when there is so much disrespect for our American flag and so many occasions when we have cause for embarrassment at the actions of some elements of our society, it is always good to be reminded of the lofty principles which our flag represents.

We were reminded very forcefully of this in the Flag Day ceremonies here last week and I have recently read a very fine article which appeared in the June edition of the Elks magazine. This article, written by Mr. Frank Hise, Grand Exalted Ruler of the Elks, is entitled "Fly It Proudly" and I feel is worthy of the attention of every Member of the House.

In the same edition of the Elks magazine there appears an article, also written by Grand Exalted Ruler Hise, entitled "Membership Requirement of Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America" which is, I believe, worthy of our attention. This is a splendid organization, of which I am proud to be a member, and I would like to include herein with my remarks the two articles to which I make reference.

The articles follow:

A MESSAGE FROM THE GRAND EXALTED RULER

This is the month when we pay honor and respect to our country's Flag. Down through history no nation has achieved the greatness of our own America whose Flag has flown proudly and grandly these many years as a symbol of a free people.

Even though we are going through a period of great change, a period of turmoil and internal strife we are still a great nation and, God willing, shall continue to be for many years to come.

There are those few in our United States who claim that our Flag is the symbol of oppression, that it is no longer the symbol of our people. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is the same Flag that has carried us through periods of war and depression, the same symbol that guarantees us our rights under our Constitution, the same symbol that supports the Bill of Rights and the rights of the individual to seek his own destiny. It is a constant reminder of the price that we have paid for freedom and the prosperity that we enjoy today.

Let every Elk and every Elks lodge display Old Glory on our national holidays over our lodges, our homes and our businesses. Let us make our Flag Day ceremony, established in 1911, not simply a gesture on this one day but a reminder of our duty throughout the year.

There are too few of us speaking out in defense of our country and if our American heritage is to be preserved we must be involved in its preservation. We are not opposed to change, but the change must come in an orderly manner based on common sense with emphasis upon the rights of the

individuals to the point where they do not conflict with the rights of others.

It is vitally important that we understand the thinking of this very intelligent generation of young people. It would be a tragic mistake to condemn a whole generation because of the militant minority. We want our young people to express themselves for most of them are sincere and hold deep and honest convictions. From our Order's experience we can be confident that our young people will come forth with new ideals, with sound, new concepts, proving themselves better Americans for having been subjected to the pressures at this point in time.

Common sense and love of country will prevail. There are no hopeless situations. Today's problems result in large degree from apathy on our part. We must carry our message of love and respect for our nation to all citizens. We must take a closer interest in our government. We must dedicate ourselves to the teaching of our young people... working with them for a better America. Fly our Flag and be proud of it. Be good Elks—proud Americans.

MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS OF BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Order of Elks is increasingly concerned over the failure of public officials on all levels, and even some of our own members, to recognize that the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America guarantees the citizens of our Country the right of freedom of assembly.

In 1968 at the Centennial Convention in New York City, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks overwhelmingly voted down a proposal to change its membership qualifications by eliminating the word "white." Of the more than 2500 delegates, only about 20 voted in favor of this Constitutional change. Those who made the decision, after debate, represented the more than 2000 subordinate Lodges. No small group settled the issue and obviously, no one section of the Nation was dominant in the rejection.

Within Elksdom itself, there are only a few members who conscientiously believe that a change would be desirable. There have been rare instances when members, skirting their obligation as Elks not to use their membership for business or commercial purposes, have shamefully expressed views on the subject intended only to enhance their own political fortunes.

The fact is that most of the pressure for change in this membership qualification is coming in tiresome frequency not from within the Elks but from outsiders who seem to believe that we, as individuals, and as Elks, do not have a legal right of choice regarding those with whom we associate. They choose to ignore the fact that membership in the Elks is a personal social privilege. It cannot be purchased on the market; it is not a property right; nor does it involve such civil rights as voting, education, housing, or employment. The Elks is not a public conveyance that anybody can hop aboard. One has to be proposed—invited—to become a member!

For 23 consecutive years, the Order of Elks has enjoyed an annual membership increase and the total has now exceeded the million and a half mark. This in itself indicates that our fraternity has a meritorious membership format which attracts American gentlemen to our fellowship.

The crux of the entire matter of membership qualifications can be summarized in a single word, freedom—specifically, the freedom of a man to associate with whom he pleases, where he pleases, when he pleases—the right, in simplest form, to exercise the Constitutional guarantee of freedom of assembly. This right of private association is

interwoven throughout the entire social framework of our land.

The right of private organizations such as the Elks, and most of the other fraternal orders, to set their own membership rules has been affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court. Justice Harlan said in "Civil Rights Cases" (1883) 109 U.S. 3:

"... Government has nothing to do with social, as distinguished from technically legal rights of individuals. No government ever has brought, or ever can bring, its people into social intercourse against their wishes... no legal right of a citizen is violated by the refusal of others to maintain merely social relations with him, even upon the grounds of race."

This landmark case emphasizes that there is a vast difference between "civil" rights and "personal" or "private" rights, in spite of the attempts these days to confuse the two.

In *Bell v. Maryland* (1964) 378 U.S. 226, Justice Goldberg held that

"... it is the Constitutional right of every person to close his home or club to any person or to choose his social intimates and business partners solely on the basis of personal prejudices, including race. These and other rights pertaining to private association are themselves constitutionally protected liberties."

There are other important court decisions pertaining to this and to related subjects. Reference is also made to *U.S. v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542 and *Evans v. Newton* (1966) 382 U.S. 296.

In applying and exercising this right of freedom to choose one's associates, various organizations in our society set up membership qualifications or rules to join or associate. There is nothing illegal or even objectionable in this. There appear to be rules for joining or belonging to almost everything that is organized—even to becoming a citizen of the United States.

The Order of Elks has membership rules or requirements for those accepted to associate with it. There is nothing unconstitutional, unusual, or un-American in this.

The rules of the Order require that members be citizens, adults, and male; of sound mind and body; and of good character. No offense is intended toward noncitizens, minors, women, or the unfortunate who are not of sound mind, body, or character.

When the Elks require belief in God, no quarrel is made with those who do not believe. When the founders of our Order preferred to associate with members of their own race, their intent was not to condemn nor downgrade persons of other races. There is no intent by today's membership to condemn or downgrade other races when it votes to uphold the existing requirements.

When Elks choose not to associate with Communists or subversives, they are exercising the right of free men to associate with whom they please.

The Elks are doing with regard to adherence to selective membership rules exactly what many other good and patriotic organizations, including military, church, union, and racial groups, are also doing—and have a perfect right to do! The right of free choice of association is an important part of our American heritage. We seek to preserve and protect this right for everyone and ask only that others respect and honor that right for our fraternity.

Despite the basic issue involved, there have been attempts to strip lawful rights from fraternal orders by denying beverage licenses, the use of public buildings, and other privileges. Forgotten, or purposely ignored, in this ill-founded approach is the fact that members of the Elks pay their just share of taxes in order to provide for and benefit from public facilities available to all. The exercise of the right of free men to choose their associ-

ates is no legal reason to deny any organization the rights granted to other citizens or organizations. There are a number of cases in point which have been decided by the courts.

We refer particularly to the cases of *Herbert A. Jones v. Richland* (Washington) School District No. 411, Superior Court case for Benton County, Cause No. 21803; *Civil Liberties Union of Southern California v. Board of Education of Los Angeles*, 359 Pac. 2d 45; and *Danskin v. San Diego Unified School District*, 171 Pac. 2d 885.

Within the limits of Elksdom's means and talents the Order has always stood ready to help any human being in need. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks has a long history of aid to those in need, without regard to the race, color, creed, or national origin of the recipients.

Throughout the land, Elks aid crippled children; support Scouting, Little League, camping, and other youth activities; build playgrounds and hospitals; provide therapy for cerebral palsied and other physically handicapped children; bring comfort and aid to maimed and wounded veterans in hospitals; provide funds for needed medical research; and grant many thousands of dollars in scholarships and other assistance to deserving young people.

In their philanthropic work, the Elks through their subordinate Lodges, and not including the huge sums distributed by the Elks National Foundation, expend nearly nine million dollars annually; and again we say that this is done completely without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin. And we will continue to do so!

The Order of Elks has vigorously supported our government, its laws, and principles. We strongly resent slurs cast upon our Order or references to our membership qualifications as being un-American. Our patriotic record is beyond reproach and might well be emulated by some of those now criticizing our Order because we continue to believe in our Constitutional right of freedom to choose our associates as one of the important principles underlying our American heritage.

The Order of Elks makes valuable contributions to the American way of life. The reason for the long history of success of our fraternal Order lies in the fact that we practice and live by our Charitable and patriotic principles. The existence of our Order has never adversely affected the livelihood or ability of a nonmember to strive for and reach whatever goal he or she may seek—whether it be educational, moral, spiritual, or economic.

The Elks are a strong force for good in hundreds of communities throughout our Nation. We will continue to support our government, aid law enforcement, and carry out our charitable and youth activities as we have in the past with increasing strength and vigor.

In return, we demand the right to work out our destiny without outside interference.

The Elks alone will make the decision on proposals to change our membership rules. We will not be pressured or coerced by civil or human rights groups, politicians or political opportunists, racists, troublemakers, or do-gooders who are not members of the Order.

This statement is made to clarify our position with regard to our "white" membership qualification. It is made for the information of all our members so that they will not be misled by those who challenge it. As long as no one outside our membership is legally injured, our membership rules are the business of the Elks, and it is the business of no one else how we choose to pick our fraternal associates.

As Grand Exalted Ruler, I am committed to uphold the decision of the Grand Lodge and the laws of our Order, and this I do.

OUR OWN UNITED STATES

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, friends have brought to my attention an excellent composition, "Our Own United States," by Esther Gilman Moore, the gracious, talented wife of a dedicated leader of the Massachusetts bar, an outstanding judge and great American, my able, distinguished friend, the Honorable M. Alan Moore of Gardner, Mass.

These sparkling lyrics were composed by Mrs. Moore to signify her patriotic spirit, not to take the place of any national hymn or song, but to supplement the list of patriotic songs.

In making this inspiring, creative work available to the country, it was her hope that this would be another vehicle by which the American people could sing about our wonderful country, that is composed of 50 States, united together, comprising every race, class, and creed, with freedom, liberty, and justice for all.

This song was sung for the first time at the Memorial Day exercises in all the Gardner, Mass., public schools on Friday, May 22, and again in the First Congregational Church in Gardner on Memorial Day Sunday.

Since July 4, Independence Day, is coming soon, I have been asked to present this very thrilling song to the Congress, as a contribution from the Third District of Massachusetts, that I am so honored to represent here in the House, and am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to include this song in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it can be circulated throughout the country to thrill and inspire the American people, young and old alike, as it has done in the composer's home city.

This very beautiful, impressive composition has a distinctive spiritual tone, and will be deeply appreciated by the people of America as a valuable addition to the patriotic, musical literature of the Nation.

I am proud to send Mrs. Moore, and her distinguished husband and family, my heartiest congratulations upon this fine, new song, which I know will be deeply appreciated and sung wherever it is known. The song follows:

OUR OWN UNITED STATES

(By Esther Gilman Moore)

America—the country filled with folk from every land.

They came to find a freedom everyone could understand,

Where man could work and prosper and could give a helping hand—

Our own United States.

Chorus:

Land of fifty states together
Land of every race together
Land of liberty forever—
Our own United States.

We pray for God to guide us so we all may live in peace,

For better understanding, and for good will to increase.

And may our love for freedom and our courage never cease

For our United States.

CXVI—1327—Part 15

Chorus:

Land of fifty states together
Land of every race together
Land of liberty forever—
Our own United States.

(To be sung to the music of "John Brown's Body," or "Glory, Glory Hallelujah.")

COMMONSENSE AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, a letter written by the son of one of my constituents is so full of sound commonsense that I want to share it with my colleagues. The writer is understandably disturbed by the manner in which irresponsible members of society are abusing the Bill of Rights and attempting to undermine our judicial system.

The letter follows:

This is my first experience in writing to a Congressman. As I think about this now, I feel a certain sense of dereliction in never having done so before. You, as my elected representative, certainly have a need to know how I feel about certain issues pertaining to government.

In retrospect, I must accuse myself of being a "lethargic American." Recent events have indicated to me, however, that if I continue in this lethargy, I will awake one day to find my country either in anarchy or in the hands of a governmental system entirely alien to our present one. Neither of these alternatives is palatable to me.

The trial of the so-called "Chicago 7" has been the catalyst to break the lethargy referred to above. I view the almost unbelievable actions of these defendants and their lawyers during the trial as a deliberate and calculated attempt to break down the judicial system in this country. Every fibre of the way of life we have learned to cherish is threatened in like manner—authority in every form is being attacked by the "New Left"; our moral codes are being undermined by a seemingly endless profusion of filth which is purveyed, unchecked, throughout the country; our once proud colleges and universities have become easy prey for the harassing and disruptive antics of radicals; the majority of the news media is controlled by people who, while decrying "repression," are guilty of a news bias which is blatantly repressive in its own right.

In short, Mr. Congressman, I fear for my country. And my greatest fear is that we don't seem to be doing anything about these threats. How, for example, can a person such as this William Kunstler be allowed to go about the country preaching sedition and fomenting riots which take a heavy toll in personal injuries and property damage? We can anticipate that any "repression" of Mr. Kunstler's activities will be viewed in the press as a violation of his civil rights. But, what of my civil rights? What of the civil rights of millions of citizens who find Mr. Kunstler's activities downright rebellious?

The convicted defendants in the Chicago trial are now free on bail. They have been admonished against any misbehavior. How many inflammatory speeches will it take, how many more riots must the nation's taxpayers endure (and pay for) before we recognize this activity for what it is—Insurrection—and then deal with it accordingly?

I, for one, am getting fed up with protect-

ing the civil rights of people who advocate the overthrow of my government. I believe it high time we interjected some of our God-given faculty for common sense into the Bill of Rights. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the rights to assemble and petition, etc., imply a responsible citizenry. Messrs. Kunstler, Hoffman, Dellinger, Hayden, et al have shown themselves to be highly irresponsible. They make a mockery of the Bills of Rights as they spew out their invective into the ever-present TV camera. How much longer must the American public put up with this?

America has many ills and you people in the Congress have a tremendous responsibility in these trying times. There are many issues—the Viet Nam situation, equality for Negroes, pollution, etc. I submit that one issue overrides them all—civil disobedience. Unless we have a sane and responsible approach to dissent, we stand the chance of losing our America.

I consider myself to be an average citizen, a part of the middle America which the "liberal" press chooses to ignore. I don't presume to speak for all of middle America but I'll wager my feelings on this subject are representative of the majority of Americans. The last time I looked, our system of government was still aimed at the common good. None of us can afford to lose sight of this precept.

Thank you for your attention to this letter.

Yours truly,

THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as commander of the congressional squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, I would like to make known to the Members the great work of this fine body of dedicated volunteers. The National Commander, Brig. Gen. Richard N. Ellis, has just released the annual report for 1969, which records the services rendered by the fine men and women of the Civil Air Patrol. The following statistics demonstrate dramatically the extent to which this all important organization is providing essential humanitarian services for our Nation and all of the 50 States.

During 1969 these dedicated men and women broke all existing records. They flew over 27,626 hours in search and rescue missions, maintaining an average of three aircraft in air every hour of every day. The Civil Air Patrol came to the aid of local, State, and Federal agencies in more than 16 States which were in need of aid due to hurricanes, floods, blizzards, and tornadoes. More than 70 percent of all flying hours in support of the national search and rescue mission were flown by the Civil Air Patrol. This great effort resulted in the saving of 38 human lives, the location of 136 objectives, 149 evacuations were accomplished, and 1,529 other persons in distress were assisted. The 31,828 cadets and the 31,772 seniors have worked very hard to increase their operations so that since 1966 they have raised their number of missions, sorties, and hours flown by 60 percent. This increase has enabled the Civil

Air Patrol to provide such services as 3,963 man-days, 224 aircraft, 1,066 communications sets, and 595 vehicles to such national disasters as Hurricane Camille. By the end of 1969 there were 17,764 licensed Civil Air Patrol radio stations, and 5,446 aircraft to assist the untiring efforts of the hard-working volunteers of the Civil Air Patrol.

It is impossible to measure the extent to which this organization of dedicated humanitarians has aided this country in terms of human lives saved and anguish and anxieties relieved. I think I speak for all of my colleagues when I express my wholehearted appreciation for the splendid and invaluable service rendered to this Nation by the Civil Air Patrol.

WHITE HOUSE CHARLIE MCCARTHY

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, there is much speculation that Vice President SPIRO AGNEW speaks only with prior clearance from President Nixon. Many citizens contend that SPIRO AGNEW opens his mouth and Richard Nixon's voice comes out—much like the act of Edgar Bergen and Charlie McCarthy. At least another very responsible newspaper—not one of the eastern establishment—has suggested that this is indeed the case. I, therefore, commend the following article from the St. Louis Post Dispatch which appeared on June 21, 1970, to the attention of my colleagues:

UNDAUNTED BY AGNEW

Vice President Agnew's latest caper is a curious one indeed. Immediately after making a speech in which he took a less caustic tone than he has been accustomed to using, Mr. Agnew in a towering rage roared for the head of Joseph Rhodes Jr., the Harvard graduate student appointed last week by President Nixon as a member of the Scranton commission to investigate campus unrest. What was it all about?

The Vice President was exercised by a statement of Mr. Rhodes, in an interview, which he said showed immaturity and bad judgment. Mr. Rhodes's offense was to suggest that one thing to be investigated by the Scranton commission was whether extremist attitudes in government have contributed to campus violence; specifically, he cited President Nixon's famous words about "campus bums."

Mr. Rhodes did not say that the President's phrase or any of Mr. Agnew's phrases had incited campus violence; he said the commission ought to investigate this as well as other aspects of the problem. He is quite right, and we are glad he is sticking to his guns. If the Scranton commission is to command any respect it must enjoy complete freedom to dig into all facets of campus unrest. There is no reason why police and government attitudes toward students should be granted a special immunity.

Because Mr. Agnew rarely speaks without White House authorization the strong probability is that here as in other instances he was being used to express Mr. Nixon's views and not only his own. We imagine that the President was outraged by Mr. Rhodes's interview and hoped to force him

to resign. Fortunately Mr. Rhodes seems to be a man of some mettle. If Mr. Nixon wants him off the Scranton commission he will have to fire him, and that is as it should be.

BARGE MIXING RULES

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider the matter of degree to which barges will be allowed to mix exempt and nonexempt commodities in tows throughout the United States.

I have been quite surprised at the desire of many individuals to maintain the nonregulated, nonpublished rates. I recently read an article in the New York City Journal of Commerce which expresses this problem very well, and I hope the Members will have an opportunity to read it before voting on this bill. I am therefore inserting the editorial of Friday, May 22, 1970, which is entitled "Secrecy in Ratemaking," at the close of my remarks:

SECRECY IN RATEMAKING

Certain relationships are well-recognized by our society as being confidential: those between doctor and patient, lawyer and client, priest and parishioner and even (up to a point) between newsman and his sources. But there has developed a counter-trend in recent years.

More and more is being heard of late of what is described as "the public's right to know." From this, expressions like truth in lending and truth in packaging have developed and gained legislative status. The government has not been spared entirely. A lot of questions are being raised concerning the difference between what it says it is doing in Southeast Asia and what some people feel it seems to be doing. But for the most part it is private industry and commerce that is being asked to bare its secrets, sometimes with one result, sometimes with another.

One little-publicized sector in which this is becoming a factor is in the field of what is known as "exempt barging", which is to say in the negotiation of freight rates governing barge movements of dry bulk commodities which are treated as exempt from regulation. In this field the normal roles are reversed. The carriers selling the service are willing to have the rates made public; the shippers buying these services don't much like the idea. Which raises a problem.

The problem extends back to the Transportation Act of 1940, which granted certain exemptions from economic regulation to water interstate carriers (just then being taken into ICC's fold) but not to railroads. The theory was that water carrier rates were so low they did not compete with rail rates; therefore, there was no point to bringing them under regulation.

The argument was probably valid at the time, and it was probably for that reason that the barge lines were allowed to ignore another section of the law prohibiting them from "mixing" movements of regulated and unregulated commodities in a single tow. But during the middle 1950s the barge carriers hit on some improvements that changed the picture. These made possible larger towboats, bigger barge fleets and lower unit costs. They also brought barge lines into sharper competition with the railroads. In consequence, ICC decided to invoke the "mixing rule" and to deny, after a speci-

fied cutoff date, the barge carriers the right to mix regulated commodities (steel, paper, sugar, etc.) in the same tow with such unregulated dry bulk commodities as coal, grain, salt and the like.

After a lengthy court detour the issue went to Congress. It has been there since 1967. In the interim a group of legislators headed by Rep. Samuel F. Friedel has produced a compromise measure under which barge lines would (1) be allowed to get out from under the "no-mixing rule" but would (2) be compelled to publish their negotiated rates. This would not give the rails all they have been seeking, but it would enable them to know what their competition is doing and thereby satisfy one of their chief complaints.

While neither carrier group is especially pleased with this solution, neither has much cause for displeasure, either. But mysteriously enough, the measure is making very little headway.

Peter Fanchi, president of Federal Barge Lines, quoted a leading member of the House Interstate Commerce Committee last week as saying the bill had "no chance in its present form" though it was one of the cleanest pieces of legislation he had seen in years.

The reason seems to be that some large shippers are unhappy about the measure. Even though they ship large volumes of the commodities involved by rail and at published rates, they rather cherish their present right to negotiate secretly the rates governing that portion of their traffic that goes by barge and free of regulation.

We cannot begrudge anyone the temptation to keep a tight grip on something that seems advantageous to him now and to resist any legislative efforts to pry his fingers loose. But in this case it is not merely a matter of surrendering an advantage for a disadvantage. If the mixing rule is finally applied to the inland waterways, barge operations will suffer. Some of today's big tows will have to be fragmented. Others will require longer to accumulate. The result is that some proportion of the technological advances made by the barge industry will be lost and that rates will go up in consequence.

As against this, how important is the element of secrecy in the making of unregulated dry bulk rates? Perhaps the answer was given by the 19th Century English poet, George Crabbe, who remarked: "Secrets with girls, like loaded guns with boys/ Are never valued till they make a noise."

WMIX SALUTES THE POLICE

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I recently saw a bumper sticker on a car that read:

If you have an emergency and do not want to call the police, try calling a hippie.

I think this portrays how essential and dedicated police are to the preservation of law and order in a society necessarily governed by laws.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to tell you that Mr. John R. Mitchell, president of the Mount Vernon Radio & Television Co., whose call letters are WMIX in Mount Vernon, Ill., has launched a public service campaign to rally support behind our dedicated police officers. Every hour on the hour, WMIX is broadcasting a 30-second promotional support an-

nouncement similar to the one I am having printed in the RECORD as follows:

WMIX salutes the police officers of America. These respectable men deserve and command the respect of each one. They are men of integrity, honor and responsibility. Our very protection rests on their strong shoulders, their courage, their ability, their fearlessness, their devotion to duty. Your police officer—a stalwart man of uncommon valor!

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of us can have greater respect and support for the people who are "watching out for all of us."

CRISIS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my most distinguished constituents, the Honorable Roger A. Freeman, formerly with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, and now a special assistant to President Nixon, recently delivered an address before the annual meeting of the Washington State Research Council in Seattle, Wash. Mr. Freeman's speech on the "Crisis in American Education" contains a timely and most important message which I heartily commend to the attention of my colleagues. I am, therefore, submitting Mr. Freeman's remarks for inclusion in the RECORD:

CRISIS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(By Roger A. Freeman)

I cannot adequately tell you how thrilled I was when I received your invitation to serve as your speaker at this luncheon. I left the State of Washington nearly fifteen years ago and thought that I had long been forgotten here. While David Swenson's letter was still on my desk, bathing my face in its reflected glow, I began getting telephone calls from Herb Miller, Ben Ehrlichman and others, urging me to accept the invitation. So here I am.

Having spent some of the most precious and most exciting years of my life in the Pacific Northwest, I am humbly grateful to you for letting me know that I made some lasting friends during the decade I lived and worked here.

If I were at liberty to do what I feel like doing, then I would now recognize my old friends in the audience, reminiscing about our common exploits in the legislative wars of the 1950's and tell the new generation tales of battle scars that have long since healed.

But you did not come here for that. You came to hear me speak about the "Crisis in American Education." So, in fairness to you, my hosts, and to make sure that you don't make me pay for my own lunch, I shall address myself to the assigned subject.

But before I do so, I want to pay tribute to the man who brought me into public life here over twenty years ago, to whom I owe most of what I know about public affairs, and whom I served as an assistant for more than five years. I mean, of course, Governor Arthur B. Langlie whose untimely death was a severe blow and grievous loss to all of us. I am most happy to hear that a biography of this great man, the only man ever to be elected Governor of Washington three times, is now in preparation and will soon be published.

For as long as anyone of us can remember there has always been talk about a "crisis in education." Those within the educational establishment usually saw the crisis in financial terms, denounced the existing support level as lamentably inadequate and predicted dire consequences and disaster if available funds were not promptly multiplied. That no such crisis ever developed does not necessarily mean that our educational spokesmen had only been crying "wolf." It may well be that because their warning came early enough and their appeal for remedial action was sufficiently forceful and effective, their crisis predictions never came true.

That experience caused me in past years to place a question mark behind the phrase "crisis in education" whenever I used it. Somehow I felt certain that our schools and colleges would turn the corner in fine shape before they reached the critical stage.

I no longer feel as confident as I once did, and I no longer place a question mark behind the term "crisis in education." For the first time in history it appears that the profound faith of the American people in their educational institutions has been shaken and their belief in the wisdom of our educational leaders and in the soundness of their goals or practices has turned to doubt and even to outright disapproval. If a vote of confidence were asked for today from the people across this nation in the management and policies of their educational institutions, it would in most states no longer be as favorable as it would have been twenty, ten or even five years ago. This is true above all in regard to some of our most prominent universities and colleges, but also of many high schools and elementary schools. This is evident not only from the growing number of failures of school tax and bond elections—which in most areas offer the people the only organized way in which they can vote their displeasure—but also from numerous independent polls, letters and many other sources. How are schools and colleges to weather the onslaught to which they are now subjected, how are they to cope with their current and future problems, to progress and prosper in the years ahead, if they can no longer count on the affection and trust of the great majority of the American people upon whom their very existence depends?

So far, the flow of funds into education has not declined and continues to show a healthy rate of growth. Yet there are many voices heard, mostly from inside the establishment, which assert that inadequate financial support is at the root of their trouble and that lack of money is the most urgent problem in education which could be solved by the addition of several billion dollars in federal funds. Congress is being criticized for not appropriating enough money for education and the President is attacked for having vetoed an education appropriation earlier this year and for not having proposed the new and expanded programs which his critics urge upon him.

The President stated his reasons clearly in the Veto Message of January 27, the Message on School Reform of March 3 and the Message on Higher Education of March 19. Let me summarize them briefly:

1. Inflationary pressures, generated largely by eight years of deficit spending to the tune of \$57 billion, are still so intense that demands for federal funds for all purposes must be restrained and their total kept approximately within the frame of prospective revenues. To pursue an expansionary fiscal policy at this time would add fuel to the fires of inflation and could wreck serious harm, none the least on education.

2. Certain costly school programs introduced with great expectations a few years ago are not yielding the promised results. In fact, the entire concept of a clear-cut positive cost-quality relationship in education

has been called into question by recent research.

3. The label "education" is not enough to justify claims for federal funds. There must be evidence that a proposed program offers the most effective solution available and a tangible return to the taxpayers.

The President criticized that "we are not getting as much as we should of the dollars we spend," recommended several programs to correct existing shortcomings and promised: "As we get more education for the dollar, we will ask Congress for more dollars for education."

Some of our critics claim that the budget is tight only because military outlays have been tremendously increased and that arms swallow most of the federal tax revenue which otherwise could be allocated to education and other social purposes. The facts are to the contrary:

In the current three-year period—FY 1968 to FY 1971—defense spending is being cut 9 percent, outlays for education and other social purposes boosted 47 percent, all other federal expenditures increased 21 percent. But the record of defense costs should probably be reviewed in a broader historical perspective:

Immediately after World War II, the military establishment was largely dismantled and outlays fell precipitously from \$80 billion in 1945 to between \$12 and \$13 billion annually from 1948-1950. This unilateral disarmament was one of the causes of the Korean action which shot defense costs up to \$50 billion in 1953. Since that time—that is between 1953 and FY 1971 as proposed by the President—defense expenditures increased 49 percent—approximately equal to the simultaneous rate of price rise. Spending for health, education, welfare and labor increased 944 percent, for all other functions 182 percent (see Table—Page 5).

More than half of the \$129 billion increase in Federal expenditures between 1953 and 1971 was applied to social purposes, less than one-fifth to defense. Defense meanwhile shrank from 64 percent of the Federal budget to 36 percent, from 13.6 percent of Gross National Product to about 7.2 percent.

In other words, the share of Federal revenues and of the Gross National Product allocated to national defense has been cut almost in half since 1953. Most of the huge savings were applied to social purposes, with education one of the main gainers. To slash our badly depleted defense establishment even faster or further in this troubled and hostile world would risk the nation's very existence in an irresponsible manner and be an invitation rather than a deterrent to war.

With only 6 percent of the world's population and between one-fourth and one-third of its developed resources, the American people now invest in educational institutions annually almost as much as all other nations combined. Nothing testifies more eloquently to the American faith in education than the priority which the people have granted it in financial terms. Over the past twenty years the support of schools and colleges from all sources has multiplied about eight times while personal consumption expenditures or business or personal investment multiplied only slightly more than three times. Expressed in dollars of constant value, personal consumption doubled while educational spending expanded five-fold.

Over the same period, the number of employees in private industry increased 38 percent while it tripled (+203 percent) in public education. In the rest of government, manpower grew 87 percent. These are impressive facts which make charges of neglect or starvation of education look plain silly.

To be sure: school enrollment grew faster than the population as a whole. Twenty years ago the impending "tidal wave" of postwar babies faced the schools with a grave chal-

lenge. Would schools be able to obtain the resources required to expand their staffs and facilities in proportion to students? Would the American people be willing to provide the huge funds by traditional methods? Few observers thought at the time that the job could be done without a massive intervention of the federal government.

The task was truly stupendous: Between 1950 and 1970 public school enrollment nearly doubled, jumping from 25 million to 47 million pupils (= +88 percent). Nobody expected in 1950 that school support would multiply seven-fold in the succeeding 20 years, from \$5.4 billion to \$38.5 billion; but it did. Expressed in constant dollars, the increase equalled 350 percent—while enrollment, as mentioned, went up 88 percent, national income or product 125 percent.

What did this accomplish? While enrollment grew 88 percent, the instructional staff expanded 131 percent: classroom teachers +119 percent, non-teaching professional staff such as administrators, counselors, psychologists, nurses, librarians, etc. +358 percent. The ratio of the instructional staff to pupils was reduced from 1:25 to 1:21.3, which means that there are now 4.8 fewer pupils per teacher in the public schools than there were in 1950.

In his first education message in 1961 President Kennedy, in proposing federal school construction aid, suggested that 600,000 classrooms ought to be built during the 1960s to take care of all needs and that state local governments would be unable to meet that goal unaided. Actually, about 700,000 new classrooms were constructed in the 1960s—without a federal construction aid program. There are now about five children fewer per classroom than there were in the early 1950s. The most amazing fact is not that these reductions in class size took place in a short number of years but that this was accomplished during the time of the sharpest enrollment expansion that America's public schools ever experienced, and that it was done largely by action of the people themselves, in thousands of tax and bond elections.

Of the \$33 billion that were added to the support of the public schools over the past twenty years, 93 percent came from state and local governments which were then as now alleged to be "hanging on their financial ropes." No program of general federal aid for school operations or construction was enacted in spite of truly heroic efforts of its protagonists, in a campaign begun well over a century ago. Nothing testifies more clearly to the continued effectiveness of the traditional American way of government by the consent of the governed. In the current school year, 1969/70, the federal government supplied only 6.4 percent of the public school support, according to the National Education Association*, with most of it closely earmarked for special programs and little available for general support.

The time of enrollment growth in the public schools is over. Current projections suggest little or no increase in the 1970s—unless mass closing are forced on the private schools which still accommodate almost 6 million children. Barring such a development, the task of providing adequate support for the public schools should be far easier in the 1970s than it has been for several decades. There is one big IF in this expectation: IF the public schools can retain—or, in many cases, regain—the confidence and goodwill of the communities they serve.

So far we have recorded only the "input" into the schools: dollars, teachers, classrooms. It has always been customary to measure educational progress and quality by "input" factors—such as dollars expenditure per pupil or teacher-pupil ratio—not by

"output" factors, that is improved skills and knowledge of the students.

Unfortunately, we have no record of "output" because school administrators have always strenuously resisted demands to introduce qualitative yardsticks into the schools by which the progress of students in essential skills and knowledge could be measured, recorded and compared.

In his School Reform Message, the President stressed the need for objective measurement of educational results. He added:

"For years the fear of 'national standards' has been one of the bugaboos of education . . . The problem is that in opposing some mythical threat of 'national standards' what we have too often been doing is avoiding accountability for our own local performance. We have, as a nation, too long avoided thinking of the productivity of the schools."

Many years ago we had at least a tentative gauge in the percentage of pupils held back. But the practice of having lagging pupils repeat a grade was largely abandoned when the schools discovered the secret of perpetual promotion.

Achievement test data on pupil skills in the 3Rs are now available only from research projects and from a few cities. James S. Coleman of Johns Hopkins University, who in 1965/66 headed the largest and most thorough examination of American public schools ever undertaken, was amazed to find: "The evidence revealed that within broad geographic regions, and for each racial and ethnic group, the physical and economic resources going into a school had very little relationship to the achievements coming out of it." He concluded that "if it were otherwise we could give simple prescriptions: increase teachers' salaries, lower classroom size, enlarge libraries, and so on. But the evidence does not allow such simple answers."

Reviewing the ensuing national debate in the New York Times Magazine of August 10, 1969, Christopher Jencks of the Harvard School of Education, summarized his conclusions: "Variations in schools' fiscal and human resources have very little effect on student achievement—probably even less than the Coleman Report implied."

The most detailed report now available on any city school system (*New York City School Fact Book*, City University of New York 1969) found:

"The evidence we have accumulated is somewhat surprising. We have recorded traditional variables that supposedly affect the quality of learning: class size, school expenditure, pupil/teacher ratio, condition of building, teacher experience and the like. Yet, there seems to be no direct relationship between these school measurements and performance. . . . Statistical data in that report show that reading and arithmetic achievements in the highest expenditures schools (\$1100 per pupil and up, median \$1330) average between 5 and 7 months behind those in the schools with the lowest expenditures (below \$600 per pupil, median \$551). The teacher-pupil ratio was 1:25.9 in the high-achievement schools, 1:12.3 in the low-achievement schools."

But the belief in the educational magic of the dollar dies hard. Five years ago Congress enacted a \$1¼ billion-a-year program to raise the achievement level of millions of children from low-income backgrounds who were reported to lag one or several years behind national norms (averages) in basic skills. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for "compensatory education" and a few related programs now account for about half of all federal school funds.

Two years ago the *Associated Press* found in a nationwide survey: "Title I, the federal project on which \$3 billion has been spent in the hope of answering the educational needs of deprived children, is not working out. On

this point, critics and supporters alike are agreed."

After reviewing the major "compensatory education" programs since 1957 the U.S. Civil Rights Commission found that "none of the programs seems to have raised significantly the achievement of participating pupils."

In his Message on School Reform, the President reported that:

"The best available evidence indicates that most of the compensatory education programs have not measurably helped poor children catch up . . . Recent findings on the two largest such programs are particularly disturbing. We now spend more than \$1 billion a year for educational programs under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Most of these have stressed the teaching of reading, but before-and-after tests suggest that only 19 percent of the children in such programs improve their reading significantly; 13 percent appear to fall behind more than expected; and more than two-thirds of the children remain unaffected—that is, they continue to fall behind. In our Headstart Program, where so much hope is invested, we find that youngsters enrolled only for the summer achieve almost no gains, and the gains of those in the program for a full year are soon matched by their non-Headstart classmates from similar poor backgrounds."

The record of thousands of projects from "Higher Horizons" and "More Effective Schools" in New York to "Banneker" in St. Louis, from "Madison" in Syracuse to the Berkeley schools—all of them started with great enthusiasm—tells a story of consistent failure to produce the educational improvement among so-called "deprived children" which their sponsors hoped for and promised.

What this adds up to is, of course, not that we should quit increasing school resources every year. The President made that abundantly clear—he recommended, in fact, several programs to bolster school support in certain critical areas besides proposing a system of federal revenue-sharing which will aid state and local governments generally.

The basic approach of the School Reform Message is: let us pursue methods, through research, that will accomplish what we are aiming at. But let us not go overboard until we know how what will work with children from slum backgrounds. Just spending billions of taxpayers' money is no adequate substitute for tangible achievements.

The New York City Master Plan (1969) declared: "The plain fact is that no one yet knows how to make a ghetto school work."¹ This has not kept New York City from multiplying its outlays generally, but particularly in schools in poverty areas, to the point where it now spends on the average about twice as much per pupil as other large cities. But students in New York City schools lag, on the average, far behind national norms—and they slipped back another two months in reading last year. What was the Board of Education's response? It demanded a 30 percent increase in operating funds—\$380 million—for next year (1970-71) besides a \$600 million appropriation for new construction. Not surprisingly, New York City authorities expect this to be paid by the rest of the country.

Most compensatory and similar programs for educational improvement place their main emphasis on reducing class size, although it has long been known from hundreds of research studies that there is no correlation between class size and pupil achievement. The *Encyclopedia of Educa-*

¹ My colleague, Daniel P. Moynihan, commented on this a few months ago: "The plain fact is that nobody knows how to make a real ghetto school—that is one made up of European Jewish students—not work."

*According to other sources, 80%.

tional Research reported twenty years ago that:

"On the whole, the statistical findings definitely favor large classes at every level of instruction except the kindergarten . . . the general trend of evidence places the burden of proof squarely upon the proponents of small classes."

Three years ago the Coleman report found that the teacher-pupil ratio "showed a consistent lack of relation to achievements among all groups under all conditions." But the myth that pupils learn more in smaller classes still flourishes and the demand for cutting class sizes continues while resistance to technological progress, such as programmed learning with the help of machines or television and films grows. Could the explanation lie in a fact brought out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics last year? Commissioner Geoffrey H. Moore reported at a Congressional hearing last December that "the aggregate supply of trained teachers is expected to significantly exceed demand, if recent entry patterns in the occupation continue." He projected job openings between 1968 and 1980 at 2.4 million, the new supply of teachers at 4.2 million.

Youth unemployment has long been severe—one out of seven people between 16 and 21 is out of a job, and one out of four among non-white youths. In no other industrial country in the world is there a comparable problem of youth unemployment. But we have so far failed to study why we do so badly. Since the belief that education is the best answer to poverty has virtually become part of the American Creed, we might well look to the schools for a remedy.

Among the country's worst school systems by any yardstick save expenditures per pupil are the District of Columbia schools. But, there are exceptions. For example, Bell Vocational High School, 60 years old and almost all black, has little if any of the troubles that beset most other Washington schools and its graduates have no difficulty in landing jobs. So what does the Board of Education plan to do about it? You guessed it—it intends to abolish Bell and the other four vocational high schools.

There used to be an excellent academic high school in Washington, Dunbar. Some twenty years ago eighty per cent of its graduates, almost all black, went to college. Reorganized under more recent rules, Dunbar is now as bad as Washington's other high schools. I should mention that my son has been attending a Washington public high school this past year.

Amidon was among the country's best schools—and many D.C. schools maintained at least a semblance of good education under the four-track system. The four-track system was abolished, Amidon was equalized with other D.C. schools—equal, that is, to the lowest schools in the country measured by pupil achievements.

It has widely been suggested that schooling should be started earlier so that disadvantaged children do not lag behind others when they reach first grade. Results of the massive Headstart program have so far not been convincing and efforts have been started to begin schooling even earlier, e.g., at three years. The number of 3 to 4 year olds in schools has risen from 800,000 five years ago to 1.2 million—with the attendance among whites 15% and among non-whites 21%. This may be all to the good. Would it help the educational process to begin at birth, as some have suggested? Nobody knows. Available studies have shown that the I.Q.'s of adopted children correlate with their natural parents from whom they have been separated since birth and bear little relationship to the foster home. Also, the I.Q.'s of identical twins reared apart are almost as closely correlated as the I.Q.'s of identical twins reared together. This seems to suggest that intervention at birth may come about nine months late.

Several research projects are now being sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which aim to find and identify methods of teaching "disadvantaged children" effectively. One project farms out the teaching of reading and other core subjects to independent contractors whose compensation varies according to the measurable progress of the students. Another project provides parents with vouchers, giving them a freedom of choice among schools, public or private, which they wish their children to attend.

Ventures of this type aim to stimulate imagination and, above all, competition among schools, which has so sadly been lacking under a system of virtual monopoly that left parents and students no practicable choice. How would you like to shop if there existed just one grocery store for your neighborhood and your only recourse were a complaint to a distant and quite independent board of grocery store supervisors? How good would service and values be under such a system?

To expand, intensify and systematize educational research, the President recommended to Congress the formation of a National Institute of Education. It will sponsor projects at schools, colleges and research centers as well as of individual scholars and also have some studies conducted by its resident staff. Ideas about improved education, no matter how attractive, must be tested before they are translated into huge undertakings. Some ventures in recent years did more harm than merely waste money. They were like the psychoanalyst who blamed his patient's appendicitis on early life experiences and tried to cure it on the couch.

Lavish promises to parents and taxpayers about improvement in educational achievements which went unredeemed have aroused widespread disappointment and deep unhappiness. Bitterness and recriminations have in many locations led to violence and senseless mob action whose consequences will plague us—and the affected children—for years. In numerous cities, well-intentioned men and women have raised demands or taken steps which not only split communities and multiplied civic strife and hatred but permanently damaged the education of millions of youngsters. Such action was often encouraged, sponsored or carried out by governmental authorities. I am reminded of a warning that Mr. Justice Brandeis gave more than four decades ago:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding. (*Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 478)"

In many locations, action intended to improve the education of large numbers of children has actually worked to retard their progress, to create conflict and chaos and to alienate large numbers of residents from the public schools. Some schools have been virtually ruined and some cities could be destroyed in the process if it continues much longer.

There is dynamite all over the place and if we do not "cool it", if we permit it to heat up more, it may blow up in a major conflagration. The main losers then might be the schools but the victims will be the children whose hope for the future depends on getting an education in schools that can operate only if there is no disruption or turmoil.

I have always been a great believer in community control in education and in other public services. This is why I regret that neighborhood control of schools was never given a fair chance in the sections of New

York City where it was intended to be tried out. Intensified research for finding more effective methods combined with greater influence of the parents on school policies might well offer the most promising solution. Actions and policies strongly opposed by the parents or leading to a diminished role of the parents in school affairs are unlikely to help the children. By pursuing a course that alienates their communities, some public schools may well be sawing off the branch on which they are sitting.

Grave problems loom ahead for the schools, public and private, and some of those problems are of a financial nature. This is why the President established by Executive Order a Commission on School Finance, which will report to him within two years. But the financial problems of the public schools don't amount to a crisis—unless the schools themselves, by their actions further weaken the affection and confidence of the parents and taxpayers upon whom their support inescapably depends. At this time, the danger of a deep and lasting split between the American public and its school system is present, but not immediately threatening. It is imminent and grave in the case of universities and colleges. I will therefore devote my remaining time to the ominous developments on campuses from coast to coast, which jeopardize the future of higher education in the United States.

The administrators of colleges and universities no less than those of elementary and high schools tend to view finances as their most pressing problem. "The most critical question facing higher education today is how to find sufficient resources," declared the Association of American Universities in April 1968. Considering the growing wave of campus revolts in recent years, some of us may doubt that finding sufficient resources truly is "the most critical question facing higher education today". Finding leaders capable of coping with the violent uprising could be more crucial.

Enrollment at Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) multiplied about three times over the past twenty years, revenues ten times. With the rate of enrollment growth certain to diminish in the years ahead, the task of obtaining sufficient income should also turn easier. In all likelihood, though, it will not.

While enrollment was about evenly divided between public and private institutions until about 1950, there has since been a decided shift evident toward public IHL; seventy to seventy-five percent of the new students now enroll at state and city colleges, largely because of the ever-widening tuition gap. State institutions now charge less than one-fourth of the tuitions of private colleges. The latter depend on private donations to make up the difference between instructional costs and charges. But their gift receipts have not been rising as rapidly as the state taxes which support public IHL. If present trends continue, most of the 1500 private colleges—about two-thirds of all IHL in the country—may within the next two decades have to close their doors or turn public. This would, to all appearances, not break the heart of those who set the tuition policy of public colleges.

General operational support of all IHL, from Federal or state sources is unlikely to materialize because two-thirds of all private IHL are church-connected. This raises constitutional questions that have so far proven insuperable. To provide federal funds only for the operations of public IHL would, of course, sound the death knell for the private colleges which Congress most assuredly does not want to do.

This is one major reason why the President in his Higher Education Message of March 19th stressed aid to students rather than to institutions. In his presidential campaign and in earlier years, Mr. Nixon has strongly advocated tax credits, for dona-

tions and for tuitions, as a means of aiding higher education. The Senate adopted such proposals on several occasions and a bill of that type could pass Congress any time with broad bipartisan support. The President has not changed his views on educational tax credits but has not pushed the proposal because higher education associations, with some exceptions, have taken an equivocal, and in some cases a negative attitude. Heads of institutions prefer direct grants which enable them to spend the sums according to their own judgment; they dislike indirect aid such as tax credits which would confer on parents and other college supporters greater powers in the decision-making process. Sponsors of educational tax credit plans, though they constitute a commanding majority, according to several polls, have so far not effectively organized to get their program adopted.

In recent years the urgency of pleas for the grant of direct federal funds to institutions has sharply intensified. This expresses the fear of the heads of institutions that their established supporters have become increasingly disillusioned and alienated and can no longer be depended upon to increase the funds as rapidly and as unquestioningly in future years, as they have in the past. Mass riots, violence and wanton destruction that have taken place on about 500 campuses over the past six years—the most serious ones within the past two years—the forcible disruption of studies and abject surrender of orderly administration that have occurred and been permitted to continue, have seriously eroded the respect, affection and genuine pride which the American people have traditionally accorded higher education and its leaders. Outright hostility shown by faculty and students on many major campuses toward all efforts that would tend to strengthen the defense capacity of the United States, and violent action against defense research and ROTC activities, have widened the chasm between town and gown and turned admiration into suspicion, antagonism and scorn.

I can obviously not, in this context, adequately discuss the record and far-reaching implications of the campus revolt that started in Berkeley six years ago. But, neither can I avoid talking about the impact these events are likely to have on the future support of colleges and universities.

Several polls within the past few months suggest that the American public disapproves, with a ratio of between 3:1 to 5:1, of the student disruptions or closing down of colleges and universities by mobs of students, faculty and outsiders, that it favors the calling of law enforcement agencies and the National Guard on campus where college and administrators are unable to maintain orderly operations.

According to a Gallup Poll in March 1969, 84% of the public wants Federal aid withdrawn from campus lawbreakers. Administrators were not listening.

Possibly the most significant indicator of the public's resentment was expressed in a Gallup Poll on May 13-14 for *Newsweek* (May 25) in which respondents were asked who was primarily responsible for the deaths of four students at Kent State University; 11% blamed the National Guard, 58% the demonstrating students, 31% gave no opinion. Since the facts at Kent State are not yet fully known—the President has appointed a commission to investigate the tragedy—the vote expresses the "gut reaction" or basic attitude of the public more than its judgment in the particular case.

The public sentiment is also being reflected in adverse votes on education issues on state and local ballots and is beginning to show in a diminished flow of incoming gifts. Sooner or later it may also be reflected in the treatment that colleges and universities can expect at the hands of state legis-

lators who, after all, must shape their votes to conform with the wishes of their constituents, if they want to continue in public office.

This is why administrators look increasingly to the federal government for funds. But the prevailing sentiment in Congress bodes no good. According to latest reports, the President's recommendations and other proposals to aid higher education may not be acted upon by the 91st Congress—except for the establishment of a secondary market in guaranteed student loans—largely because of the campus revolt.

The public's ire is directed at the militants who have engaged in orgies of vandalism and destruction, but also at trustees, administrators and faculty members who have permitted them to do so with impunity. Those campus authorities have defaulted on their duty to protect the civil rights of other students and faculty, an overwhelming majority, to pursue their education, teaching and research without being subjected to coercion, intimidation, and physical assault.

It is difficult to recall now that the campus revolution started as a movement purportedly for free speech. Before long it manifested itself in preventing all who would disagree with the militants—faculty, students or public officials from speaking. High officials of the U.S. government, such as then Vice President Humphrey and Secretaries Rusk and McNamara, were physically attacked when they tried to speak. Neither the President nor his top advisers would now be able to speak on most major U.S. campuses. Is this an example of dialogue or free speech?

Does anybody really believe that the student revolt would end or abate if the war in Vietnam and Cambodia ended tomorrow? The leaders of the action would invent some other cause. They do not want reform—they seek bigger ends.

The President of Stanford University and the president of its student body have recently acknowledged that behind most action is a small hard-core of revolutionaries who are "bent on nothing less than the destruction of the university, primarily as a way of bringing down the society itself."

Acts of arson, burglary and vandalism were committed on the Stanford campus in recent months. 45 policemen were injured in just two nights. The beautiful building in which my office is located—completed less than three years ago—was and still is partially wrecked. But it is in a better shape than the nearby Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences which was fire-bombed. An Indian scholar's life work there was destroyed. More than 30 ROTC buildings were fire-bombed and many other structures burnt on various campuses. Non-conforming faculty and staff were beaten up.

There are laws against such acts on the books of every state, imposing long prison sentences. Are the criminals who committed these acts now serving time in penitentiaries? How many of the faculty and students who participated have been expelled? Blackmail and violence have often been rewarded by college administrators with concessions and surrender. Most of the time, little effort was exerted to apprehend offenders and if identified they were usually granted amnesty. Small wonder that a reign of terror continues on campuses. Nor will it end until either the presidents and trustees of colleges and universities live up to their responsibilities—or somebody else does the job for them, which would, of course, be far less desirable.

Nobody questions the right of students, faculty or administrators to make their individual disagreements known with any action of the U.S. government, foreign or domestic. But a university which takes a stand on a political issue—and a violent stand at that—destroys its value and forfeits its claim to be a center for impartial study and teaching. It transgresses upon the rights of the members of the academic community

with different views. It is too often forgotten that most parents send their children to college to learn, not to decide public policy. If students were mature enough to exercise such judgments, they would not need to go to college. But even if all seven million students on U.S. campuses disagreed with official U.S. policy—which, of course, they do not—what makes anybody think that they would have the right to force the hand of the lawful government and the duly-elected representatives of 205 million Americans? What makes the dissidents think that they can run the country—without subjecting themselves to the inconveniences of having to run for elective office to gain the consent of the governed before they try to usurp the right to govern? What the leaders of this movement really want is, of course, not to run the country but to ruin it. Shall we let them do it?

A society that does not defend itself is bound to destroy itself. To yield to mob rule is to end government by the people.

Less than two months ago I spent a week of discussions in Moscow. Soviet officials were quite frank in saying that they expect American foreign policy to be influenced and largely governed by domestic events, including violent mob action on our campuses. The Soviets expect that they can sit back and wait until we give in. They are, I believe, mistaken. But I am not surprised that they feel this way.

There are now signs that the patience of the American people is wearing thin. If aroused groups resorted to vigilante action as their last resort, as some did in New York a few weeks ago, the results could be tragic for our colleges and for the free institutions we cherish. A "backlash" could gravely harm our system of higher education, built up by the dedicated efforts of generations of Americans in more than three hundred years. Let us not forget that Rome was built in seven centuries, destroyed in a few days. There is still time to keep our higher educational institutions from going down. I hope and trust that it will be used well.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, 1953 AND 1971

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	National defense	HEW-Labor	All other	Total
1953.....	\$49.4	\$7.1	\$20.4	\$77.0
1971.....	\$73.6	\$74.3	\$57.6	\$205.6
Increase (in percent).....	+49	+944	+182	+167

INCREASE IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, 1953-71

	Amount (in billions)	Percent
National defense.....	\$24.2	19
Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor.....	67.2	52
All other.....	37.2	29
Total.....	128.6	100

¹ President's proposals as revised May 19, 1970.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 22, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

NO NONSENSE IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in a recent appearance on the nationally televised news show, "Meet the Press," former Attorney General Ramsey Clark was asked why, when he was in office, he refused to use wiretapping as a tool in the fight against crime. Clark replied:

Because crime can't be controlled by wiretapping. It undermines the confidence of the people in their Government. It demeans human dignity in the long run. It escalates the levels of violence in America. . . .

To which, I am sure, the overwhelming majority of citizens concerned with the urgent crime problem would answer with a resounding: "Nonsense."

Let us take a contrasting approach as demonstrated this past weekend by the nationwide narcotics raids which smashed an operation that directed most of the cocaine and nearly one-third of all heroin sales in the United States. Carried out in 10 cities, the raids netted 127 arrests and grabbed narcotics worth about \$2.6 million on the retail market, along with \$19,875 in cash, 23 automobiles, and 14 weapons. In a 6-month investigation leading up to the arrests, another \$5.1 million worth of narcotics had previously been seized.

As reported by the press, Attorney General John Mitchell stated that without the use of court-approved wiretaps the raids would have been impossible.

Contrast these results with the pathetic inaction justified by hazy clichés and generalities which was the hallmark of Ramsey Clark's tenure as head of the Justice Department. No wonder Candidate Nixon singled him out for retirement during the campaign.

On May 4 of this year the Republican congressional committee newsletter carried an exclusive by Will Wilson, Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, on the use of wiretaps in this administration.

For necessary background on this vital weapon of law enforcement, I include at this point the statement by Mr. Wilson mentioned above:

PUTTING LAW TO USE—WHAT WIRETAPS ARE DOING FOR U.S. TODAY

(By Will Wilson)

The decision of Attorney General John N. Mitchell to use the wiretap provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 marked the turning point in mounting what will be a successful assault against organized crime. Wiretapping and immunity are the two best weapons against

the illegal gambling syndicates whose cash-flow revenues is the life blood of organized crime.

In 1969, the Department of Justice requested authorization for electronic surveillance in 33 cases under investigation. The results: 173 arrests in 12 of the cases; continuing investigation in which indictments are anticipated in 11 of the cases; only seven cases in which results were non-productive. In all of the cases, indications are clear that the evidence secured from the wiretapping was essential to the investigation and could have been uncovered in no other way.

Since none of the cases has been completed, being presently at either the trial or appellate stage, no specific statements can be made about them or about the extent to which the retrieval of overheard conversations contributed to the success of the investigations.

Why is it necessary to resort to wiretapping? To answer this requires an understanding of the nature of the type of crime in which electronic eaves-dropping is principally used—organized crime.

Today, the core of organized crime in the United States consists of 24 groups operating as criminal cartels across the nation. Estimated overall member strength of these core groups, called "families," is put at 5,000. Like any large corporation, but unlike the criminal gangs of the past, the organization functions regardless of individual personnel changes.

Each family is headed by a "boss," whose primary functions are the maintenance of order, through the family "enforcer," and the maximization of profit. Beneath each boss is an "underboss." He collects information, relaying messages to the "boss" and passing his instructions to his underlings. The lieutenants—"caporegime" or "capodecina"—are the chiefs of the operating units. Below them are the "soldati" or "button men" who actually operate the illicit enterprise, using as personnel the professional criminals who directly confront the public.

Rarely are the leaders touched by police investigation. They maintain insulation within the organization through the underboss and the "caporegime," avoiding direct communication with the "soldati."

Until recently, no information was available about the structure of organized crime. Senate investigations were the first to uncover credible evidence of the existence of syndicated crime. But the general reaction was disbelief that large, highly structured, criminal conspiracies could operate continuously without being directly observable. Even the testimony of Joseph Valachi, a soldier in the family of Vito Genovese, a New York Boss, was received skeptically.

Today, much more is known about organized crime. Much information has resulted from electronic surveillance of figures involved in organized criminal activity. For example, in 1967, the "Patriarca tapes" were released in Providence, R.I. Raymond Patriarca's involvement as head of a New England "family" was discovered when the FBI placed a microphone in his operating office located in a vending-machine company (the National Cigarette Service). At about the same time, another electronic surveillance of the office of a Kenilworth, N.J., plumbing company, established Simone Rizzo de Calvalcante as boss of the New Jersey family and linked him to "legitimate" businessmen, lawyers, and even police officials. These are only two examples of the utility and need for electronic surveillances.

But knowing of the existence of such organizations and of the identity of those who comprise membership is not sufficient. The organization must be destroyed and in order to destroy such an organization with criminal prosecutions it is necessary to attack it at all levels. Because the leaders are insulated,

rarely can their criminal activity be proved by conventional processes. Instructions to the caporegime, and, in turn, to the soldati, flow through buffers. Rarely are there witnesses to any overt criminal act. Even more rarely are there any who are willing to talk about it.

Between 1961 and 1966, only 185 indictments were returned against members of La Cosa Nostra, as the criminal empire is known. Convictions were obtained against 102, only 2 percent of the hard core. And, without electronic surveillance techniques, prospects for improvement were not high. A significant proportion of the convictions were obtained through tax-evasion prosecutions. But because of the increased attention paid to tax returns of racketeers, they have been declaring larger incomes, listed as "miscellaneous income." Thus, the prime figures remain free of the law.

The result of all of this was summed up by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in these terms:

"In many ways, organized crime is the most sinister kind of crime in America. The men who control it have become rich and powerful by encouraging the needy to gamble, by luring the troubled to destroy themselves with drugs, by extorting the profits of honest and hardworking businessmen, by collecting usury from those in financial plight, by maiming or murdering those who oppose them, by bribing those who are sworn to destroy them. Organized crime is not merely a few preying upon a few.

"In a very real sense, it is dedicated by subverting not only American institutions, but the very decency and integrity that are the most cherished attributes of a free society. . . ."

In 1963, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy observed that, to make major inroads against organized crime, new weapons, including electronic surveillance techniques, would have to be obtained, and that, until then, the job would not get done.

In 1968, Congress passed into law the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, which gave the Government the needed new weapon, authorizing the use of electronic surveillance in cases involving racketeering. Philosophical opposition to this weapon, however, by LBJ's Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, prevented its use until the Administration of President Nixon when it was ordered to be used by Attorney General Mitchell.

Today, as the files of cases will eventually show, the use of electronic surveillance has changed the balance. An increasingly higher proportion of investigations are resulting in indictments and convictions of organized-crime figures.

THE CASE FOR LAW AND ORDER—WITH JUSTICE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, San Jose Local 11 of the ILWU through the years has been a good friend of the black and brown people, the minorities, and the ethnic underdog. Those who shout for law and order should think what those words mean to these groups when the word "justice" is forgotten. Law and order without justice is, simply, continued repression. Hitler shouted for

law and order, forgetting justice, and the world is still paying the consequences. In a spirited editorial in its May-June bulletin, local 11 spells it out in clear and simple terms. Without justice, law and order is a hoax. But the editorial speaks for itself, so without further comment, I would like to enter it in the RECORD at this point:

A CONTROVERSIAL EDITORIAL

Law and order means different things to different people. To most packinghouse workers it means being able to relax in your home after a hard week's work without being mugged, robbed or otherwise molested.

But to some people—especially those in high places—it seems to mean something different. To the race-haters who want to keep down the black and brown people "law and order" means clubbing, shooting or jailing those who militantly demand their rights. To the hawks "law and order" means a free hand to expand their war violence as they see fit without "interference" from peace demonstrators. To the big corporations it means—more and more—the use of police to attack strikers to enforce Mr. Nixon's policy of holding back desperately needed wage increases.

These days many people are demonstrating, marching, protesting, throwing rocks, shouting. There is also shooting and killing—but the shooting and killing is being done by the forces of "law and order". The S. J. Mercury recently printed a quotation by a law-and-order man. Here it is:

"The streets of our country are filled with students rebelling and rioting. Communists are seeking to destroy our country. Russia is threatening us with her might and the Republic is in danger. Yes, danger from within and without. We need law and order. Yes, without law and order our nation cannot survive. Elect us and we shall restore law and order."

Who said that? Spiro Agnew? Ronald Reagan? They could have said it. But the quotation is from Adolf Hitler, in Germany in 1932.

What is causing the turmoil in our country? Injustices. And the protests against injustice go largely unheeded. The injustices are the disease—the war, racism, poverty, unequal taxes, etc. The protests are only symptoms of the disease. A pot of water will produce a head of steam if heat is applied. But the people who shout "law and order" don't seem to want to cure the disease by ending injustice. They only want to suppress the symptom—the protests. They seem to cut off democratic expression just like Hitler did in Germany. Beware those who shout "law and order" without even mentioning justice!

But there is hypocrisy involved here too. Adolf Hitler, the "law and order" man plunged Europe into a blood bath and killed 35 million people. That is law and order? Today too some of the most prominent "law and order" men appear to have little respect for the law themselves. Pres. Nixon is sworn to uphold the U.S. Constitution. Yet he has torn it to shreds by widening the war in Indochina. Forty thousand boys have died in an illegal war.

Again, in 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against segregated schools. Yet the southern ruling class thumbs its nose at the court and the law while segregation continues.

They flaunt the law, yet preach "law and order". But the police and national guard don't shoot down these law violators do they?

Let's keep our eye on the ball and struggle to end injustice. Let's not be misled by the "law and order" hoax.

THE SOMERSWORTH, N.H., FREE PRESS SPEAKS ON CHALLENGE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Somersworth, N.H. Free Press reaffirms some of the moral virtues and commitments that seem to have gone out of style in recent years. It expresses the kind of commonsense and dedication to timeless ideals that have made the small weekly newspapers of New Hampshire and the Nation the durable institutions they are.

The editorial written by Free Press Editor Patricia Perro follows:

A CHALLENGE

This past week I received a notice of the graduation of one of our local young women from a prominent woman's college.

The principal speaker at the commencement exercises, a doctor of medicine whose name is well known, gave as his address to these young women, a talk entitled "Fertility control . . . a gift and a challenge."

Think about that one for a moment! What kind of a nutty, mixed up world is this when the most challenging and inspiring message one can think of to present to a graduating class is that of "Fertility control?"

The problems of over-population I am quite familiar with, having read and listened to dozens, maybe hundreds of talks and writings on this subject over the past year. Concern over the problem is certainly justifiable. I'm aware of it, and so, by this time, is almost every American girl in college or in high school today.

In spite of that, it would seem that commencement time might more appropriately be a time to speak to college women about the constructive good that they can bring to the world just by being women. Is it honoring them or is it degrading them to suggest that the best that we can ask of them is to not produce tomorrow's children, to ask them only that they stifle the creation and caring that is their own separate and special talent to give?

The peculiar quality of being a woman has, since the beginning of time enabled them to be a calming and stabilizing force in a beehive of humanity that sometimes seems bent on annihilating itself with its opposing forces of aggression, greed, and destructiveness.

A stabilizer, a sedating, a quieting influence has never been more needed than it is right now.

Why then do we not put THAT challenge before our graduating women today? The challenge to do "their own thing" more seriously and earnestly than ever before . . . to apply their special skills to the job of creating and regaining the happy, tension-free, stable type of home atmosphere that is being belittled and even deliberately undermined from so many corners today.

A stable, happy family unit, has always been the cornerstone for a stable and healthy larger society. It's a simple truth, and one that's being sadly neglected by all except those who knowingly and for their own ends, seek to tear it down.

A world with too many people inhabiting it, is indeed a problem, but an even greater problem exists in a world (populated in any numbers) by a tense, greedy, restless people; rootless, directionless, and lacking in moral

conviction, purpose or even the most elementary form of religious belief or faith.

It's a little scary to realize that today's colleges, with all they have to offer in the way of technical knowledge and skill, seem to be grinding out an intellectual group of beings incapable of wisdom; oblivious to, or even acting in direct opposition to the basic truths of humanity.

In many of our colleges today, the students are seeking, but are not finding the truth. The question comes constantly . . . "What can we do in the world?" . . . "How can we improve on what is here?"

Sitting in a park chanting peace songs, may be a heck of a nice way to spend an afternoon, but it isn't going to do it.

Carrying placards and shouting curses at "the establishment" isn't going to do it.

And cutting down on the number of births isn't going to do it either. Not all by itself . . . not without some attention to the quality of the life that is being preserved.

It's the old, old story of not being able to see the forest for the trees.

TEN MAJOR APPROPRIATIONS BILLS PASS HOUSE—NOW PENDING IN SENATE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, according to a press report the other body is conducting night sessions in an effort to speed up and expedite action on appropriations bills pending in the Senate.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), recently reported on the status of all major appropriations bills.

This year the Committee on Appropriations has done an excellent job. We have a splendid record—as the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), said—in moving, reporting, and passing appropriations bills in the House.

Of the 12 major appropriations bills, 10 have passed the House, including the second supplemental appropriations bill.

The status of these bills is as follows: Treasury-Post Office, passed House, pending in the Senate.

Independent offices-HUD, passed House, pending in the Senate.

State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary, passed House, pending in the Senate.

Interior, passed House, pending in the Senate.

Transportation, passed House, pending in the Senate.

District of Columbia, passed House, pending in the Senate.

Foreign assistance, passed House, pending in the Senate.

Agriculture, passed House, pending in the Senate.

Military construction, passed House, pending in the Senate.

Public works, reported, on floor this week.

Defense, in committee.

Labor-HEW, in committee.

The House Committee on Appropriations has virtually cleared its agenda—deadlines have been met—bills have been reported out promptly and passed on schedule. The work of the Committee on Appropriations and the House has proceeded with dispatch and should be commended.

I trust that the other body will act with dispatch and diligence in acting on the annual departmental appropriations bills now pending in the Senate.

**A TRIBUTE TO ALEX ELIGH,
THROUGH WHOSE EFFORTS
THOUSANDS OF NEWARK, N.Y.,
YOUTH HAVE DEVELOPED INTO
PRODUCTIVE CITIZENS**

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a community center can be one of the most important buildings in the life of any town or village. The success of such a center always hinges on the enthusiasm and personality of the center director.

The people of Newark, N.Y., in my 36th Congressional District are taking time tomorrow night to pay tribute to a man who has served as director of its community center for the past 22 years. Alexander George Eligh came to Newark in 1948 and joined the staff of the Newark Community Center. A few months later Alex took over as director of the center and has served in that capacity ever since.

Thousands of young people have benefited from his advice, counsel, and wisdom. He has dedicated his life to the youth of this community and hopefully will continue for many more years. It is through such unselfish dedication that young people today can be guided toward a productive future.

I am sure that my colleagues join me in praising the 22 years of dedication Alex Eligh has given to the youth of his community and wish him many more successful years.

Mr. Speaker, the Newark, N.Y., Courier Gazette on June 18, 1970, carried a brief editorial describing the local sentiment toward Alex Eligh. I share that editorial with my colleagues:

ALEX ELIGH TESTIMONIAL

They're throwing a little party for a nice guy next Wednesday night at Beckens Park.

It's a testimonial dinner for Alex Eligh, veteran director of the Newark Community Center, who deservingly will be recognized for his outstanding services to the youth of the community.

A little party? The men behind the scenes hope it will be merely a figure of speech because they are looking forward to a smashing turnout on the night of June 24. They want to present Alex with a big purse and the more tickets are sold the heavier the purse will get.

A nice guy? You can bet on it. They wouldn't be putting on this party if Alex wasn't deserving of it.

The testimonial tribute and dinner is the community's way of showing Alex how much

he has been appreciated in the community. We think it's the nicest thing that the committee could do for such a grand person.

We hope the committee sells over 1,000 tickets for the dinner.

It couldn't happen to a nicer guy.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 914

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed by the speedy passage on Wednesday of House Resolution 914, which allowed the House to adopt, without debate or amendment, the Senate amendments to the Voting Rights Act extension.

This was an unfortunate move by the House for two major reasons. First of all, it is simply bad legislative policy to lump together two such important issues as voting rights and the enfranchisement of 18- to 21-year-olds. Each of the provisions of the Senate and House bills on voting rights should have been considered on its own merits, rather than adopted en bloc.

Legislatively speaking, the vote did not reflect the desires of the American people. Over the past 5 years, 20 States have rejected enfranchisement of 18- to 21-year-olds. Only four States have lowered the voting age, and of these two did not reduce it to 18. Thus, Representatives of the 20 States which have rejected the 18-year-old vote could not represent the views of their constituents by voting for the resolution.

Even more important, there are grave doubts as to the constitutionality of Congress legislating in this area. Section 2 of article I of the Constitution clearly states that the power to name the qualifications of voters resides with the States. The 10th amendment further strengthens this section by declaring that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. As I noted previously, the people of 20 States have indicated that they do not want the 18-year-old vote.

It is crystal clear to even the most casual student of the Constitution that Congress does not possess the right to legislate the qualifications of voters. The procedures for changing the Constitution in this regard are spelled out in article V, and three amendments affecting voter qualifications have been added to the Constitution by means of these procedures: First, the 17th amendment, providing for direct election of Senators; second, the 19th amendment, guaranteeing right to vote for women; and third, the 24th amendment, eliminating the poll tax as a requirement for voting.

Once Congress is allowed to embark upon this method of amending the Constitution, by statute, there is no limit beyond which the reformers cannot go. We might just as well discard the Constitu-

tion entirely as to disregard its clear specifications and procedures for change.

Let us also look at the social implications of this new provision. There is no denying that the 18- to 21-year-olds of this generation are better educated than past generations. But does this academic education serve as adequate qualification for the franchise? I think not.

There is another form of education which, I feel, serves as the foundation for responsible and intelligent voting. This education is a pragmatic one, and comes from earning one's own way, settling in one place and participation in community affairs, paying taxes, and caring about where the tax dollar goes, and, in general, interacting with society as a responsible adult.

One or two generations ago, many persons in the 18 to 21 age bracket might have fallen into this category. But this situation has changed dramatically with the tremendous growth in higher education facilities and the number of young people attending college today. A parallel growth in the so-called youth market sector of our economy has indicated tremendous expenditures on leisure-time activities and appurtenances. Here is evidence that the youth of today, while undeniably educated and informed, are not yet the mature and productive citizens who have truly "earned" their franchise.

Let us also look at the figures for States which have lowered the voting age. The turnout for 18- to 21-year-olds runs about half of the normal voting turnout. The right to vote is one which is exercised by every conscientious American citizen, and yet even when given this right, half to two-thirds of the youth eligible choose not to exercise it.

In conclusion, it is clear that there are strong reasons for deploring the action of the House in adopting the Senate amendments to the Voting Rights Act without adequate debate. On a question of such grave constitutional and social import, it is an avoidance of responsibility to the people of the United States to have taken such hasty action.

**PREFERRED POSTAL RATES FOR
AGRICULTURAL MAGAZINES**

SPEECH OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, under permission granted by the House of Representatives on June 18, permitting all Members to have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks during the debate on H.R. 17070, I wish to correct my answer to a question put by my distinguished colleague, Congressman SCHERLE on June 18, 1970, page 20456.

In response to a question concerning the intent of this legislation that agricultural magazines mailed for delivery

in zones 1 and 2 under conditions prescribed in former section 4358 be considered preferred rate publications for rate consideration, my answer should have been in the affirmative. As the record will show, with the help of my distinguished colleague, Congressman UDALL, this affirmative answer was properly developed on the record.

Nevertheless, my immediate response, when Congressman SCHERLE posed the question, should have been:

It is still the intent of this legislation that agricultural magazines mailed for delivery in zones 1 and 2 under conditions prescribed in former section 4358 are to be considered preferred rate publications for rate considerations.

GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am more than pleased that the House acted yesterday to restore the Golden Eagle passport for entrance to our national parks.

Very early in 1969, I introduced—as did many of my colleagues—a bill to reinstate the passport program, which was due to expire March 31, 1970. The Senate had approved an extension of the passport in September, last year. We are now returning the House-passed version with a few technical amendments to the Senate for approval, and I feel certain that within a very short time, the bill will be fully enacted and the many users of our parks can continue to enjoy the passport privilege.

As the matter now stands, the passport will be restored until December 31, 1971, with the annual fee cost increased from \$7 to \$10. Also, a complete study has been ordered by the Department of the Interior with a report and recommendations to the Congress by that date as to how the program can be made more productive.

The financial results of the Golden Eagle passport, since its inception in 1965, have not come up to expectations. The increase of \$3 in fees will give the Congress an opportunity to see if the original financial objective can be achieved, and the recommended study will give us a chance to see if the program can be made more effective for all concerned.

Because of the long delay in congressional action, the Department of the Interior has permitted free entrance into the national parks so far this summer and apparently will continue to do so until final action is taken on the passport program. I am pleased that the Department has done this, for the many Americans who enjoy the beauty of our parks and participate in the recreational activities they offer should not be the victims of our procrastination.

During the past year, I have received a great deal of mail in support of the Golden Eagle passport. These letters have come mainly from senior citizens and members of large families who have

willingly purchased the passport each year. The increase of \$3, as provided for in my own bill, brought no objections from my constituents.

The Golden Eagle passport has allowed our citizens to visit Federal recreational areas as often as they wish without additional cost. Retired persons especially, living on fixed incomes, can spend much of their leisure time in these beautiful forests with an insignificant expenditure of funds. The program has encouraged family outings, for only one fee is charged for a passenger vehicle, no matter how many persons occupy a car. The parks attract all sorts of people without regard to age or economic status. And, they should be assured of only a minimal entrance charge to them.

Mr. Speaker, we can well serve our countrymen with the restoration of the Golden Eagle passport, and I am delighted that the House and the Senate have seen fit to do so. When the recommendations of the proposed study are before us, we then can take a hard look at them with the hope that they will give us even a greater opportunity to serve.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERGY SPEAK OUT ON BEHALF OF PEACE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1966 I entered into the RECORD comments made by his Holiness Pope Paul VI reflecting the Pope's untiring commitment toward bringing about peace in Vietnam. It is now almost 4 years later and we are still involved in that conflict. Some religious leaders have not been as outspoken as the Pope has been. However, many feel they can no longer remain silent. It is significant and important that many of the Roman Catholic clergy in this country, a significant part of the moral voice of the land, have written and signed the following document, on behalf of peace, which I would like to enter into the RECORD for the benefit of all of our colleagues:

We, priests, seminarians and religious of the Roman Catholic Church are convinced that American society is in a state of profound crisis and that in the face of this crisis silence is no longer tolerable.

The crisis is widespread—poverty, the disintegration of our cities, the destruction of our environment, inflation. But it is most pressing and in the last few weeks most visible in the escalation of war, the repression of political dissent, and in a growing failure of confidence in the good will and sensitivity of American governmental institutions.

Not all have been silent. Thousands, mostly but not only students, have tried to make their anguish heard, and often in apparent despair of the possibilities for dialogue have resorted to confrontation.

But there has been silence—most notably a silence from many of us who claim roles of moral leadership. This silence must end.

A government committed to "bringing us together" has polarized the nation into sometimes silent, but increasingly openly hostile and fear-ridden camps.

In the name of God and our own survival we must insist that this same government and the moral leaders of the nation begin to listen with openness to the troubled voices that are trying to be heard in every corner of the nation.

These are not the voices of a few, dismissible malcontents, but those of thousands who plead for the great questions of our time to be seen and met in a moral light.

This war must end. Repression of political dissent must end. Confidence in our form of government must be restored.

To these ends, we, in this statement, plead for good will and dialogue while there is still time.

SIGNATORIES

Rev. Charles Albright, Catholic chaplain, West Virginia University and pastor St. John's parish, Morgantown, W. Va.

Sister Mary Amanda, teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Robert Andrade, seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Vincent Andrews, seminarian, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.

Rev. Michael Arms, asst. pastor, Cathedral of St. Paul, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Sister Grace Arthen, teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Robert F. Ashbeck, seminarian, 4309 34th St., Brentwood, Md.

Rev. Paul Asselin, C.S.P., moderator, CCD Focus, Archdiocese of Baltimore, Md.

Association of Detroit Priests, Executive Board, Martin J. O'Connor, chairman, Detroit, Michigan.

Sister Kathleen Ballantine, RSM, 338 E. 29th St., New York, N.Y.

Sister Janice Barry, 314 E. 33rd St., New York, N.Y.

Don Baxter, seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Robert Benedetto, Paulist Father, New York, N.Y.

Rev. Walter Birkle, St. Brigid's, 119 Ave. B, New York, N.Y.

Sister M. Brennan, teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Keith Brennan, seminarian, 5109 Canterbury Way, Temple Hills, Md.

Joseph H. Braun, seminarian, Oak Ridge, N.J.

Sister M. Beatrice Brown, 325 E. 33rd St., New York, N.Y.

Sister M. Faith Brown, 325 E. 33rd St., New York, N.Y.

Rev. Bonaventure Brown, OFM, STD, chaplain, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

Thomas Brown, Pontifical College, Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

James M. Brucz, seminarian, Oak Ridge, N.J.

Frederick Burg, seminarian, 4309 34th St., Brentwood, Md.

Sister Patricia Burke, 611 E. 6th St., New York, N.Y.

Rev. Edward Byrne, asst. pastor, 28 Attorney St., New York, N.Y.

Carlo Busby, seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Terence Cahill, seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Richard Callanan, Catholic chaplain, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Rev. William Cantwell, CSP, 415 W. 59th St. New York, N.Y.

Rev. John Carr, publisher, Paulist Press, Paramus, N.J.

Rev. James Carroll, Chaplain, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

Frank Clep, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

John Cody, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Rev. John Collins, Chaplain, U.C.L.A., Los Angeles, Calif.

John Collins, Seminarian, Oak Ridge, N.J.

Rev. Claude Collins, asst. pastor, St. Ann's Boston, Mass.

Rev. Eugene Condon, president of Priest's Association, pastor, Edgefield, S.C.

Rev. John P. Conlon, coordinator, South Jamaica; Pastoral Zone, Jamaica, L.I., N.Y.

Sister Maryellen Connors, teacher, 338 East 29th St., New York, N.Y.

Rev. James Conway, chaplain, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

James J. Crosson, Missionaries of the Holy Apostles, 1325 Quincy St. NE., Washington, D.C.

Sister Agatha Cullen, 384 Grand St., New York, N.Y.

Rev. Edward Delaney, Suffern, N.Y.

Rev. Wilfrid Dewan, professor of theology, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

William J. Doherty, seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Timothy Donohoe, seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Ed Donovan, chaplain, University of California, San Diego, Calif.

Rev. James Donovan, C.S.P., asst. pastor, Church of St. Lawrence, Minneapolis, Minn.

John Duffy, seminarian, Oak Ridge, N.J.

Sister Mary Fatima, teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Rev. James Fisher, C.S.P., associate editor, *The Catholic World*, New York, N.Y.

Rev. George Fitzgerald, Catholic chaplain, Tufts University, Medford, Mass.

Rev. Edward J. Flahaven, director, Urban Affairs Commission, 240 Summit Ave., St. Paul, Minn.

Dan Floria, seminarian, Oak Ridge, N.J.

Rev. Thomas A. Fox, Paulist Father, Boston, Mass.

Rev. Joseph Gallagher, C.S.P., director, Paulist Institute for Religious Research, New York, N.Y.

Sister Nancy Gallen, teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Rev. James J. Gilhooley, 307 E. 33rd St., New York, N.Y.

Sister Susan Gerrity, teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Rev. David Gomez, C.S.P., asst. pastor, St. Rose of Lima Church, Layton, Utah.

Rev. Neil Graham, assistant, St. Emerick's Church, New York City, N.Y.

J. Edward Guinan, asst. chaplain, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Rev. David Guitan, asst. pastor, Church of the Most Holy Crucifix, New York, N.Y.

Rev. Miles X. Hillis, C.S.P., 415 W. 59th St., New York, N.Y.

C. A. Howard, Atonement Seminary, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Patrick J. Hughes, Paulist Father, Boston, Mass.

Rev. Michael Hunt, chaplain, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich.

William C. Hunter, Paulist seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Alvin Illig, C.S.P., 415 W. 59th St., New York, N.Y.

Vincent Inghilterra, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Patrick Johnson, seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Sister Pat Joyce, 126 Ridge St., New York, N.Y.

William Juenemann, seminarian, 650 Jackson St., NE, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Peter Kain, chaplain, Kingsboro Community College, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Sister Helen Kaiser, 325 E. 33rd St., New York, N.Y.

Mike Kallock, Paulist seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. James S. Kaston, Church of St. Frances Xavier Cabrini, Minneapolis, Minn.

Sister Dorothy Katravas, teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Sister Joyce Kavanagh, RSM, 630 Isham St., New York, N.Y.

Sister Charlene Kay, 145-53 South Rd., Jamaica, L.I., N.Y.

Sister Ruth Kelley, RSM, teacher, 630 Isham St., New York, N.Y.

Rev. Donald J. Kenna, Catholic chaplain, Queens College, L.I., N.Y.

Sister Aloisa Kennedy, 145-53 South Rd., Jamaica, L.I., N.Y.

Rev. Thomas J. Keough, 28 Attorney St., New York, N.Y.

Frank Kessel, 3875 Harewood Rd., NE, Washington, D.C.

Rev. David Killian, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Assistant, Catholic Information Center.

Rev. John Kirvan, Paulist Priest, New York, N.Y.

William M. Kondrath, Oak Ridge, New Jersey, Seminarian.

Thaddeus M. Kozkowski, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C., Paulist Seminarian.

Sister Rose Lanzzone, Teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Jeffrey La Drouce, Pontifical College, Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Sister Miriam Leonard, 611 East 6th St., New York City, N.Y.

Kenneth Lerclue, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Rev. Paul H. Lewis, C.S.P., Pastor, P.O. Box 112, Clemson, S.C.

Sister Elizabeth Lillis, Teacher, 338 East 29th St., New York City, N.Y.

Rev. John G. Lynch, Professor of Theology, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. William McAuliffe, Associate Chaplain, University of California, San Diego.

Rev. Patrick McCabe, 28 Attorney St., New York, N.Y.

James R. McCauley, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Justin McCormick, McArdle Laboratory, Cancer Research, University of Wisconsin.

Rev. Dermott McDermott, Assistant Pastor, 119 Avenue B, New York, N.Y.

Michael McGarry, Seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Ken McGuire, Paulist Father, Columbus, Ohio.

Kenneth McGuire, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

John McGuirk, Pontifical College, Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Joseph McKeon, Newman Chaplain, York College, South Ozone Park, N.Y.

Rev. Vincent McKiernan, C.S.P., Mount Paul Novitiate, Oak Ridge, N.J.

Rev. Louis McKernan, Professor of History, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Joseph McLaughlin, S.M., Marist College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Floyd McManus, Paulist Father, Boston, Mass.

Rev. John McNasser, Chaplain, U.C.L.A., Los Angeles, California.

Rev. Stanley MacNevin, Chaplain, Memphis State, Memphis, Tenn.

Rev. Harry McSorley, C.S.P., St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Al Maccherino, 650 Jackson St., N.E., Washington, D.C.

Rev. Edward Maher, Chaplain, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich.

Rev. Charles Mahoney, Assistant, St. Patrick's Center, Memphis, Tenn.

Sister Mary Ellen Malloy, 325 E. 33rd St., New York, N.Y.

Sister Joan Marese, Teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Sister Gratia Maria, Teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Sister John Marie, S.A., 300 East Fifth, New York, N.Y.

Rev. Charles Martin, Associate Pastor, St. Patrick's Center, Memphis, Tenn.

Rev. Harold J. Masterson, 611 W. Boston Blvd., Detroit, Michigan.

Dean Masthenson, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Rev. Peter Meehan, Assistant Pastor, St. Theresa's Parish, New York, N.Y.

Ken Meltz, Seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Alfonse L. Mercatante, Assistant Chaplain, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Sister Colette Milazzo, 100 Pearl St., New York, N.Y.

Sister Rita Marie Minogue, R.S.M., Teacher, 630 Isham St., New York, N.Y.

Rev. Robert Mize, Paulist Father, Texas.

Don Morales, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Rev. Richard Marold, Catholic Chaplain, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.

Rev. Bob Moran, St. Mark's University Parish, Goleta, California.

Rev. Arthur Mouser, Catholic Chaplain, Clemson University, Clemson, S.C.

Michael J. Mozola, 201 Taylor St. N.E., Washington, D.C.

Kevin Munn, Seminarian, Oak Ridge, New Jersey.

Sister Paul Muriel, Teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Kevin Murphy, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Sister Margaret Murphy, 145-53 South Rd., Jamaica, L.I., N.Y.

Rev. Thomas Murphy, Paulist Father, Toronto, Canada.

Jose Neto, Seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

David O'Brien, C.S.P., P.O. Box 386, Storrs, Conn., Chaplain, University of Connecticut.

Sister M. Canice O'Reordan, 325 East 33rd St., New York, N.Y.

Bernard R. Palka, Atonement Seminary, Washington, D.C.

Sister Anne Marie Patterson, Teacher, 262 Macon St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

George Paulist, Seminarian, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Robert J. Peirine, 720 23rd St. N.W., Washington, D.C.

Rev. David Pilliod, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Richard Podrin, Church of Nativity Assistant, 324 S. Prior Ave., St. Paul, Minn.

Rev. Joseph Quinn, Chaplain, Pastor, St. Thomas Aquinas Parish, University of Connecticut.

Thomas J. Reardon, Marist College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Salvatore Riggs, Priest, 94-20 160 St., Jamaica, N.Y.

Charles Rinaldi, Seminarian, University of West Virginia.

Paul G. Robichaud, Seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

James Ryan, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

John M. Ryan, Seminarian, Oak Ridge, New Jersey.

Anthony F. Scola, seminarian, 3105 Teton Lane, Bowie, Md.

Joseph J. Scott, seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Robert Scott, Catholic chaplain, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Sister Agnes Shaw, 325 E. 33rd St., New York, N.Y.

Robert Shaw, seminarian, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Rev. Peter Shea, CSP, St. Lawrence Church, Minneapolis, Minn.

Rev. Kevin Sheehan, CSP, asst. pastor, St. Paul the Apostle Church, 415 W. 59th St., New York, N.Y.

Rev. John B. Sheerin, CSP, editor, *The Catholic World*, New York, N.Y.

Anthony Shones, seminarian, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Howard C. Smith, seminarian, Marist College, Washington, D.C.

Joseph F. Smith, seminarian, Oak Ridge, N.J.

Sister Jane Stephens, student, School of Social Service, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

Rev. Robert J. Stulting, asst. director, Catholic Information Center, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Rev. Frank Sullivan, CSP, Boston, Mass.

Rev. Jeremiah Sullivan, asst. pastor, Good Shepherd Church, 608 Isham St., New York City, N.Y.

Sister Agnes Suzanne, 325 E. 33rd St., New York, N.Y.

Rev. Francis Sweeney, doctoral student, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

Rev. Matthew Thompson, St. Brigid's Church, 119 Ave. B, New York, N.Y.

Rev. Richard Trelese, chaplain, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Sister Joan Turel, 325 E. 33rd St., New York City, N.Y.

Rev. Robert Valentine, Tagaste, Suffern, N.Y.

Sister Patricia Vayda, student, School of Social Service, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

Sister Ann Veronica, RSM, teacher, 630 Isham St., New York, N.Y.

Andrew Vignone, seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Dick Vogel, Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, Ohio.

Rudolph Vorisek, CSP, asst. pastor, St. Mark's University Parish, 6550 Picasso Rd., Goleta, California.

Rev. Ed Wallin, CSP, New York, N.Y.

Rev. Donald Wegschneider, chairman, Social Action Committee, asst.

Rev. Anthony J. Wilhelm, C.S.P., Chaplain, Newman Center, University of California, Berkeley.

Vince G. Wissman, Seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Clarence Wright, Seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. James J. Young, Graduate Student, School of Social Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Richard Byrne CSP, Chaplain University of Connecticut.

Raymond Colliton, Seminarian, St. Paul's College, Washington, D.C.

Rev. J. Paul Carrico, New York City, N.Y.

Sister Madeline Duffy R.S.M. New York City, N.Y.

Timothy Tighe CSP Assistant Pastor St. Patrick's Parish Memphis, Tennessee.

For further information call:

Bob Benedetto, P.O. Box 70, Cooper Station, New York, 10003, (212) 982-7556.

Kevin Sheehan, 415 West 59th St., New York City, 10019, (212) 265-3209.

John Kirvan, 415 West 59th St., New York City, 10019, (212) 265-4028.

DECISION NEEDED ON TEXTILE QUOTA

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, at this time of decision on the problem of textile exports from Japan, I take the opportunity to share with members of Commerce my respect for the work that has been done by Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans. His long, untiring effort to reach an agreement for a voluntary reduction in textile exports should not go unnoticed.

It is also the time to compliment President Nixon who, as an advocate of free trade, has recognized a crucial threat to our American textile industries. The President and Secretary Stans have faced a desperate situation and earn our further encouragement.

However, the American textile industry and its working men and women want a clearly understood, precise decision made on textile exports that endanger their livelihoods. In other words, they are asking for a showdown on an international problem that has become their personal problem.

More than half the Members of Congress have now supported the textile and footwear quota legislation before the House Ways and Means Committee. This is good legislation and will remove the serious threat to our American textile and footwear industries.

I feel that the Ways and Means Committee has, under the condition of so many cosponsors, the obligation to release the quota legislation and let Congress make its final decision on the problem.

NATION'S RAILROADS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, along with my colleague from New York in the other body, Mr. JAVITS, legislation authorizing the Secretary of Transportation to guarantee loans to rail carriers to assist them in the performance of transportation services necessary to the maintenance of a national transportation system, and to establish a joint congressional committee to carry out a study and investigation for the purpose of making recommendations for the solution of the problems of the Nation's railroads.

The bankruptcy of the Penn Central Railroad is a clear indication that we cannot delay any longer in enacting a coherent plan for the operation of the Nation's rail passenger system. Such a system must be free of the financial uncertainties which have been continually cited as excuses for poor if not unsafe, service, rundown equipment, and low employee morale.

Service must continue while the Penn Central is in reorganization under the bankruptcy laws. The Penn Central has some 94,000 employees; 69,000 daily commuters in New York State alone depend on the line's services; and countless shippers and industries rely on the Penn Central in the conduct of their businesses. These interests demand that the railroad be kept running. However, bankruptcy is not the way to run a railroad. Nor is the hand-to-mouth public-damned attitude that has characterized much of Penn Central's service, especially on the New Haven and Harlem-Hudson commutation divisions.

Title I of the bill we are introducing today would provide emergency assistance to the Penn Central and other distressed railroads in the form of loan guarantees up to \$750 million to assist in maintaining essential transportation operations. The bill explicitly safeguards the interests of the taxpayer by stipulating that any loan so guaranteed must be used solely for railroad transportation purposes. In other words, it is the clear intention of this legislation that funds obtained hereunder shall not be used, directly or indirectly, to assist any other nonrailroad aspect of a rail carrier's operation.

At the same time, it is incumbent upon the new management of the Penn Central to act aggressively in dealing with the

financial and organization problems of the company. In seeking aid from the Government, it is essential that the responsibilities of private enterprise be upheld as well. The Penn Central and its subsidiaries must be prepared to take certain actions on their own behalf, such as disposing of some of their real estate interests in order to pay due bills.

The emergency loan guarantee authority will not by itself solve the problem of the Penn Central or any other railroad. This is a situation of great complexity, reaching far beyond the financial difficulties of a single company. Indeed, the dimensions of the problem are evident in the national rail passenger corporation bill, S. 3706, and the Urban Mass Transit Assistance Act, S. 3154, which are both pending in the House.

Because of the magnitude of this problem, title II of our bill would establish a joint congressional committee to carry out a study and investigation for the purpose of making recommendations for the solution of the problems of the Nation's railroads. In order to enact appropriate legislation this session, the committee is directed to report to the Congress by September 30.

While a number of standing committees in the House and Senate have already announced their intentions of looking into the Penn Central situation, we believe that a joint congressional committee, consisting of key members of the appropriate House and Senate legislative committees, can recommend a comprehensive solution to the problems of the entire railroad industry. Such a joint group would bring together the best minds and the best proposals to deal with the structural bottlenecks in our Nation's transportation system, which together with the financial stringency has brought the Penn Central into bankruptcy.

Our aim must be to keep the railroads operating and I hope that the House will act promptly on this legislation.

FEDERAL BLUE CROSS CONTRACT

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a letter I received from Frank R. Karson, administrator, Glenside Hospital, for consideration by my colleagues. This letter depicts important shortcomings in the Federal Blue Cross contract which affects all Federal employees under this coverage.

Although the contract provides full coverage for 365 days in a general hospital for mental illness, the contract is misleading because the Federal employee must pay the first \$100 plus 20 percent of all other charges if he were to stay at a licensed mental hospital. We all well know that the mental wards in general hospitals are usually filled to capacity—their facilities are not available. The waiting lists are long, and it is extraordinarily difficult to be admitted. The Federal employees have to turn to a licensed mental hospital where they have to pay

a substantial part of the expense. Most Federal employees cannot afford this.

If one could walk into the mental ward of a general hospital and get treatment, I would have no reservations about the present coverage. Unfortunately, this is clearly not the case.

It seems inequitable that State employees, Massachusetts included, have contracts which provide full benefits in licensed mental hospitals as well as in general hospitals, and Federal employees do not. Furthermore, most industry and business firms have more complete benefits because the coverage is extended to licensed mental hospitals as well as to general hospitals.

If we are willing to give Federal employees coverage for mental illness in a general hospital where facilities are not available, then we should be sure that he has the same coverage in a licensed mental hospital like most of his fellow Americans. Although the Federal employee has been assured that he has the best coverage available, he obviously does not. This deficiency in coverage in the area of mental health can and should be corrected. If it is not, then surely the Federal employee should be informed of the present inadequacy of his coverage. I recommend Mr. Karson's well-written and informative letter to my colleagues. It describes a serious situation that should be corrected.

The letter follows:

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL,

Jamaica Plain, Mass., June 5, 1970.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
J. F. Kennedy Memorial Building,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'NEILL: This letter is forwarded to you with hopes that some good will result from it in attaining improved benefits for Federal Employees under their health plan with Blue Cross.

I am and have been the Administrator of Glenside Hospital for ten years. Glenside is a 121 bed private psychiatric hospital in Boston, Massachusetts. It is licensed by the Department of Mental Health, Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Glenside received a three year accreditation in 1969 by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals and is a member of the American Hospital Association. We have over 80 psychiatrists on our Medical Staff and treat approximately 1400 cases a year. To my knowledge, we have more referrals to our hospital and help more people in the field of mental illness than any other hospital on the whole East Coast except for one or two large 5000 bed State Hospitals. Our average in-hospital stay is three to four weeks.

About three or four years ago the Federal Blue Cross contract allowed 30 days coverage for mental illness but, hidden behind the definition of Hospital, limited the 30 allowed days to a general hospital only. In Boston, there are only four or five general hospitals with psychiatric in-hospital services with a combined total of less than 110 beds. These beds are forever full and the overflow is generally referred to us or other similar licensed mental hospitals. When a Federal employee or his dependent was unable to get help in a general hospital and was referred to us, he lost the benefit of full coverage for 30 days but was covered at Glenside under the Supplemental Benefits part of his contract. He now had to pay the first \$100 under High Option and was further liable for 20% of all other charges. It was at this time that I spoke with a Government Union representative from Washington at a Union meeting held at the V.A.

Hospital in Brockton, Massachusetts. I explained to him the short-comings of the Federal Blue Cross Plan in regard to mental illness. That since it was almost impossible to get a bed in a general hospital for an acute mental illness, the 30 day allowance by Blue Cross was, in my opinion, worthless. That the Union should strive to get the 30 days or more if possible, to be allowed in a licensed mental hospital. I cited that this type of contract was being sold by Blue Cross. That the state employees of Massachusetts had such contracts which provided full benefits in a licensed mental hospital as well as in a general hospital. When the Federal Blue Cross contract came out the following year, I was shocked to see the coverage for mental illness extended to 365 days but still limited to general hospitals. Federal employees were buying a small zero before but now were purchasing a great big zero.

The Federal Employee who was told and who thought he had the best health plan in the world was outraged when we told him that he had full coverage in a general hospital for 365 days for mental illness but that he would have to pay the first \$100 plus 20% of all other charges if he were to stay on at Glenside for treatment. What could he do? Where could he go? There were no beds available in general hospitals. The Federal employee and his family have been led to believe they have the best health plan available but they have been misinformed. Most industry and business firms today have far better plans because they cover mental illness in a licensed mental hospital as well as providing full benefits in a general hospital.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts employees and municipal employees of Massachusetts cities and towns get 120 days of full coverage at Glenside for mental illness under a Blue Cross contract. State employees recently switched to Aetna and still get the 120 days of full coverage at Glenside. General Motors has a Blue Cross contract which gives their employees 45 days of full coverage in a licensed mental hospital. Harvard, M.I.T., Polaroid Corporation, and hundreds of others have Blue Cross contracts allowing 60 days of full coverage in a licensed mental hospital. The I.B.M. Corporation has a Blue Cross contract which allows 365 days of full coverage at Glenside.

Almost all the commercial insurance carriers pay benefits in a licensed mental hospital the same as they would in a general hospital. General Dynamics uses Prudential and their employees get 120 days of full coverage at Glenside. Sears, Roebuck and Company operate their own plan and allow 120 days of full coverage at Glenside. The Aetna Government Wide Indemnity Plan allows the same full benefits at Glenside as they do in a general hospital. The Military Champus Contract with Blue Cross provides the same benefits to Glenside as they do in a general hospital. Our own contract at Glenside Hospital with Blue Cross allows our employees 60 days of full coverage in a licensed mental hospital in addition to 365 days of coverage for medical-surgical illnesses in a general hospital. I could go on and on with examples. Suffice to say it appears that the Federal employee is surely being short-changed if he is being told he has the best plan available. His plan is sadly lacking when it comes to coverage for mental illness. If he could walk into a general hospital and get treatment, I would have no quarrel. However, he is unable to do this because of the limited facilities in general hospitals for treatment of mental illness. Therefore, he may come to Glenside where with his Supplemental Benefits paying 80% of the hospital bill after he pays the first \$100, it could cost him \$300 to \$400 for a three to four week stay. Too many Federal employees cannot afford this. What is even more important, is the fact that they are unaware of the inadequacy of their

Blue Cross contract. I have had the unfortunate and unpleasant task of spelling it out for hundreds of Federal employees and their families.

I firmly believe the inadequate coverage for mental illness in the Federal Blue Cross contract is an oversight and not intentional. A few years ago a similar situation was found with the New England Telephone Company. They had a Blue Cross contract which covered in full in a general hospital but would pay nothing in a licensed mental hospital. Fortunately I met an executive of the Insurance Planning Committee for New England Telephone who found it unbelievable when I pointed out the inadequacy in his contract regarding coverage for mental illness in a licensed mental hospital. The following year, the New England Telephone contract with Blue Cross was changed to provide proper mental health coverage and now telephone employees have full benefits at Glenside.

It is my hope that this letter will in some way help you to better determine the type of Blue Cross contract which should be offered to the Federal employee. Mental illness should not be overlooked. If you are willing to give the Federal employee coverage for mental illness in a general hospital where facilities are not available, then you should be sure he has the same coverage in a licensed mental hospital so that he can turn to us for help as do most of his fellow Americans. The Aetna Government Wide Indemnity Plan is okay since it provides the same benefits in a licensed mental hospital as it does in a general hospital.

Glenside and other similar licensed mental hospitals are designated by Massachusetts Blue Cross as cooperating hospitals and payment is made to us on that basis through their Master Medical contracts and/or their special Basic contracts.

I have been in the mental health field for twenty-two years and have seen the tremendous strides taken by insurance companies in offering coverage for mental illness. I have been in contact with thousands of families and I know the comfort and relief it gives to them when they know they have proper insurance coverage. However, the Federal employee is unaware that his insurance contract is inadequate. This deficiency in the area of mental health coverage can be and should be corrected. If it is not, then surely the Federal employee should be made aware of the short-comings of his contract. It should be clearly spelled out in his brochure. As it stands now, he can read his brochure and cannot find where he is disallowed benefits in a licensed mental hospital.

The Federal Blue Cross contract has long concerned me and I have been promising myself this letter for some time. I am most pleased to be conveying my thoughts on this subject to you today. I submit the above for your information and consideration and further request that you do not hesitate to call on me if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

FRANK R. KARSON,
Administrator.

HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental

genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, an article in yesterday's Wall Street Journal reminds us again that economic appearances can be very deceiving. On the face of international economic statistics, the United States would appear to be no worse off than most other industrialized nations in its current bout with inflation. But, as the Journal's reporter, Alfred L. Malabre, Jr., points out, this is not the case.

Because U.S. price and wage levels are already much higher than other nations, an increase in these levels that equals or nearly equals the rate in every major industrial nation means that we are rapidly pricing ourselves out of world competition. As Malabre notes, unless U.S. prices and wages increase at a noticeably slower pace than other countries, our competitive edge is quickly eroded.

The article adds that the demand for higher wages in the United States has been accompanied by lower productivity among its workers, while operations abroad have become increasingly more efficient.

This growing absolute disadvantage cannot be dismissed any longer. As Malabre puts it:

The picture is gloomy, and there is nothing very comforting in the fact that exports amount to only some 4% of America's gross national product, as some analysts like to point out.

All this adds up to only one more reason why the administration must grab the reins of the economy more tightly than it so far has shown a willingness to do, and press down hard on rising prices and wages.

The article follows:

APPRAISALS OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Efforts to play down the seriousness of the inflation that continues to overhang the U.S. economy often stress the fact that prices are increasing no faster than in most major industrial nations. Inflation in the U.S. shouldn't be viewed with excessive concern, this argument runs, so long as the price climb here doesn't get too far out of line with the price climb elsewhere.

It's perfectly correct that inflation in the U.S. hasn't been far out of line with the rates at which prices have been raising recently in other key countries. A comparison of consumer price trends by the International Monetary Fund bears this out. In a recent 12-month period, the IMF reports, consumer prices rose 8% in Japan, 6% in the U.S., France and the United Kingdom, 5% in Canada, and 4% in West Germany and Italy.

Such comparisons, however, overlook several considerations that leave a much less sanguine impression of the U.S. position.

For one thing, they overlook the fact that U.S. price levels generally are considerably higher than price levels abroad. Accordingly, unless U.S. prices increase at a slower rate

than prices elsewhere, the absolute spread between U.S. levels and those abroad will widen.

Suppose, for instance, that a particular U.S. automobile sells for \$6,000 and a particular Japanese car sells for \$3,000. The price spread between the two cars is \$3,000. Now suppose that the price of the U.S. car increases 6% and the price of the Japanese car increases 8%. The percentages suggest at first glance that the U.S. position has improved. But actually the spread has widened to \$3,120. The U.S. car now sells for \$6,360 and the Japanese car for \$3,240.

The same situation pertains in the area of labor costs. Recently, wage rates in key countries abroad have been climbing about as rapidly as in the U.S., where the average annual increase nowadays is roughly 8%.

A study by Towers, Perrin, Forster & Crosby, a Philadelphia-based management consultant, compares average hourly wage rates in major countries. The comparisons are based on 1968 data and are expressed in dollars, using 1968 currency exchange rates.

Average hourly wage

United States	\$3.01
Canada	2.37
West Germany	1.30
United Kingdom	1.22
France	.99
Italy	.79

Simple arithmetic shows that an increase of 8% brings the U.S. wage level to about \$3.25 and the French level, for example, to \$1.07. This increases the spread between the two levels by approximately 16 cents, from \$2.02 to \$2.18.

It is only recently that U.S. wage rates have risen at anything close to the speed of wage rates in most other places. The U.S. level, however, has been so high for so long that the spread widened even in years when U.S. wages rose relatively slowly.

Between 1960 and 1968, the Towers, Perrin, Forster & Crosby study shows, the U.S. wage level climbed 33%. This compares with increases of 142% in France, 114% in Italy, 110% in West Germany, and 36% in the United Kingdom. Only the Canadian increase of 28% was smaller than the U.S. wage rise.

Nevertheless, in absolute terms the difference between U.S. and foreign wage levels widened in every instance during the period. The spread increased by 43 cents in the case of the United Kingdom, 33 cents in Italy, 17 cents in France and 7 cents in West Germany. The difference between U.S. and Canadian wage levels obviously grew also, but not as greatly as might be expected because the Canadian wage level was already relatively high in 1960. The spread grew by 23 cents.

It is worth seeing how the picture would look if U.S. wages had risen as rapidly in 1960-68 as wages, say, in France. Instead of increasing by 17 cents, the spread between the U.S. and French wage levels would have increased by \$2.63.

High wage rates can be offset by high worker productivity. Suppose a worker for Company A earns \$3 per hour and produces 30 widgets per hour, while a worker for Company B earns \$1 per hour and produces 10 widgets per hour. Company A's wage rate is higher than Company B's, but not its per widget labor costs.

On an international scale, U.S. workers have been more productive than workers elsewhere for most of the post-World War II era, in part because they have had access to more efficient equipment. Recently, however, facilities abroad have become far more efficient, often through the application of techniques first tried in the U.S. The upshot has been a sharp reduction in the productivity lead of U.S. workers.

It is not surprising, in view of what has been happening on the international wage-price front, that Uncle Sam's stance in the highly competitive world marketplace has begun to sag. In 1964, U.S. merchandise exports exceeded merchandise imports by near-

ly \$7 billion. Last year's surplus was only about \$600 million. Uncle Sam's share of world exports of manufactured products—the goods that the U.S. traditionally has been so adept at supplying—stands at about 22%, lower than at any time in the postwar era. In 1958, the U.S. share amounted to 28%.

The picture is gloomy, and there is nothing very comforting in the fact that exports amount to only some 4% of America's gross national product, as some analysts like to point out.

It is true that foreign trade represents a small slice of the U.S. economy, which happens to be highly self-sufficient. But it is also a fact that America's role as a world leader—in everything from encouraging the expansion of international commerce to supplying assistance to developing nations—depends on its ability to compete effectively in world markets.

If the U.S. should no longer be able to compete, the scenario becomes dismally predictable: Surging imports, disappearing jobs, rampant protectionism, an unraveling of the international monetary system, whose stability requires a competitive U.S.

REDS' WORLD GOAL MEANS BLOOD

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that the Soviet Union is an imperial power holding captive within its boundaries non-Russian nations, the victims of Communist aggression which is historically consistent with Czarist imperialistic power. This fact was effectively emphasized by the distinguished Walter Trohan, the world-renowned bureau chief of the Chicago Tribune in his Wednesday, June 17, column, as follows:

REDS' WORLD GOAL MEANS BLOOD

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, June 16—Thirty years ago this week one of the most shameful chapters in all history was written by Russia in the seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It is vitally important that every American be familiar with this story and its implications today.

Freedom was outraged with the occupation of the Baltic states on June 15, 1940. A week later Russia invaded Romania, occupying Bessarabia and part of Bukovina. The United States did nothing and stood largely mute, because the Roosevelt administration expected Russia to clash with Germany.

"The occupation of the Baltic states and the Romanian territory had straightened out the curve in her western border," F.D.R.'s secretary of state, Cordell Hull, wrote calmly and briefly in his memoirs.

The occupation of the Baltic states was written in blood. In 30 years of slavery hundreds of thousands of once free peoples have been put to death and hundreds of thousands of others have been imprisoned in slave labor camps. The communist brutality and cruelty taxes the imagination.

It must be remembered that the seizure of the Baltic states came after Russia divided Poland with Germany and after Russia invaded and occupied substantial areas of Finland.

All of these acts demonstrated what many refused to believe, that the imperialism of the czars, which the Communists professed to abhor, was only the beginning. All in all, Russia has made captives of 21 nations, including such captives of the czarist imperialism as the Ukraine and Byelorussia.

Most recently the imperialism has been demonstrated in Korea, Cuba, and Viet Nam. Furthermore, this imperialism has been raising its ugly head in the middle east, where it has been reported that Russian pilots are flying Russian jets for Egypt.

More than 75 of our 100 senators have fixed their names to a resolution calling for shipment of American made jets to Israel because of the communist threat in the middle east. Many of these signers refuse to recognize this same communism is a threat in Viet Nam, where it is killing American boys and would enslave the people of South Viet Nam because the Communists want the rich coastal rice fields.

Thirty years ago this week the United States, under F.D.R., was silent because it was becoming pro-Russian where it had been pro-Italian in Mussolini's dream of an African empire. Now some Americans are pro-Communist, in effect if not by intent, in southeast Asia and anti-Communist in the middle east.

Russia hasn't changed its attitudes as we have changed ours. The Communists have made no secret of their goal of world domination. We have seen this as good at some times and bad at others in curious compromises with what was, is, and always will be evil, if it survives.

It must be remembered that Russia is not one vast monolithic bloc of dedicated Communists. There are some 21 different peoples hoping some day they will achieve freedom, to say nothing of millions of Russians who would be free of their reign of terror.

All who love freedom should support the Baltic states in their quest for freedom, as exemplified in the congressional resolution of June 28, 1966, which called for bringing the force of world opinion behind the restoration of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. This applied to the other captive nations as well.

No country, even one as great as our own, can be truly free while any nation is in slavery or is denied the right of self-determination.

THANKS TO CHARLEY
BRAITHWAIT

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, reams have been written and spoken by our colleagues in support of the reasons that they have, over the years, either approved or disapproved of the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity, better known as the poverty program.

For my part I have repeatedly stated that there are many worthwhile and beneficial segments within the overall program. I have also charged that some parts of the program are not only unworkable, the results have been nil and the administration wasteful.

My paramount reason for opposition to the authorization and appropriations for O.E.O. has been the imbalance between programs for the urban and rural areas. Always it seems more and more money must be appropriated to cool the strife in the ghettos. More and more funds must be somehow allocated to cool the long hot summers. All the while the rural areas, where the need is just as great, continue to be neglected and forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege recently to read a copy of the testimony

submitted by Mr. Charles Braithwait, the executive director of the West Central Missouri Rural Development Corp., before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Welfare appropriations chaired by the senior Senator from Washington. Mr. Braithwait recently appeared in company with Mr. Maurice R. Vincent, who is in charge of planning for the West Central Missouri Corp.

While Mr. Braithwait's testimony speaks for itself, it is noteworthy that he presents some statistics that apply to these nine rural counties in west-central Missouri, eight of which are in the Fourth Congressional District.

The testimony of Director Braithwait emphasizes a position that my office has long stood for, and that is that there is a pronounced imbalance in the appropriation of OEO funds between the rural and the urban areas. We all know that there was a time when the Office of Economic Opportunity funds were regarded simply as a sort of fire extinguisher, to cool off racial unrest. Thank goodness that concept was abandoned and today at least some attention has been focused on areas other than the inner, inner city to the neglect and omission of what could be described as outlying or quasi-agricultural, small-town communities.

As Mr. Braithwait so eloquently sets forth in his statement, when a person is poor, geography makes no difference. His statistical data points up the need for a more careful look by both Appropriations Committees, in both bodies of the Congress, toward a more equitable distribution of funds between the urban and the so-called rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one possible solution to our urban problems, it is that our cities do not become larger and larger and more and more unmanageable, and that what some of us prefer to describe as rural revitalization must go forward. We mean, of course, to turn around by every means available the continued migration from the rural areas to the big cities, and hopefully keep the population stable and constant in our rural areas. Then we can look forward to the day we can attract some light industry to provide the income which can revitalize our rural areas.

The West Central Rural Development Corp., in my opinion, is an excellent example of a well-managed human resources agency. Mr. Braithwait and Mr. Vincent presented testimony which was very informative. Their agency is helping not only with the administration of OEO funds but they are lending a helping hand to anyone who desires to apply to various Federal agencies for loans and grants such as HUD, the Farmers Home Administration, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture.

The fact that these two able men made their appearance before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Welfare appropriations and have come such a great distance is deserving of commendation. By their testimony which has put into perspective the needs of rural areas, they have performed a service not only for the other body of the Congress but for the House as well.

I am privileged to have the opportunity to share with my colleagues the remarks

of Mr. Charles Braithwait, executive director of West Central Missouri Rural Development Corp. of Appleton City, Mo., as he testified in the other body:

TESTIMONY OF MR. CHARLES BRAITHWAIT

I asked to appear before this committee, I asked to be here to speak for some 50,000 people who have few other voices. These people are predominately white, generally elderly and stunned by what has happened to them. They didn't become poor quickly but have seen their area, their economy and their personal incomes dwindle. They do not seek a blank check on the national treasury—they only need help to understand and deal with an unfriendly and changing world.

I stand here in two capacities. First—I stand here as the director of a community action agency. I have directed this agency for more than 4 years and feel that I speak for other rural agencies as well.

I have come to the Capital to seek money for health and housing projects that are badly needed in my rural area. I am also here in a second capacity—that of private citizen.

Few leaders remain in our area; most have left for greener pastures. Our organization must fill this void in leadership. Most of the employees of our community action agency are homegrown. With our staff living in 33 different communities, we furnish a great deal of the leadership in this area. We belong to local churches, civic and social clubs, and a great deal of the work we do to change attitudes and create awareness of the impact of poverty is done as citizens of the community rather than as professionals.

Our area consists of nine rural counties in West Central Missouri. It covers 6400 square miles. The area is essentially rural. Only three communities are in the 10,000 population bracket and three more are in the 5,000 bracket. The remainder of our 149 towns range from small towns in the 2500 population range, to hamlets of less than 100. Forty-six percent (46%) of our people are poor. Nearly half earn only a few dollars above poverty guidelines. There is virtually no middle-class in the area. We have a small but deeply entrenched and powerful upper-middle-class. The attitudes and life styles of the population are functionally rural. About 1/2 of our geographic area is in the Ozark Mountains. The remaining 1/2 is rolling plains characterized by scrub oak and cedar thickets growing on land that is not worth clearing for farm land. There are only three major highways in our area, and two of these run along the edge rather than through the center.

Only 12 communities in the area are served by motor bus and there is no rail or air transportation available. Some 45% of the western third of the area is underlaid by coal which is being mined by open-pit mining methods. There are no public health facilities in the area. Over 29,000 housing units in the area are unsound or lacking in facilities.

The mission of a community action agency is to mobilize new and existing resources and bring them to bear on the root causes of poverty. In trying to accomplish this mission we face two problems:

The first is in developing local resources. Due to the low tax base and depressed economy of the area, there are few local resources. The control of the local resources that do exist is divided among 149 city governments, 553 churches, 908 civic and fraternal organizations, 9 county courts, and 9 each of nearly every kind of state and federal government local office that exists in the area. The resources controlled by any one of these organizations are so limited and the number of organizations so great that the development of resources frequently costs more than the resources are worth.

In 1966 the median family income in this area was \$3,362 compared to a median in-

come in the state of Missouri of \$5,127. This creates a situation in which the most competent members of our communities move away and those who remain tend to be less talented and aggressive and less likely or able to deal with increasingly complicated problems.

Our organization is the only organization in the area able to pull together the remaining talent and resources and forge them into a weapon to be used to cure the ailments of the area.

Let me repeat, we are the only organization in the area with the skills or knowledge needed to bring together the talent and resources available in this area in order to solve our problems.

The second problem that we face is in mobilizing state and federal resources. Our community action agency is funded to provide outreach and recruitment and to bring together a net of state and federal programs to try to cure the basic causes of poverty. We have been successful in doing this. We currently administer programs from the departments of labor, agriculture, and health, education, and welfare, co-administer a program with the University of Missouri, as well as our O.E.O. programs. There are more programs available than we can administer with our current O.E.O. budget. We have only \$363,075 versatile funds. The limited money available to us makes it nearly impossible for us to continue to provide administration, organization and outreach for added programs without expanding both our administrative and operational staff, all of which must be paid from our O.E.O. versatile funds. We are in danger of being killed with kindness!!

Our O.E.O. versatile funds serve as the foundation upon which we have built a structure of programs and projects designed to meet the needs and solve the problems of the poor in this rural area. The problem we face is that many of the programs available to us must rely for administration, outreach, recruiting and field support on the already overburdened foundation of the community action agency.

New OEO programs become available to us from time to time, but do not bring with them sufficient money to enlarge the field and administrative staffs that they must have in order to operate.

We are seeking housing and health assistance as well as manpower assistance from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, and Department of Housing and Urban Development. Each time we receive assistance the burden on our central and field staffs gets larger. Funding levels do not increase while costs go up, and the size of the staff stays the same while the burden grows greater. We have a good community action agency. It has been rated as one of the best in the Nation. One of the best ways to measure the effectiveness of a community action agency is to examine the amount of personal income that it helps its participants to obtain. For each dollar this CAA spends the earning power of an individual is increased by 50¢ a year, thus in two years individual earnings power, created by the activities sponsored and administered by this CAA, repays the money spent to assist those individuals. From that time on the added earnings of those individuals represent net gains in the national and local economies. This means that in 4 years people helped by this CAA will have earned twice as much as the agency spent helping them.

Another problem we face is that unemployment benefits and welfare benefits available in our area are not sufficient to support those residents who cannot participate effectively in the area economy. Those who cannot effectively participate in the economy and who cannot find other sources of income leave the area for the cities, they are lost to us in this area as potential economic factors and,

in turn, become the problems of the cities.

That we are spending our money well is reflected in the annual report attached to the printed copies of this speech. Our area is not competitive for the national tax dollar. We need more money. Of the some 50,000 low-income people in our area, we have reached only 16,000. Many of these we are unable to help because we do not have programs that fit their specific needs. We need to strengthen the base of our agency which is provided by OEO versatile dollars. With this base stronger, we can mobilize more resources, administer more programs and effectively deal with the problems that we face.

A SUMMER FOR CANDLELIGHT

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the electric power shortage becomes more critical each year. We now accept the terms "brownout" and "blackout" as part of our normal vocabulary. Clearly, there is a need for greater responsibility on the part of the Government and the private utilities to redress this imbalance. An article entitled, "A Summer for Candlelight," by Martin F. Nolan in the Boston Globe discusses the present problems and places the major portion of the blame squarely where it belongs—on the heads of the electric power companies. He calls for greater Government regulation of the utilities to assure that enough power will be available.

Mr. Nolan points specifically to the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project in Maine as a case in point. This Federal project would provide the "peaking power" in the Northeast at times when other electrical supplies have neared exhaustion. The private utilities have fought against Dickey-Lincoln for years because, says Mr. Nolan—

If Dickey-Lincoln is built, then the Northeast will have a "yardstick" of federally produced power against which to measure the astronomically high rates charged people in the Northeast.

Such a yardstick would show the discrepancy between cost and service which the New England consumer must endure. Mr. Nolan's article follows:

[From the Boston Globe, June 21, 1970]

A SUMMER FOR CANDLELIGHT

(By Martin F. Nolan)

WASHINGTON.—The Elizabethans had a simple explanation for the environment problem long before Edmund Muskie looked at his first dirty river.

In the late 15th century England, Shakespeare and others wrote in the context of the Platonic division of the four basic elements of life: earth, water, fire and air.

The imbalance of these elements in nature or in man created spiritual trouble and meant dramatic tales.

So it is with today's drama: earth, water and air are defiled because of man's over-dependency on fire, otherwise known as technology.

If anyone today subscribes to that theory of life and literature, it is the electric power companies of America.

Accompanying the latest monthly bill to clients of the Potomac Electric Power Co. is "An important message to Pepco customers."

After hemming and hawing a bit, the mes-

sage says that if it gets too hot this summer in Washington—not a rare occasion—don't turn on your air conditioner. Thank you and that'll be \$23 for the nifty service last month.

Pleading with their paying customers "to keep their usage of electricity at a conservative level," the gentlemen of Pepco admit that "some of the electric utilities in the East may be unable to meet the need from their own resources." Translation: Buy candles and get set for the next blackout and a series of lesser "brown-outs" or "grey-outs."

Since customers can't go to another electric company in town, Congress has decided to investigate. In hearings on electric power reliability last month, a subcommittee headed by Rep. Torbert H. Macdonald (D-Mass.) quizzed the spokesmen for the electric companies on the need for tougher standards of reliability from the Federal Power Commission.

To a man, the moguls were against it. "We prefer establishing voluntary compacts between utilities," said one. Another said, "State public utilities commissions can make the best judgment."

True, that's why stray mongrels prefer the judgment of a blind and deaf dogcatcher. With the possible—and recent—exceptions of Massachusetts and New York, most state regulators end up being regulated by the private power lobby.

That the private power lobby commands many kilowatts of pressure is evidenced every year in Congress.

Every year, legislators from Maine push for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project on the St. John River, a dam designed to provide "peaking power" in the Northeast at the busiest electrical time.

Every year, the utilities lobby against it and succeed. If Dickey-Lincoln is built, then the Northeast will have a "yardstick" of federally-produced power against which to measure the astronomically high rates charged people in the Northeast. Another vote is scheduled in the House next week.

While the utilities crowd is lobbying Congress and apologizing to the customers its aggrandizement policies march forward.

At the reliability hearings, Macdonald asked why the electric companies "advertise the advantages of air conditioning . . . The two things don't seem to jibe. If the utility companies are really concerned about the brownout and the blackouts, why do they entice people to use more electric power?"

T. J. Nagel, with the title of chairman of the coordination review committee of the East Central Area Reliability Coordination Agreement replied, "Either you advertise or the competitor will take your business."

The competition in this case is gas, coal or candle, all of which means that there's no easy solution. The current outcries against the power companies for blackouts are in conjunction with the environment with new plants and overhead wires.

Consolidated Edison in New York, for instance, has been trying to build a power plant on the Hudson at Storm King since 1963. It will be finished, if ever in 1978 because of litigation.

The imbalance of fire's dominance over earth, water and air will be righted not by less government regulation but more.

If not, then the great blackout of 1965 may become an annual event, like Halloween, Christmas and other candlelight ceremonies.

BABE RUTH BASEBALL

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join in the recent tribute to Babe Ruth Baseball. The

Babe Ruth Baseball League is the world's largest regulation teenage baseball program. Through this program thousands of young men each year are given an opportunity to become better citizens through the discipline and training in sportsmanship and team play and the physical and mental conditioning they receive as participants.

There are five Babe Ruth Leagues in Oklahoma, and representatives from Tulsa, in my First Congressional District, have won the world's series twice in the last dozen years and have been represented in the series on several other occasions. I am proud of these young men and prouder still of the great contribution this program has made to the development of the youth of my district and of this Nation. It is, indeed, a fitting tribute and memorial to the "Babe"—the greatest ballplayer in baseball history and one of the towering athletes and citizens of all time.

I commend the leaders of this program, both in Oklahoma and throughout the Nation, for their unselfish contributions to this wholesome and character-building recreational endeavor of our youth.

NIXON SHOULD HAVE SUPPORT OF NATION ON HARD TROOPS-TO-CAMBODIA DECISION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ray Coward has written one of the best columns I have ever seen on the President's decision to send American troops into Cambodia. It appeared in the May 6, 1970, Fort Worth Star-Telegram. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like this column printed in the RECORD so that all may read it.

The column follows:

(From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, May 6, 1970)

NIXON SHOULD HAVE SUPPORT OF NATION ON HARD TROOPS-TO-CAMBODIA DECISION

(By Dr. Ray Coward)

President Richard M. Nixon has made the biggest, most difficult, and the most far-reaching decision since he entered the White House on Jan. 20, 1969.

In a nationwide telecast on April 30 the President announced to the American people, and to the world, that he had ordered American armed forces, accompanied by South Vietnamese forces, into Cambodia. The joint attack was against the headquarters controlling all Communist military operations in South Vietnam. These forces have the mission to search out and destroy Viet Cong and North Vietnamese communications and supplies as well as the sanctuaries from which they operate against the allied forces in South Vietnam.

Early reports indicate initial successes in these attacks, which are being supported by B52, eight-engined jet bombers, but it is too early to assess the ultimate results of this bold action. However, it has the distinct possibility of saving American and Allied lives, in the long run, and of shortening the war and allowing American troops to be returned to the United States.

It may also pressure the Communists toward becoming more seriously involved; in negotiations for a settlement of the war in Southeast Asia. The President could still at-

tain his goal, announced 10 days earlier, to bring another 150,000 American troops home within the next year, since he has not coupled this goal with any specific timetable.

One advantage which the President made maximum use of was the element of surprise. This is a most important element in attaining success in any military operation of any sizable dimension. This gives psychological advantage to the attacking forces and can be expected to cause disruption and confusion in the Communist forces being attacked.

One thing about this operation is certain. It has not only surprised the Communist forces, but it has caused consternation in the political arena inside the United States and abroad.

Political figures in both the Democratic and Republican parties were as surprised and shocked as were the Communists.

Some of Mr. Nixon's critics may interpret this action as the beginning of the downfall of the President's political career. However, the exact opposite may be the result.

This decision took great courage and demonstrated great strength of character, and if the operation is successful and the war is shortened, which may very well be the case, then Mr. Nixon is well on his way toward taking his place among the great Presidents of the United States. It will also enhance his role as a world leader. Further, there is nothing that the Communists respect any more than power.

The Presidents who stand out in history as great leaders, such as Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, Eisenhower, and others, were men who had to make difficult decisions about complex and frequently unpopular causes. They were also well known and highly regarded as world leaders. Such a President has to rise above partisan political considerations and make a decision as to what he thinks is best for our country.

The person making such an important decision travels a lonely road and spends restless days and nights in arriving at his conclusion. Once the decision is made he assumes full responsibility for all its unforeseeable consequences.

This heavy responsibility is too great for many men. One of lesser strength and character would shudder, falter, and shy away from such an awesome decision.

The U.S. Constitution places the responsibility for conducting American foreign policy on the President. Under the Constitution the President is also commander-in-chief of the armed forces. In the latter capacity he is responsible for the security of our armed forces abroad. Therefore he has wide latitude in making these decisions.

In some instances there may not be sufficient time to consult with and to obtain the approval of Congress. Also, at times, secrecy about such an important decision may better insure the safety of American forces.

President Nixon had highly competent advice on the political aspects of the Cambodia problem from his political advisers, and from his military advisers on the military operation. He carefully weighed the conflicting elements of the complex situation and alone reached the decision to order the military operation irrespective of the political consequences.

He appealed for American support of his action and frankly stated: "I have rejected all political considerations in making this decision. Whether my party gains in November is nothing compared to the lives of 400,000 brave Americans fighting for our country and for the cause of peace and freedom in Vietnam."

Several Presidents have made decisions which helped to involve the United States in the Vietnam problem. President Nixon inherited this problem when he assumed office only a little over a year ago.

Regardless of how distasteful our involvement there may be, we all should be objective enough to understand that this is not Nixon's war. It is not a Democratic party

war. It is not a Republican party war nor an American party war. It should not be a partisan political issue. Where is the blame to be placed when Presidents from both major parties have been involved in these decisions?

No useful purpose will be served by arguing whether or not the United States should have become involved in a land warfare in Asia, which General Douglas MacArthur warned against. This is no time for Monday morning quarterbacking about last Saturday's game. Such fuzzy thinking evades the problem and is irrelevant to finding a proper solution.

The President, having been duly elected, carries the responsibility for decision-making on Vietnam and he deserves the understanding and support of all citizens.

A united America may influence the Communists to enter into serious negotiations and shorten the war. A divided America will cause them to stall and prolong the war. As for Americans and as a nation we should stand for something, lest we stand for nothing. Let's stand behind and give our full support to our President.

IN DEFENSE OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am rising in this House today to speak on a matter of great concern to me and of great importance to every American. I refer to what I believe is a widespread misunderstanding of the contribution made by our farming population to our national economy.

In recent months the Nation has become increasingly alarmed about rising prices. The cost of food, in particular, has naturally drawn much attention. Many of the solutions I have heard proposed, however, do not reflect a knowledge of the real causes behind the increases in the price of food to the consumer.

For example, the House Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, recently considered a draft report on the price of beef submitted by a special studies subcommittee. I opposed the report because it did not contain a balanced analysis of the problems faced by the beef industry. It did not reveal the kind of understanding of our national agricultural situation which is absolutely essential if we are to maintain a healthy farm industry. I am happy that the committee did not approve the report.

This basic lack of appreciation for farm problems is particularly distressing, since in the next few months the Congress will be reviewing national farm policy and will take legislative action deeply affecting every farmer in the Nation. It is of crucial importance for the well-being of the farming community, and of our national economy, that this review be undertaken with a clear knowledge of the situation facing the farmer today and of the forces contributing to the rise in food prices.

FARMERS DO NOT CAUSE INFLATION

It is not the farmer who is to blame for the recent inflation spiral.

On the contrary, the most recent USDA figures show that the increases in retail prices go to the middlemen. Virtually none of it accrues to the farmer. In 1969 the prices paid by the American consumer were 48 percent greater than in the years 1947-49, but the net income of the farmers was only 2 percent greater. The farmers' share of the retail food dollar has dropped from 47 cents in 1950 to 41 cents in 1969.

A corn farmer gets the same 2.6 cents from a box of corn flakes costing 31 cents today, as he got 20 years ago when the retail price was 17 cents.

On the other hand, the retail establishments have been recording greater profits, at rates up to 28 percent over the past year.

The parity ratio, which describes the relationship between the prices paid by farmers and the prices received by them, averaged 74 percent last year. This was the lowest level since 1933. In what other area would people work for less than three-quarters of what they are worth?

FARMERS CAUGHT IN PRICE SQUEEZE

The American consumer is very concerned about the rising cost of products he brings home from the supermarket. I share this concern. I believe, however, that we must maintain our sense of perspective and attack the problem at its roots. We must not single out the farmer as a scapegoat, because we do so only at the risk of seriously damaging the health of the industry upon which we depend for our prosperity.

Let us take a close look at the facts.

The American consumer, despite the high prices he is paying, is actually getting the best food bargain of any country on this earth. He spends only 16.5 percent of his take-home pay on food, compared with 20 percent in 1960. In Western Europe he would be paying from 25 percent to 30 percent, and in the Soviet Union from 45 to 50 percent. In Asian countries the consumer pays close to 80 percent of his disposable income for food. It is the American farmer who enables the American citizen to spend so little of his income on food and so much of it on other things.

While the consumers are getting an increasingly better deal, farmers are being put in a terrific price squeeze. Producing more and better food products than ever before, they are actually getting lower prices than they did 20 years ago, while their costs have been steadily rising.

They too, must pay higher prices for everything they need. The cost of consumer items has risen 28 percent in the last 10 years, and is still rising at an annual rate of over 6 percent. In the past 10 years, interest rates have gone up 300 percent and taxes about 200 percent.

Income has not kept pace. Farmers participating in the support program received \$1.32 for a bushel of corn last year; 20 years ago the price was \$1.88. In 1969, the farmer earned an average of \$1.57 per hour. This compares with \$2.83 for employees in food marketing industries, and with \$3.19 for employees in all other forms of manufacturing.

Because his income is so low and his

expenses are rising so rapidly, the farmer gets very little net return for his labor. Far from being the cause of inflation, he is actually subsidizing the prosperity of our nonfarm population.

It is time that the entire Nation pay respect to the farmer for the tremendous job he is doing in supplying food and fiber for the Nation and a hungry world.

Does the consumer realize how high prices would rise if family farmers decided to sell out, leaving food production in the hands of a few giant growers?

Do our businessmen realize what a large contribution farmers make to the American balance of payments by the exportation of food?

Do city officials realize how much more difficult their already serious problems would be if larger portions of our rural population moved to the cities in search of high-paying jobs?

Americans should think seriously about facts such as these.

Mr. Speaker, in the next several months, the Congress will make a complete review of Federal policies toward the farming community. It is my sincere hope that the debate will be informed on the conditions facing the farmer today. In the past I have worked to establish the necessary kind of understanding between the farmers and Members of Congress who are not as familiar with farming problems. I instituted a series of farm visits for Congressmen representing urban districts. These visits contributed to mutual understanding by giving those unfamiliar with farm life a firsthand view of the needs of our farmers, and a greater awareness of the interdependency of our national economy. There cannot be prosperity in the factory and not on the farm.

I sincerely hope that as the debate on the farm program nears, all Members of Congress and the Nation as a whole, will consider what a large stake each of us has in maintaining a healthy farm industry. Without it urban dwellers, in particular, would not be able to spend such a large portion of their income on the material goods which represent their prosperity, or sell those goods which they produce and farmers buy.

The farmer needs stability in his business and a decent return for his efforts if he is to continue to provide the consumer with an adequate supply of quality food. The well-being of our entire country, urban and rural areas alike, will depend upon Congress exercising its responsibilities in an intelligent and informed manner.

SATISFACTION IN DEALING WITH THE PRESIDENT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a continuous canard runs around this city and through the columns of the opinion molders that White House relations with the Congress are bad.

It is fostered by an occasional gripe by an occasional Republican which is seized

upon by those seeking controversy and blown all out of proportion.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely true that the President does not consult with all the 435 Members of the House and 100 Members of the Senate as often as each would like. Nor can he do all that each would like done. There is no way.

Neither is it logical to expect that the President will consult with Members of the Congress before he makes each decision, as some seem to think he should.

But these situations are not unique to President Nixon, nor are they a source of continual misunderstanding or contention between the President and the Congress.

Those who seek to imply this should know better. If they do not know better, a quick check of Members of both the House and Senate would show a high rate of satisfaction in dealing with the President and his congressional relations staff.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM STILL A THREAT TO PASSAGE OF BADLY NEEDED POSTAL REFORM BILL

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think we had full and relevant debate last week on both sides of the issue of compulsory unionism in the postal reform bill and I do not seek to rehash the point. However, since the matter is still pending before the other body, I should like to place in the RECORD two very excellent articles which appeared last week in the Wall Street Journal, one of the most responsible newspapers in the Nation—especially on matters which involve the business world. The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 17, 1970]

UNION SHOP COULD LICK POSTAL REFORM

(By Byron E. Calame)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon Administration's desire to reorganize the Post Office along business-like lines is putting it in an embarrassing spot with solid Republican businessmen. That's because the Administration is finding it necessary to defend the right of mailmen to demand a union shop.

How did a Republican Administration wind up allied with organized labor on such a touchy issue?

A good measure of the Administration's predicament stems from its appraisal last year of the need to win the support of organized labor for the postal reorganization plan now being debated in the House. The union shop aspects of the House bill were agreed to by Post Office and labor officials in the negotiations that followed last spring's postal strike. Both sides are thus committed to support them. Like President Nixon's original postal reform proposal sent to Congress last year, the current plan gives mailmen the same right to bargain for a union shop agreement that private workers have under the Taft-Hartley act. A union shop is one in which all employees must join the union within a specified time after they are hired.

"If the postal system is to be run on a sound, business-like basis," contends Deputy Postmaster General E. T. Klassen, "its employees must work under the same general rules that are applicable to the private sector of the economy."

THE 1968 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

But the strongly conservative National Right to Work Committee and other foes of the union shop have managed to arouse the ire of significant numbers of Republican businessmen by contrasting the Administration's present stand with the GOP's past positions on compulsory union membership. The committee, for example, has widely reprinted and distributed this excerpt from the 1968 Republican platform:

"We pledge to protect Federal employees in the exercise of their right freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal to form, join or assist any employee organization or to refrain from any such activities."

And the Right to Work Committee fired off letters to every Republican in Congress last week to remind them of this statement Postmaster General Blount (a former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce) made before the GOP platform committee two years ago: "No free individual should ever be forced to join, or give financial support to, a union . . . in order to get or hold a job. There should be no qualification of the fundamental right to join or not to join a labor organization."

The opponents of the union shop claim they have convinced "a growing number" of GOP Congressmen to abandon the Administration on the issue. The test will come today or tomorrow, when the House votes on an amendment to be offered by Rep. Henderson (D., N.C.). It would add language to the bill specifically affirming that every postal worker has the right to join or not to join a union.

The charges that Mr. Blount and other Administration officials have departed from traditional Republican principles have apparently been effective. At the moment, Administration allies in the House are gloomy about beating the Henderson amendment. Even if the Administration loses in the House, it will have another chance to push for the union shop provision when the Senate takes up the postal reorganization plan.

"If they can make the argument on the floor that a citizen shouldn't have to join a union to work for his own government, they'll win," predicts a Congressman backing the Administration's bill. "But if they argue it on the basis of unionism versus non-unionism, they'll lose."

Rep. Udall (D., Ariz.), who has played a major role in the push for postal reform, has warned that it would be "tragic" and "a mistake of the greatest proportions" for either side of the long-standing right-to-work controversy to try to make the legislation a vehicle for their cause. Nevertheless, Rep. Derwinski (R., Ill.), who also supports postal reorganization, complains "we're almost at the point where nobody's discussing postal reform."

Representatives Udall and Derwinski, with the support of the Administration and organized labor, hope to win approval for a substitute version of the reorganization bill that would replace the much-amended measure cleared by the House Post Office Committee. The substitute, however, takes the same approach toward the union shop issue. Both versions would specifically remove postal employees from the jurisdiction of an Executive order of President Nixon and put them under the Taft-Hartley Act that covers all workers in private sector. The act makes the union shop a bargainable issue in all but the 19 states that have passed their own right-to-work laws.

The basic idea of postal reorganization doesn't appear to be in great danger, though it still isn't completely clear how organized labor might react to approval of the Henderson amendment.

AFL-CIO officials aren't saying publicly what they might do if the right-to-work clause should be added. But some backers of the bill on the Hill claim that they have been informed privately by labor men that

the AFL-CIO won't accept the measure with the right-to-work clause in it. And in a rare personal letter to all House members last week, AFL-CIO President George Meany warned that the amendment "would place employees in the postal service under a seriously unfair and discriminatory disability."

Mr. Meany has made it clear that he's firmly committed to winning the collective bargaining beachhead contained in the bill and expanding the principle eventually to all Federal workers. And he is said to see the right to bargain for a "union security" agreement as a key part of the beachhead. Similarly, most postal union officials call this right a "gut issue."

Still, some union leaders admit privately that the immediate impact of the Henderson amendment wouldn't be terribly significant. One major reason: 87% of all post office employees already are union members through the present Executive order governing Federal labor-management relations. The order gives workers complete freedom to join or not to join a union.

Moreover, it would be difficult for postal union chieftans to reverse course and fight the reform proposal just because the right-to-work clause was added to it. Abandoning the provisions in the bill for an 8% pay raise and the right to go to the bargaining table this fall to negotiate additional wage increases for 1971 and 1972 could be extremely hard to explain to some rank-and-filers.

TWO OPPOSING ARGUMENTS

The general outlook for postal reorganization in the Senate appears to be favorable. But the union shop aspect of reform is already evoking threats of a filibuster by such Republicans as Paul Fanin, who warned in a recent Senate speech:

"This U.S. Senator, for one, does not plan to sit idly by and watch the U.S. Congress pass legislation which can require an American citizen to join a union before he can work for his own Government."

Rep. Udall and Post Office officials argue that the union shop provision of the bill would simply bring postal workers up to equal footing with workers in private sector. But as the right-to-work people see it, this is precisely the danger.

Reed Larson, executive vice president of the Right to Work Committee, argues that this "would set a precedent that would have enormous ramifications—and all of them bad. Unquestionably, it would sweep rapidly through the rest of the Federal Government and down to the state and local levels."

Some ardent right-to-work advocates have even predicted that if the Administration bill is passed in its present form, "control of our postal service is bound to pass from the hands of Congress into the hands of the AFL-CIO."

Mr. Blount and other Post Office officials complain that the Right to Work Committee is seeking to make "the public and the Congress believe that the Administration advocates, and the Postal Reorganization Bill proposes, that there be a union shop in the postal service." Declares Mr. Blount: "Utter nonsense."

The rationale of giving postal unions full collective bargaining rights—except for striking—has been spelled out this way by the Post Office's Mr. Klassen: "Postal employees would no longer have to depend on the political climate in Congress for wages and other benefits, but would instead bargain for their rights through the same procedures as the private sector." Under present laws, the wages of mailmen and most other Federal employees are set by Congress; their unions can bargain only about working conditions and other non-pay issues.

Mr. Klassen continues: "Since the thrust of postal reform is toward a complete reorganization along efficient and economical business lines, labor-management relations must come under the jurisdiction of the nation's major labor laws. . . . To do otherwise would be to take the heart out of the reform effort."

Despite this business-oriented pitch, both the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have lined up in opposition to the union shop provisions.

"Instead of postal reform," the Chamber of Commerce said in a June 12 letter to all Congressmen, "we can anticipate that the bill's main effect would be to turn over postal management to the postal unions, and thus erect a permanent obstacle to the modernization and improved use of manpower necessary to provide better postal service. Under such a situation, we could expect nothing more than ever increasing costs and deteriorating services."

A CLEAR-CUT ISSUE

For the National Association of Manufacturers, however, it's a "clear-cut issue of compulsory unionism." The trade group advised its members earlier this month that "The NAM believes the Postal Reform Bill has merit . . . but NAM also believes that no Federal employee should be required to pay union dues or to join a union as a condition of employment."

Backers of the Administration's postal reorganization scheme ruefully credit the persevering efforts of the Right to Work Committee with arousing the wrath of such GOP strongholds as the Chamber of Commerce and NAM. But some question why the committee chose to wage its massive drive in the first place.

Rep. Udall told his House colleagues recently that he found himself "wondering" about that. "I don't know the answer, but I suspect it may have something to do with fund-raising," he said. "After all, if businessmen are frightened into believing 'compulsory unionism' is on the march, they're more likely to contribute generously to the organization that is leading the fight against it."

Mr. Larsen denies the suggestion of opportunism on the committee's part. "We've been hammering away on it for a year," he claims. His assessment: "Blount was naive. He thought he had to have it (the right to bargain for a union shop) to get union support, but he misjudged the situation."

All of which is perhaps a back-handed tribute to the bargaining ability of organized labor and AFL-CIO boss Meany.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 18, 1970]
POSTAL-REFORM BILL GETS "RIGHT-TO-WORK" CLAUSE ATTACHED IN HOUSE VOTE—AMENDMENT VIOLATES A BARGAIN REACHED WITH ADMINISTRATION FOR UNION-SHOP ARRANGEMENT

WASHINGTON.—The House attached a "right-to-work" amendment to a pending postal reform bill, giving mailmen the privilege of declining to join unions that would bargain with a proposed new postal service.

The nonrecord 179-95 vote theoretically is subject to reversal on a later roll call, but the heavy margin indicates it almost certainly will be included in the bill the House finally sends the Senate.

The House action would torpedo a key part of the bargain reached by the Nixon Administration and AFL-CIO postal unions after the postal strike last March. That agreement resulted in vital union support for the Administration's plan to reorganize the Post Office into a semi-independent service within the Executive Branch.

The section the House struck from the bill would allow unions to bargain with the new postal service for a union-shop arrangement. A union shop requires employees to join a union after they're hired.

Despite strong Administration backing for the union-shop clause, almost all House Republicans voted for the "right-to-work" amendment offered by Rep. Henderson (D., N.C.). Proponents argued that the amendment was necessary to avoid opening the way for "compulsory unionism" for postal employees.

The National Right to Work Committee was instrumental in mustering House support

for the Henderson amendment. In letters to Congressmen, the committee pointedly noted past Republican pledges for "right-to-work" arrangements for Government employees.

Opponents of the "right-to-work" plan argued futilely that approval of the Henderson amendment would jeopardize union support for the overall postal-reform plan. They maintained that postal unions were giving up their access to Congress for pay raises by supporting the reorganization plan and thus should have the right to bargain with the postal service for union-shop arrangements like unions in private industry.

The House didn't complete action yesterday on the complex postal reorganization bill, but will resume work today. One amendment that would have gutted the entire reform plan was defeated 105-to-57.

CHIEF M. SGT. FRANCIS COLLIER RETIRES

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Chief M. Sgt. Francis W. Collier, of Foxboro, Mass., in my district, has retired from the Air Force after 28 years of service. He has been called "Foxboro's famous career soldier." His long and very distinguished career deserves recognition, and I wish him success in what should be a promising second career.

Chief Master Sergeant Collier, at the time of his retirement earlier this year, was one of the senior enlisted men in the Air Force. He was the sixth ranking non-commissioned officer.

Immediately prior to his retirement, he served as message control officer at the National Military Command Center, Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in Washington, D.C. Upon his retirement he was awarded the Joint Service Commendation Medal, one of many awards and honors he received in a career which took him from Europe to the Far East and to assignments in many of the 50 States. He entered service as a private, earning promotion to the highest enlisted grade in 1959.

The Foxboro Reporter story, which I am pleased to put into the RECORD, notes that Chief Master Sergeant Collier prepared for a possible second career by utilizing his service time to earn a B.S. degree in business administration. I am certain that he will succeed in his future endeavors, as he did in such a remarkable fashion in his notable service career.

The text of the story is as follows:

FOXBORO'S FAMOUS CAREER SOLDIER: CHIEF M. SGT. FRANCIS COLLIER RETIRING—WITH B.S.—AFTER 28 YEARS

Chief Master Sergeant Francis W. Collier, was one of the senior enlisted men in the Air Force before retiring with 28 years of service earlier this year.

A native of Foxboro, Sergeant Collier entered the military service in May 1942 at Ft. Devens, Mass., as a private and was promoted to the highest enlisted grade in 1959. During his career he served primarily as a first sergeant, sergeant major and personnel and administrative inspector. At the time of his retirement he was the sixth ranking noncommissioned officer in the Air Force.

His assignments were at all levels of command while serving in Europe, the Far East as well as many of the 50 states. Some of

Sergeant Collier's more important assignments were that of the command sergeant major, Headquarters Air Force Systems Command (then Research and Development Command); base sergeant major, Oberpfaffenhofen Air Depot, Germany; and the dual role of sergeant major, Headquarters, Fifth Air Force and Headquarters, United States Forces, Japan.

He served in the Washington, D.C., area from May 1961 until his retirement, first in the Pentagon as message control officer, USAF Message Branch and later as message control officer at the National Military Command Center, Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

During his tour in Japan, he entered the off-campus program, University of Maryland and received a B.S. degree in business administration in 1967 from the University of Maryland.

Sergeant Collier completed 30 semester hours in graduate work at George Washington University before retiring. While assigned to the Washington area he lectured at the University of Maryland and Georgetown University on "The Role of Noncommissioned Officers in the Air Force."

He has been active in scouting for over 30 years serving on troop, district and council committees around the world.

The sergeant received numerous awards, commendations and letters of appreciation within the military and civilian community. He was awarded the Joint Service Commendation Medal upon his retirement for his performance of duty as message control officer at the National Military Command Center, Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

He also was decorated with the Air Force Commendation Medal and two awards of the Army Commendation Medal.

The sergeant's wife, Lillian, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence W. Evans of Norfolk, Mass. Sergeant and Mrs. Collier have a son, George, an architect major at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and two daughters, Jane, a political science major at Northeastern University in Mass. and Betsy, a high school student.

The Colliers presently reside at 7222 Reservoir Road, Springfield, Va.

U.S. EXIT FROM ASIA LEADS ASIANS TO WONDER AS TO WHAT COMES NEXT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, what next for the Asians after the United States withdraws? That is the base question for Asians these days as the departure of U.S. troops proceeds.

Millard C. Browne, editor of the editorial page of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, has just returned from a tour of the Far East and this question is the basis of the final article in his perceptive series.

Following are the last two articles, the first dealing with his observations in Japan and the second being his wrapup discussion on the Far East:

FAST-GROWING JAPAN FACES U.S. PROBLEMS: POLLUTION, RIOTS, INFLATION, INDUSTRIAL SPRAWL

(By Millard C. Browne)

TOKYO.—From Osaka Airport by expressway downtown into Japan's second largest city, you drive on the left and the signs are all in Japanese. Other than that, the scene could be Buffalo, Cleveland or Chicago.

The city is overcast with the same pall of smog, and you pass some of the same sort of ugly industrial sprawl punctuated with a skyline of modern buildings and a network of modern roads. One difference is that many houses along the way, even if surrounded by industrial slums, have neat Japanese gardens closed in behind cozy fences.

Osaka, flattened in World War II and rebuilt almost from scratch, is a city for making money, and never mind the scenery. It is a good introduction to today's Japan, and so is the 130-mph "bullet train" ride from there through cultural Kyoto and industrial Nagoya, past tidy rice paddies and tea fields into booming Tokyo.

FAST GROWING ECONOMY

This complex is the economic heartland of the world's most dynamic industrial nation. Ten years ago it ranked sixth among world economies; today it is third; within 15 years, at the growth rate it expects to maintain, Japan will pass Soviet Russia and become No. 2. It has already outdistanced the U.S. in output of some kinds of goods and is pushing hard in others. And it is in the sprawling, smoggy, booming cities like Osaka, Nagoya and Tokyo where it is happening.

The "other Japan" of tourist fame—the old Japan of Buddhist temples and Shinto shrines, of Noh plays and silken kimonos—is still much in evidence. But you have to seek it out on the old tourist routes, in Nikko, Nara, Kyoto and the Mt. Fuji area.

"Progress and harmony" are the twinned themes of Japan's Expo 70, but new-style industrial progress is plainly leaving the harmony of the old ways behind in today's Japan—just as miniskirts are leaving kimonos behind and as Japanese youth are leaving the quiet family rice paddies for the action-packed cities.

CAMPUS CONFRONTATIONS

And some of that "action" takes the form of student upheavals and left-wing rioting that make recent disruptions at the State University of Buffalo seem mild by comparison. One high-ranking UB faculty member in a position to do the comparing—Prof. Lyle B. Borst, head of the UB physics department and prospective master of scholar-oriented "College D"—has spent all year at Kyoto University on a sabbatical.

When he arrived last September, Kyoto U. was in a shambles. Student dissidents led by ultraradical Maoists had waged a six-month campaign of such wanton destruction that half of all classrooms and offices were, says Dr. Borst, unusable. "It went much beyond anything at UB or other American universities."

The tide was only turned, he recalled, after a three-day pitched battle in which 3000 police mobilized by the Kyoto prefect governor (elected, ironically, as an avowed Communist) moved on campus, systematically cleared "unfortified" buildings and finally laid military-style siege to the heavily barricaded, student-held administration building.

That broke the strike and Kyoto is now, says Prof. Borst, "rapidly becoming a university again." But he doubted if the trouble would have ended until the ultraradicals were decisively confronted and defeated, with some of their leaders jailed and others sent packing.

PROMILITARY

The Kyoto confrontation is not just an isolated incident in this modern Japan. Student militancy, with hard-core, Peking-oriented Communists often in the lead, is an old story in Tokyo and other university communities. In fact, there is far greater Marxist influence throughout Japanese politics than is evident in America.

The issues seized upon by student leftists are as wide-ranging as in American colleges, but anti-Americanism is generally in the forefront. Ironically, while U.S. student radicals denounce all things military, many of

Japan's ultraradicals favor Japanese rearmament—if only as a way to punctuate denunciation of U.S. bases and demands for abrogation of the Japan-U.S. security treaty.

This whole issue of Japan's future foreign policy has been described by a leading U.S. authority, former Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer, as one of the most crucial decisions to be made on the world stage in the next two or three years.

TO ARM OR NOT

Having "made it" economically, Japan is now agonizing over how much to try to play the great power role in other ways. To arm or not to arm is one big question on the horizon, and Japanese public opinion is badly torn between a deep seated pacifism and a bursting national pride highly sensitive to the nation's continued dependence on U.S. military protection.

Even more worrisome to many Japanese is any little hint of a hardening of U.S. trade policies which threaten to become increasingly protectionist under the continued competitive hammering of Japan's steel, textile, pottery and electronics producers in their drive for ever-widening shares of the U.S. domestic market. This truth quickly emerges as the No. 1 preoccupation of most Japanese businessmen or newsmen in serious conversation with any American visitor.

INFLATION TOO

Japan's record annual economic growth rate is threatened by other familiar problems, including a growing skilled-labor shortage and an inflation rate slightly higher than ours (if you think prices are high in Buffalo, don't expect many bargains in downtown Tokyo—least of all in any first-class restaurant).

But the main story here is the one that Expo 70 advertises—that Japan has come of age industrially and now ranks securely among the world's top three economic powers. Where it will go from here is anybody's guess. One very reasonable and realistic guess, however, is that offered our press assembly in Hong Kong by the shrewd foreign minister of Singapore, S. Rajaratnam: "I do not for one moment believe that the new Japan will be satisfied with exporting Hondas and tape-recorders to the world. It cannot be merely the workshop of Asia. It must also generate gravitational pulls of its own."

ASIAN ALLIES PONDER WHETHER U.S. PULLOUT MEANS POWER VACUUM (By Millard C. Browne)

For 25 years, all the free nations of the Far East bordering Communist China have lived and some have thrived under the umbrella of U.S. military power. Twice, in Korea and Vietnam, that power has been committed in huge doses to long, bloody, frustrating wars, and always it has been a very visible presence to the new generation of Asians grown to maturity since World War II.

Now the U.S. is urgently working to extricate itself from the war, and much of Asia is wondering: What next?

Is America beginning to withdraw its umbrella of power from all of Asia, or only from the Indo-China peninsula? Does pulling out of Vietnam portend a pullout from Korea, too? Does returning Okinawa to Japan foreshadow a later shutdown of U.S. bases in Japan?

A lot of Koreans, Japanese and Chinese—not to mention Filipinos, Indonesians, Malaysians and Thais—are pondering such questions with some foreboding as each GI contingent heads for home and each neo-isolationist speech in America is reported overseas.

LAST HAND OF ONE GAME

It's not that the Asians are trying to tell the Americans what to do. It's rather that they're trying to figure out what they

should do to fill whatever power vacuum the Americans will leave behind.

The foreign minister of Singapore, S. Rajaratnam, summed it up in a speech to the International Press Institute in Hong Kong. "We are witnessing in Southeast Asia the last hand of one game being played out before the pack is reshuffled and a new game is begun."

The U.S., he noted, may be right in opting out of Vietnam. But can it "really opt out of Asia?" For in this new Pacific age—where all the superpowers and most of mankind and all the great civilizations, religions and cultures are gathered—for America to "opt out of Asia is to opt out of world history."

In every place we visited, a similar concern was voiced—not over our Vietnam withdrawal, which generally seems to be regarded as settled policy, but over the manner in which the withdrawal is accomplished and how much more "opting out" of Asian history it foreshadows.

JAPAN CANNOT FILL GAP

In Tokyo, for example, Hake I Ogiwara, the former editor of the financial newspaper Nihon Keizai Shimbun, thought Americans should be reminded that if we withdraw from Southeast Asia just as Britain is withdrawing from east of Suez, there are no other free nations to fill the power vacuum.

"Japan," he reminded me, "is barred by its constitution from sending any troops abroad."

In future years that could change, he concluded, but in the immediate future there is no way Japan could help fill a power gap. Both from Japan's viewpoint and in the interest of basic Far Eastern stability, he hoped the U.S. would not pull out of Vietnam at least not too abruptly.

"If you do withdraw," he said, "it's important that you do it very carefully."

CAREFUL PULLOUT NECESSARY

This last echoed views we had heard newsmen traveling with us in Korea and Taiwan, from some experienced "China watchers" in Hong Kong, and even from a panel of Asian experts in San Francisco before we departed.

One of the latter, former Ambassador to Japan Edwin O. Reischauer, had bluntly declared that what's at stake in Vietnam for us is simply how we get out and how we readjust our whole pattern of relationships with the Asian nations.

Another, the Los Angeles Times' Hong Kong correspondent, Robert Elegant, thought our greatest possible mistake would be to leave Vietnam in such a way as to convince Red China that the U.S. is a "paper tiger" and that future "wars of liberation" can succeed.

The word we got in Seoul was further punctuation of the same concern: that South Korea is enjoying both an increased sense of military security and a booming economic prosperity and will keep moving forward beautifully—if the U.S. doesn't rock the boat by pulling out the 50,000 troops and other supporting forces it maintains there.

KOREA AND VIETNAM DIFFER

As one Southeast Asian put it, the big difference between the Korean and Vietnam wars is that, in Korea, the U.S. backed a winner. South Koreans, he noted are tough, energetic and determined to keep their freedom, and their army is now an even match for the North Koreans who ran through them so easily in 1950.

But most Asians we talked to doubted that South Korea, if deprived of American backing, could cope alone with a North Korean invasion supported by Peking, Moscow or both.

While some Americans may argue that Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and other free nations of Asia have grown strong enough to stand on their own feet even if the umbrella of U.S. power is withdrawn, not many non-Communist Asians talked that way.

PEKING PLAYS TO THE HILT

The latter—at least those I met—were acutely conscious of the menacing, nuclear-armed presence of Communist China. None had any doubt that Peking meant to stay in the superpower game and play it to the hilt, whether or not the United States opted out.

So for America, beyond the debate on Vietnam, there lurks a bigger debate: How determined are we to play a great power role in the Far East after Vietnam?

An American retreat from Asia, as Singapore's Mr. Rajaratnam reminded us, "will not prevent world history from being written" there. It will just be written differently. And "once America has opted out . . . it may not be all that easy for it to re-enter the arena"—for the cards by then will have been so reshuffled that "the chances of the returning player getting a good hand are likely to be depressingly slim."

INERT ATMOSPHERE IN MINES COULD ABATE ACID DRAINAGE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Chemical and Engineering News concerning the atmospheric conditions of mines. The new technology now being developed involved oxygen-free coal mining that would prevent fires and explosions and would protect miners from black lung; J. K. Rice, president of NUS Corp.'s Cyrus Wm. Rice Division, described the system at the American Mining Congress' 1970 coal convention and exposition. We must always be alert to provide for the safety of miners and the conservation of our natural resources.

The article referred to, follows:

INERT ATMOSPHERE IN MINES COULD ABATE ACID DRAINAGE—OXYGEN-FREE COAL MINING WOULD ALSO PREVENT FIRES AND EXPLOSIONS, PROTECT MINERS FROM BLACK LUNG

Coal miners will look like astronauts if the coal industry adopts technology now being developed jointly by NUS Corp. and Island Creek Coal Co. Their system, which involves replacing the air in mines with an oxygen-free atmosphere, would put tomorrow's miners in life-support suits resembling those worn by today's space travelers.

J. K. Rice, president of NUS Corp.'s Cyrus Wm. Rice division, described the system last week in Cleveland at the American Mining Congress' 1970 Coal Convention and Exposition. He disclosed that the two firms have just about completed the first phase of a four-phase development program. In this first phase, funded by the Federal Water Quality Administration, the Rice division was responsible for designing the inert gas and life support subsystems. The engineering staff of Island Creek Coal Co., Holden, W.Va., directed by R. C. Taliaferro, was responsible for design of the mine and the coal handling equipment.

Why go to the bother and expense of eliminating oxygen from coal mines? Perhaps the most important reason is to prevent acid drainage—from either active or abandoned mines. In active mines, there are added benefits: Absence of oxygen will prevent fires and explosions caused by suspended coal dust or by the methane which accumulates in many mines. Since the miner must be supplied with air from some source other than the mine

atmosphere, he can be protected from black lung disease and other health hazards caused by inhalation of coal dust.

Although the costs of converting to oxygen-free operation would be high—especially for active mines—there are some partially offsetting economic advantages, over and above the environmental benefits. Massive ventilation systems, now required to provide fresh air and flush out dangerous gases, would not be needed. Electrical equipment need not be explosion-proof. Rock dusting could be eliminated. It might even be possible to capture and sell the natural gas released by gassy mines. A single large, gassy, deep coal mine can produce more than 15 million cu. ft. of methane per day, Mr. Rice points out. Currently, this valuable, increasingly scarce natural resource is vented to the atmosphere and wasted.

Impetus. It was acid mine drainage, not possible advantage, that provided the initial impetus for the program. Acid mine drainage occurs when pyrites—iron sulfides usually found in coal deposits—are exposed to air and water. The pyrites are oxidized to sulfuric acid and ferrous sulfate that, leached by natural drainage waters, trickle into streams and create a major pollution problem. U.S. coal mines, active and abandoned, emit the equivalent of 8 million tons of sulfuric acid per year. About half is neutralized by the natural alkalinity of the receiving streams; the rest destroys vegetation, kills fish, and renders streams useless for recreation or as water supplies. In Appalachia alone, some 10,000 miles of streams have been degraded by acid mine drainage. The deadly flow can continue for decades, even from mines long abandoned if nothing is done to check it.

At present, the most-used method of abating acid mine drainage is to neutralize it with lime or limestone. The method is effective, but the reaction produces a messy sludge which is itself a difficult solid waste disposal problem. Besides, even though limestone is cheap, costs for just one mine can add up to several thousand dollars a year. FWQA estimates that total costs might run as high as \$7 billion to achieve an operating cleanup program based on 95% treatment of effluent.

Expensive or not, federal and state governments are becoming increasingly insistent that the mess be cleaned up. So a lot of research aimed at finding a simple, inexpensive way to stem the flow of acid is going on. In fact, a symposium on coal mine drainage research, sponsored by the Coal Advisory Committee to the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, takes place this week at Mellon Institute in Pittsburgh. The program touches just about every aspect of the subject, from improved methods of sludge handling to such techniques as reverse osmosis, ion exchange, even the use of "friendly" bacteria to inhibit the iron-metabolizing bacteria thought to catalyze the acid-forming reaction. And Mr. Rice will again state the case for inert-atmosphere mining.

Basic. After all, what could be more basic? If acid is formed by oxidation of pyrites, when the oxygen is removed the reaction can't take place. An elegantly simple concept, and not new: In the 1930's the Works Progress Administration installed some 20,000 seals on abandoned deep coal mines. Today, backfilling and replanting is done to prevent acid drainage from abandoned strip mines, and abandoned deep mines are still being sealed and, where possible, flooded.

But if the concept is simple, its application is not, especially in deep mines. Continuous, complete exclusion of oxygen is essential to success. Mines "breathe," however, with changes in atmospheric pressure. Even if all main openings are found and sealed, there will almost always be fissures in the overburden. Rising barometric pres-

sure forces air through the fissures into the mine—enough air to support the acid-forming oxidation process.

One solution to the problem, Mr. Rice says, is to seal the mine—whether active or abandoned—and then to pump in enough of some inert gas to maintain a slight positive pressure in the mine even when barometric pressure is rising outside. From the standpoint of effectiveness, it doesn't matter which of several gases is used—nitrogen, methane, or the mixture produced by passing air and natural gas through an inert gas generator (C&EN, Dec. 22, 1969, page 66).

Economically, however, it matters a great deal. Even a small 100-acre mine would need about 400,000 cu. ft. of gas to maintain positive pressure during one 48-hour period of rising pressure. At 60 cents per 1,000 cu. ft., nitrogen is too expensive. Pure natural gas at 50 cents per 1,000 cu. ft. is no bargain, either—at least, not in context. However, if the natural gas is used to fuel an inert gas generator, the cost drops to 7 cents per 1,000 cu. ft.

POWER CREDIT

For even better economics, Mr. Rice says, use the inert exhaust gases produced by an internal combustion engine driving an electric generator. The resulting power credit can reduce operating and amortization costs by 50 to 100%, depending on circumstances.

For abandoned mines, sealing openings and pumping in inert gas is all there is to it. Applying the system to operating mines is a lot more complicated. Miners need air. Miners and equipment must go in and out of the mine and coal has to be taken out, all without letting oxygen in. Operating equipment produces more heat than mine walls can dissipate. In the sealed mine, relative humidity is a steady 100%.

Just designing the miners' life-support system has been a complex undertaking. Because of the temperature and humidity in the sealed mine, the Rice division early decided to use full suits and helmets instead of simple face masks. Because of the often cramped operating conditions, the suit could not have back or chest packs of the size necessary to handle normal breathing and cooling requirements. Maximum allowable oxygen leakage was set at 1 cu. ft. per hour per suit. This meant that continuous-purge breathing apparatus could not be used.

Space technology. What has finally emerged owes a lot to space technology. The miner would wear a helmet and face mask, supported so as to swivel with head movements; a three-piece suit consisting of a porous undergarment, a lightweight gas barrier of rubberized cloth, and an outside heavy-duty coverall; boots; and gloves. A rebreather system, mounted on a piece of mining equipment, would be connected to the suit by an umbilical hose. The system would consist of a mechanical refrigeration unit, followed by an oxygen makeup unit, followed by a blower to recirculate the refreshed air (at 72° F. and 40% relative humidity) to the miner. The oxygen source could be either a replaceable canister of potassium superoxide, which, when activated by moisture exhaled by the miner, releases oxygen and absorbs carbon dioxide. Or it could be a cylinder of compressed oxygen, in which case a carbon dioxide absorber and a pressure regulator are also needed. A small backup unit mounted on the suit would provide oxygen during travel and in emergencies.

Gas locks. Island Greek notes that the mine, too, poses some special design problems. All openings must be tightly sealed. But equipment must be taken in and out on occasion and miners will frequently be entering or leaving, so gas locks must be provided—one big enough to accommodate the largest piece of equipment, and a smaller one for personnel (the big lock would waste too much purge gas if it were routinely used for personnel access). In gassy mines, where

one aim would be to collect methane for resale, the inert gas subsystem and the gas locks would be modified to prevent dilution of the methane.

Way stations in the mine would contain sanitary facilities and emergency supplies. The way stations, ventilated with fresh air from the surface, would also be equipped with gas locks.

At another entry, the coal conveyor, surrounded by an airtight duct, would carry coal to a two-section storage bin—in effect, another gas lock—from which it would be loaded onto trucks.

The mine would also have a fan (much smaller than the ones used in "normal" mines) to recirculate the oxygen-free atmosphere. Cooling coils in the fan duct would remove some of the heat that the circulating gas picked up from mining equipment.

NUS and Island Creek have now almost finished their engineering feasibility studies. The system is feasible, they say, and, at least in the case of gassy mines, it should be economically advantageous. Now they're ready—if they get the funds—to go on to the remaining phases of the program: component shakedown in a ventilated mine, construction and operation of a demonstration mine with an oxygen-free atmosphere, and, finally, evaluation of the results and projection to actual mining conditions.

A WMAL EDITORIAL FOLLOWING THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE OF LAST WEDNESDAY

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as most of us are regrettably aware, the President's message of last Wednesday shed very little new light on an increasingly dark economic situation. Although remarkably quick to criticize attempts by past administrations to curb inflation, his elimination of other alternatives, leaves him with no positive solution of his own. The time for a genuine commitment has come. A beginning must be made. In the wake of the President's message, I would like to make available to my colleagues, the following editorial, broadcast by WMAL radio. I found it most relevant and to the point:

"Jawboning" can be defined as the President's use of his office to urge business and labor to hold down inflation. President Nixon reluctantly tried a variety of the jawbone approach in his speech on the economy, but it was too little and too late. His previous silence had been a signal for anything-goes price and wage increases . . . now complicated by an economic downturn and a flaky stock market. We agree with the President that wage and price controls or guidelines are not the answer, but his solutions fell short. The proposed "Inflation Alert" is hardly needed. Housewives feel it every time they go to the supermarket. The Commission on Productivity is a good idea. But it needs teeth to fight inflation. The proposal with the most promise may be the Federal Purchasing Review Board. Its success will be measured to the extent that it can save money in defense spending in this "transition to a peacetime economy." It fits the President's idea that government should set its own house in order before lecturing others. The Administration must understand that business and labor look to Washington for leadership. Now that the President has discovered the jawbone, he should use it.

RICHARD J. ELROD

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last fall Chicago experienced some serious civil disturbances. In the shouting and the tumult and the attacks on people and property, many innocent Americans suffered. One of them who was most seriously injured was Richard Elrod, assistant corporation counsel for the city of Chicago.

He was at the scene of one of the disturbances in his official capacity as representative of the city government. In the wake of the violence, he was struck from behind by a demonstrator. The attack was so severe that he became paralyzed and learned long weeks later that his recovery, if it was to occur at all, would be laboriously slow and painful.

Dick Elrod faced those awful moments with his family and, as he says, "prayed with them for the strength to overcome this calamity." As the days became weeks and the weeks became months, he felt his strength coming back. No one who has not had to endure the agony of prolonged physical therapy can know what it costs in terms of mental effort, as well as sheer will to succeed.

Dick Elrod's will has been so phenomenal that he is today running for sheriff of Cook County, one of the most important public offices in our State of Illinois. His recovery is virtually a miracle. He has asked no quarter or favor and claims he will wage a tough campaign for this high office. And his recovery continues so rapidly as virtually to astonish his doctors and those who at first thought he might never recover.

Mr. Speaker, this special man has vigorously sought to bring his record as a distinguished lawyer before the public. Recently he made a speech that gives his definition of law and order. I believe it speaks eloquently for his compassion and his sense of our time in history. I call it to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress today with the hope that they will find it as eloquent as we in the city of Chicago, and they will share in the inspiration this brilliant young man has brought all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Elrod's speech follows:

I'm happy to be standing here tonight—for more reasons than one. You know, my friends used to accuse me of always being in a hurry—of working at breakneck speed. Little did I realize how perceptive they were.

Seriously, I am touched and honored to see so many of my good friends and supporters here tonight. Seven months ago, as I lie paralyzed in my hospital bed, I prayed that someday I would be able to move and walk once again. It was beyond my most optimistic hopes that I would be before you as a candidate, on the verge of launching a vigorous campaign as the Democratic candidate for the office of Sheriff of Cook County. And a vigorous campaign it will be. Every day I am regaining more strength, needless to say. In this county and in this day and age it is not necessary to be a Wyatt Earp

or two-gun type sheriff. But I darn sure will make an active one.

I'll never forget last October while wondering what would happen to me and my family that my wife said, "Dick, don't despair. Think only of getting well. Don't worry about me or the children. We are praying for you."

When Mayor Daley came to see me during those first uncertain days at the hospital he said, "You're going to get well. Everyone is praying for you."

What amazed me was the thousands of letters that came to the hospital, my office and my home. Practically everyone of them said, "We are praying for you." And some people claim that religion is dead and that prayers are past. Well, I can tell you that it isn't so.

I put my faith in God, and my trust in the knowledge of Dr. Oldberg and all those wonderful people associated with him at the University of Illinois Hospital. With continued faith, prayers, and the tremendous help I am now receiving at the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago I am confident, and my doctors assure me, that I soon will be living a full and functional life.

It is difficult for me to describe to you my feelings and emotions during the past months. I cannot tell you the terror of commanding a muscle to move and the frustration when the command is not obeyed.

Or the loneliness of being hospitalized, or the physical exhaustion of the days, weeks, and months of round the clock physical therapy. If it were not for the prayers and understanding of my family, friends and the thousands of others it would have been an ordeal much more difficult to bear.

No, it hasn't been easy nor will the days ahead be easy. But I do not want or need any sympathy for the battle has been won. Let there be no misunderstanding. Richard J. Elrod will be a full time, on the job, Sheriff of Cook County.

But enough about me.

Let us discuss an issue more pertinent to my campaign for the Office of Sheriff of Cook County.

The Sheriff by State Constitution and Statutes is the Chief Law Enforcement Officer in the County. One of his chief functions is the maintenance of law and order.

Thus, the citizens of Cook County are entitled to know—in fact it is essential that they know—precisely what law and order means to me.

Law and order is a frequently used and often distorted phrase.

Let me make it clear that by law and order I do not mean the repression of lawful protest and dissent in the form of free speech and assembly, and the peaceful redress of grievances. Law and order means the right for citizens to express their dissent in an orderly and constitutional fashion. Without this right, our nation would not be the great Democracy that it is today. This does not mean that those who disagree with the status quo have the right to violently overthrow it. There is an established legal procedure for changing those policies with which we differ.

We must, however, distinguish between legitimate dissent and revolution; between free speech and incitement to riot; between free assembly and an abortion of that freedom by a militant few who try to force their will upon others. It is not an easy path to follow, but with the proper leadership and guidance this nation will do it.

We in the Democratic Party when elected to public office do not shirk our responsibilities in manifesting leadership when such leadership is needed. We believe in serving the people at all times and under all circumstances no matter how trying. We believe in working together and mediating problems so that people can live together in a better society.

What does law and order mean to me?

It means many things. It means the control and prosecution of crime. It means safety on the streets. It means a fair and just judicial process, and professionalism in the field of law enforcement and criminal prosecution.

It means enforcement of the law uniformly as to all—rich and poor, black and white, long-haired and short-haired, young and old. It means a progressive jail system, where inmates are not subject to physical and verbal abuse from their keepers or atrocities from the stronger prisoners—and where suicide is not a tragic alternative to an archaic and oppressive system.

Yes, law and order goes far beyond the issue of dissent and civil rights. It means protection of the poor and uneducated from unscrupulous and fraudulent business practices. It means protection of the city dweller from the slum landlord. It means the protection of the citizen from the robber, mugger, rapist, and extortionist. It means a community secure from the havoc of these evils.

Law and order means the eradication of the organized crime syndicate, which, like a cancer, silently and slowly undermines our society.

It means the enforcement of laws to guarantee the rights of citizens to clean and fresh air and water. These are rights that have been too long ignored, rights that we should have demanded and received long before environmental control became the popular issue that it is now.

Law and order means strict enforcement of our laws dealing with the sale of dangerous drugs. It's tragic, but much of this traffic is among our youth. Those who are still impressionable and willing to try anything for a "Kick."

Recently there was a survey among students of a suburban High School asking who had tried drugs. More than 26 per cent admitted that they had. Just think. Twenty-six per cent.

The latest figures show that in the state of Illinois there are an estimated 6,000 addicted drug users. I'm not talking about some kid getting high on pot. I'm referring to hard core, compulsive drug users. And a good number of these are in our High Schools or under the age of 21.

What's being done to prevent this wholesale abuse of our youthful resources? There are many governmental agencies that are responsible for enforcement of drug laws but their efforts, although in the main laudable, are not being properly co-ordinated. There is too much duplication of effort and little central planning.

Through proper leadership, which will be instilled when I am Sheriff, I will solicit the help of Volunteer Citizen Groups to work with these governmental agencies.

Yes, law and order should mean peace of mind for parents that their children are not being tempted by dope pushers out to make a fast buck at the expense of our youth.

One of my first undertakings as sheriff will be to coordinate the efforts of local police departments in Cook County and these Volunteer Citizen Groups to plan a combined and efficient program to attack this problem.

This department in the Sheriff's office will be known as the Youth and Drug Division.

Law and order means that police should be given the effective legal tools to do their jobs. I do feel as some do that giving the police the proper legal tools will lead to harassment of law abiding citizens. A policeman is too busy to look for unnecessary things to do, and in my opinion few are so deviously motivated.

I do not condone police brutality or excessive use of force in any sense, but at the same time, I do condemn those who try to tempt the police into violent responses by physical or verbal taunts.

As both a prosecutor and a legislator I have fought to give police the tools to do their job effectively. As a prosecutor I won the conviction in the Meyer case recently affirmed by the United States Supreme Court.

This case allows law enforcement officers to take effective action against those individuals who interfere with the police during a riot or demonstration. It also sets forth guidelines for the police and the citizen in balancing the need for free speech and assembly with the necessary and reasonable governmental functions—such as the control of traffic on our streets and sidewalks.

In order to provide law and order your law enforcement officers must have the adequate training, especially in the field of human relations and crowd control.

An untrained, improperly supervised policeman is just as much a threat to law and order as the demonstrator who hurls bricks and stones. He is just not equipped to preserve the peace, and often will cause violence rather than prevent it.

It has been said that the police are the "Thin Blue Line" that separates an organized society from becoming an anarchy. This is why these guardians must be the best, the most thoroughly trained.

The Sheriff's police force represents just a fraction of his staff. There are scores of additional bailiffs and deputies who are in effect a reserve in case of an emergency.

For this reason, when I am Sheriff I will insist that all of these employees be given the same comprehensive training in crowd control and demonstration duty as those on the regular police force.

Then, if there is an urgent need in any county town or unincorporated area there would be a trained, ready reserve to move in to help keep the peace. This will not be a bunch of pot-bellied, poorly trained, so-called posse, such as one Sheriff attempted to form.

To some, law and order is the assurance that a wife, daughter or girl friend can walk down the street unmolested.

To others, it means the right to "Do their thing."

To freely speak their minds, to peaceably demonstrate their displeasure with the status quo.

Law and order means all of these things, and much more.

It means an end to the spiraling crime rate that is contributing to the mass exodus from our urban areas. It means a clean up of our parks and recreational areas so that we can once again enjoy these facilities without fear of being mugged or robbed.

This concept of law and order is something upon which we all—despite our philosophical differences—can agree.

Too long we have been living in a society of fear. The man in the streets fears the criminal. The so-called left fears the motives of the so-called right and vice versa.

A society built upon fear is not a healthy society. Thus, we need law and order applied equally and with justice for all to provide safety and protection for all factions.

In order to have a free society, we must have law and order. Freedom is not something that comes easily. It is something that must be protected and preserved.

Freedom is not a legacy that we can pass on to our children unless we have law and order to guarantee its preservation. I think we are going to continue to have a free society because we are going to insist upon a lawful, not upon a lawless society.

I could go on discussing what law and order means to me. But I think I've made myself pretty clear.

I am not trying to label myself as a law and order candidate. There are many other issues in this campaign for Sheriff of Cook County. However, I would be remiss if I failed to emphasize its importance.

Law and order is not something that affects one segment of our society. It concerns us all. It is directly involved in the office I seek—Sheriff of Cook County.

Law and order. Simple words for a complex subject. No, there is no simple solution for insuring law and order. It will take profes-

sional administration and the best police talent available. It also will take a dedicated effort between our elected officers and all segments of our society to establish and maintain the communication that is necessary to resolve the problems that exist today. And these are what I will institute if elected Sheriff.

But first I must be elected. The fact that all of you have come here tonight is a big step toward that goal. There are months of hard work and planning ahead.

I pledge to each of you that I will vigorously campaign in every part of this county: that I will preach the principles, policies, philosophy and progress of the Democratic Party to every voter in this County, so that on November 3, 1970 the entire slate of fine, outstanding public servants of the party will be elected to office.

Thank you again for being here tonight and thank you also for your continued prayers that helped enable me to be here tonight.

SENSE ON THE BARGELINES SOEELY NEEDED

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been extremely interested in the continuation and growth of water transportation, both as to the safety of operation and the efficient improvement of barges, I am wholeheartedly in favor of prompt action on the mixing rule bill, H.R. 8298, which has long been debated in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill will be before the House for action this week and I look forward to its passage.

I believe an editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 19, 1970, on this legislation will be of interest to the Members of the House:

SENSE ON THE BARGELINES

Legislation to preserve the economies of large-scale water freight transportation is up again in Congress for the third year—on such reasonable terms, with such overwhelming support from those involved and with such minute and meretricious opposition that it would be all but preposterous not to enact it.

The measure is endorsed by the regulated barge lines, the railroads, maritime and railroad labor, the Senate and House Commerce Committees, and the Departments of Transportation, Agriculture and Justice. Its only opposition comes from some large shippers who want secret rates and are willing to go to destructive lengths to keep them.

The trouble started in 1967 when the Interstate Commerce Commission reversed a position of a quarter-century's standing and ruled that barge lines could not carry more than three dry bulk commodities, which are exempt from rate regulation, in a single tow without losing the exemption. Realizing that this would mean splitting up single economical large tows into several uneconomical small ones, the Commission has since postponed the effective date of the new ruling four times, waiting on Congress to straighten out the mess the ICC had precipitated.

The barge lines promptly sought legislation which would permit their regulated and unregulated traffic to be freely combined in single tows but not until last year were they able to reach a compromise agreement with the railroads, which had a good case for some *quid pro quo*. Then the railroads very reasonably agreed to what the barge lines wanted

provided the legislation also required publication of the unregulated dry-bulk rates.

As Peter Fanchi Jr., president of Federal Barge Lines, says, "We have truth in lending, truth in packaging and I expect we will soon have truth in barging." Congress can ill afford to put itself on record in favor of secret rates, the only issue remaining in the way of this remedial legislation.

WHOSE AX IS BEING GROUND?

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in my efforts to advance the Dickey-Lincoln School project, I have been motivated and guided by the needs and wishes of the people of Maine and New England.

I have regarded as most urgent and accepted as a matter of great personal responsibility the need to devote all possible energy and effort in order to realize the construction of the Dickey project.

I am disappointed that my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) should disparage my honest commitment and efforts, dismissing them with the curt statement that I have a personal ax to grind.

If I have been honing an ax, it has been to serve the people I represent, to cut through and clear away the thorny brush of misleading and false statements, of half-truths and juggled figures which have been thrown up to obscure the truth about the Dickey project.

Today, as in 1965, when it was authorized by Congress, the Dickey project remains sound, sane, and valid, deserving to be completed. Today, as in 1965, the people of Maine and New England pay usurious electric rates as compared to national averages. And today more than ever evidence of power shortages, predictable brownouts, and the threat of blackouts argue persuasively for construction of the project without further delay.

The ax of Dickey's opponents, the private power interests has not gone unattended, finding willing hands to whet it to a razor-sharp edge and use it to delay—and hopefully destroy—the chance that the project may make its significant contribution in serving consumers of electric energy on the east coast.

Willingly or unwittingly, some of my colleagues have allied themselves with its enemies of the Dickey project and so, it would seem, have some respected conservation groups.

I have great respect for and subscribe to the general goal of the Audubon Society, the Wilderness Society, the National Wildlife Federation, and other similar organizations devoted to the maintenance and improvement of our natural environment. But in the case of the Dickey issue, I believe them to be dead wrong.

They plead for maintaining the status quo, forgetting that human interests come into play. The status quo means not only a continuation of high consumer charges for electricity, and shortages of energy. It also means a lack of industrial development, joblessness, poverty and

lack of hope for many people, the people for whom I have been grinding and wielding the ax.

In an effort to prevent change, the conservation groups have been guilty of dramatizing and grossly overstating the impact of the Dickey project on the areas in which it will be constructed, and a number of my colleagues, doubtless influenced by the excellent reputations of the organizations, have been taken in.

The fact is that construction of the Dickey project is not incompatible with environmental interests and promises very limited change in the area except for the creation of a huge manmade lake which will provide diverse new recreational opportunities.

Only six of Maine's 3,600 streams would be flooded; only 2,000 of Maine's 180,000 deer would be displaced and most would survive and establish deer-yards in other areas; and only one-half of 1 percent of the State's vast timberlands would be flooded to create the needed reservoir. This can hardly be viewed as an environmental disaster.

Tomorrow, I shall seek your support for the Dickey project when I move to include \$807,000 for preconstruction planning and design during fiscal 1971.

I urge that you consider the facts and only the facts germane to this issue. I shall rely upon your good judgment and sense of fairness and hope that you will see fit to support the cause for which I have worked and the people for whom I have undertaken this difficult task.

LOW-COST SPACE SHUTTLE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the future of our national space program has been examined by a special task force established by the President to determine the decisions this country must make to provide a strong and productive program in the 1970's. The cornerstone of this program is the development of a low-cost earth orbital shuttle which can be flown much like an airplane and used over and over again. Because of the importance of the shuttle to our national space effort in the 1970's, I addressed a number of questions on this subject to Dr. Thomas O. Paine, Administrator of NASA. I am including his letter and reply to a number of questions in the RECORD:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

ADMINISTRATION,

Washington D.C., May 28, 1970.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Manned Space
Flight, Committee on Science and Astronautics,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your significant and timely inquiries regarding the design, operations, and cost of the space shuttle and related booster system. Attached are specific answers to each of your questions. However, I would like to set forth some general comments on our space planning to establish a framework for the answers to your specific questions.

First, I would like to review briefly the

NASA policy of phased project planning. Under this policy, major research and development programs are conducted in four sequential phases. The first phase (Phase A) consists primarily of an in-house analysis and preliminary study effort to determine whether the proposed technical approach is feasible. Phase B consists of detailed studies and definition, comparative analyses, and preliminary design directed toward facilitating the choice of a single approach from among the alternate approaches selected through the first phase. Phase C involves detailed systems design with mockups and test articles to assure the hardware is within the state-of-the-art and that the technical milestone schedules and resource estimates for the next phase are realistic. The final phase (Phase D) covers final hardware design development and project operations.

The phased project planning process provides that the work content of each of the first three phases is directed toward developing information needed to support the decision to proceed into the next phase.

NASA and the DOD have been working for more than three years on the preliminary analysis of alternate approaches and concepts, and on the research and technology effort needed to determine whether it is appropriate to develop reusable vehicles that will substantially reduce the cost of operating in space. We have concluded that this is an achievable objective. We are convinced that availability of these vehicles will lead to significant changes in our concepts of operation in the space environment as well as reductions in costs.

Accordingly, we selected contractors on May 12 to proceed into the second or definition phase of detailed study, comparative analysis, and preliminary design directed toward facilitating the choice of a single program approach. These contractor efforts will take place over the next eleven months. However, to assure high flexibility as we proceed, we are continuing with first-phase studies of several alternative approaches.

The steps we are taking now will provide us with more complete information on the very significant questions you and others are asking. We will decide at the conclusion of this phase whether it is appropriate to settle on a single design or continue competitive approaches. We will be able then to take into account technical assessments and opinions throughout NASA, as well as those of other experts in industry, universities, and other government agencies. We can determine then whether the criteria described in the RFP comprise the most feasible and realistic system, all factors considered.

Similarly, these detailed definition studies will permit us to gain a thorough understanding of service life, frequently of utilization, and what is involved when we consider such matters as Air Force requirements. These detailed results will in turn supply the Department of Defense with the information it will need to determine how it will utilize the shuttle and what organizational, logistics, and financial support it should provide.

One objective of the space shuttle is economy based on broad and flexible utilization of this transportation system. The system will have the capability for a wide variety of future missions including logistic support of manned orbiting systems, delivery of unmanned payloads to orbit, recovery and return or on-orbit repair of satellites, and performance of independent short duration manned missions. We believe that the vehicle design will provide an inherent capability to meet additional applications which will materialize as we acquire experience in this type of space operation. Therefore, the problem of early "dead-ending" should not be experienced in the shuttle program.

This brings us to your third group of questions. Again I wish to emphasize that all of these matters are being pursued vigorously

as we enter the definition phase. Alternate approaches are being considered. Formal reviews will be conducted every two or three months. Use of existing hardware and facilities will be fully considered along with the cost and impact of additional facilities, should they be required. Integrated plans were developed in support of the Space Task Group activity during 1969. These plans are being re-examined and updated with consideration of alternatives in the phasing of major program elements consistent with realistic consideration of the budget aspects of the transition from current systems to the space shuttle, space station, and other advanced systems in future years.

Finally, the plan to move toward reusability is based on studies that show the resulting savings will more than repay the cost of development. The economies of reusability will occur in both the vehicle and payload areas. Necessarily, these studies are based in part on assumptions. No one can predict all of the variable factors with certainty for a time period eight to ten years from now. But my associates and I are convinced we are at the very beginning of the utilization of space and space technology for the benefit of men on earth. We believe that these estimates are quite conservative, and that when the shuttle becomes available the traffic to and from earth orbit will increase rapidly. We expect that presently contemplated applications will expand sharply and that others not even foreseen at present will be introduced.

The benefits of the space shuttle are not limited to cost reduction. It is my expectation that this new capability will provide a significant contribution to our national security. It will also provide the capability to do things such as space rescue, which cannot now be done. Furthermore, there is reason to expect that the ability to retrieve, repair, and refurbish objects in space will provide additional improvements in the economy and effectiveness of space operations.

Thus I believe it is clear that the responsible course to be taken is to invest now in the study efforts and proceed at an efficient pace in the future toward bringing into operation a system that will permit us to end the practice of discarding vehicles after a single flight. We will continue this work through the Phase B studies currently being initiated. Then at the conclusion of this phase we will reach another checkpoint at which we will be able to review the situation thoroughly.

Therefore, in light of all these considerations, we believe that it was a sound decision to move ahead at this time with Phase B of the space shuttle.

Please call on me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

T. O. PAINE,
Administrator.

DESIGN

Question 1—Is it appropriate at this point in time to settle on a single design or concept when the risks and costs of the primary or alternate schemes are not clearly known?

Answer—NASA has not settled on a single design. The Phase B study proposals provide a point of departure for defining a reusable shuttle system. They encompass a range of configurations and design approaches. Technical risks and costs implicit in any of these design alternatives will be prime considerations of the study. Concurrent with Phase B, NASA will continue to study alternate approaches.

Question 2—Have divergencies of opinion within NASA as to basic concepts been taken fully into account?

Answer—Yes, NASA has considered many opinions and taken them into account in evolving the Phase B approach. Extensive in-house evaluation of configurations developed in earlier studies were made prior to release of the RFP. Positions from many sources in-

cluding the NASA MSF centers and research centers and appropriate Air Force agencies have been melded together to establish the approach taken in our Phase B studies where in these positions will be the subject of continued investigations and definition.

Question 3—Can the RFP be challenged as to its genuine substance, depth, and ultimate acceptance as the most feasible and realistic system, all factors considered?

Answer—The RFP was designed to define baseline requirements and a study plan whereby the contractors will consider alternate approaches and conduct extensive tradeoffs to define a feasible and realistic system.

NASA conducted extensive Design Reference Reviews and configuration studies and these together with the Phase A feasibility studies served as the basis for the RFP. The RFP including the Statement of Work was prepared and reviewed in depth through successive stages by NASA and the Air Force. Consequently, a wide range of expertise was utilized in the preparation and approval of the shuttle RFP.

OPERATIONS

Question 1—Has full consideration been given to Air Force requirements especially to the cross-range capability?

Answer—Yes, Air Force requirements are being given full consideration and especially as regards cross-range.

Under "Study Objectives and Approach" of Phase B Space Shuttle System Statement of Work in-depth study of the cross-range requirement is stipulated as a fundamental objective. The study effort will yield data to evaluate designs of the space shuttle system with the orbiter optimized for a high aerodynamic cross-range of 1500 n.m. and a low aerodynamic cross-range of 200 n.m. NASA will completely evaluate the results of the contractor's two design studies to explore in depth the overall influence of the cross-range performance requirement on the cost, schedule and capability of the space shuttle.

NASA and the Air Force have jointly developed the requirements for a national space transportation system and have developed a policy of mutual participation in such activities as design reviews, technology programs, preparation of work statements and Source Evaluation Boards.

Question 2—What is the service life of the shuttle and what is the frequency of utilization?

Answer—Based on previous systems and technology studies, a design goal of one hundred reuses of each vehicle has been established. When the shuttle becomes operational, each flight system will be capable of being readied for another mission within a turn-around time of two weeks. Requirements for these design goals will be evaluated during the Phase B studies.

Question 3—What potential military uses exist for the shuttle and at what point in time and under what circumstances will the Air Force assert its role, specify its missions, and provide organizational logistics and financial support?

Answer—John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, for DOD stated to the Senate in March of this year that DOD fully supports the Space Shuttle studies in the following testimony.

"Once an economical and operationally effective STS is developed, we would expect to use it to launch essentially all DOD payloads into earth orbit. We hope thereby to reduce DOD launch costs by an order of magnitude. Not only will we economize from the point of view of a reusable launch vehicle, but significant savings can accrue because repair and reuse of payloads will be possible and payloads design criteria could become less stringent. In addition to all of this, we would expect to benefit from the STS technology resulting from NASA's development efforts."

The Air Force and NASA have worked very closely during the past several months to

identify their respective missions and associated design requirements. This close working relationship is continuing and the requirements of both agencies are reflected in the Phase B study plan. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of the Air Force have signed an agreement which establishes a Space Transportation Policy Board. It is the function of the Policy Board to assure that the Space Transportation System will fulfill the objectives of both agencies by establishing program objectives including operational aspects, technology status and needs, fiscal considerations and interagency relationship.

Question 1—Have all possible approaches been fully considered to minimize cost and risk?

Answer—Preliminary cost analyses of the space shuttle system have been underway for a number of months, but a more comprehensive study must await the time when the data from the Phase B definition studies is available. Under the Phase B studies, cost, performance, and schedule and their associated technical risk will be prime tradeoff factors in all design decisions. This is consistent with the stated program objective: to provide a low-cost, economical space transportation system based on both minimized development and operational costs.

Question 2—What bench marks can be established in the program to assure that the lowest risk design has been chosen and is being developed at optimum cost?

Answer—During the period of performance of Phase B studies for the engines and systems, large scale formal reviews at the end of the third, sixth, eighth and eleventh months will be conducted by NASA to insure that the studies are proceeding in the desired manner. NASA will conduct in-house analyses of the contractors' efforts and will perform an in-depth examination of the Phase B results and a continuing appraisal of potential alternate approaches. In addition, design certification and operational program experience such as that gained in Apollo will enable NASA to insure that the proper system consistent with optimum cost, performance and low risk is carried forward for detailed design and development in later phases.

Question 3—Is existing hardware and facilities directly applicable and usable for the new shuttle being utilized to the maximum extent?

Answer—Several study activities are being initiated which will provide insight as to the capabilities of existing facilities to support the shuttle and to define possible additional facility requirements. The Phase B studies will identify major facility requirements for the shuttle. An independent assessment of all facility requirements will also be made.

Consideration is being given to the possible use of existing facilities for engine evaluations, wind tunnel tests, structural investigations, vacuum chamber simulations and operational planning. Also included is the consideration of existing launch and support facilities at KSC and WTR and the flight test facilities of NASA and the Air Force. At this time, only a limited effort has been initiated on the space shuttle that would require the use of facilities. Since the shuttle configurations are in an evolutionary state at this time it is not possible to make a final commitment on facility requirements.

Question 4—Has NASA prepared integrated plans for various systems with realistic consideration given to reasonable budget aspects during the period?

Answer—Yes, integrated plans were developed in support of the Space Task Group activity during 1969. During the past year NASA has conducted continuous planning activities to further develop these integrated plans. Several alternative levels of funding were included in the Space Task Group studies. These integrated plans are being re-

assessed and updated with consideration of alternatives in the phasing of major program elements and development efforts to conform to realistic expectations with respect to annual budget levels.

Question 5—Has consideration been given fully to the cost and impact of additional facilities in new programs and proposals?

Answer—Consideration is being given to the cost and impact of additional facilities should any be necessary.

Space Shuttle facilities requirements will be examined during the Phase B system studies. In addition, NASA has established a Facilities Task Group whose function will be to prepare an overall Space Shuttle facilities plan. This plan will reflect recommendations as to the facilities necessary to support activities identified by the Phase B contractors and by NASA and DOD. Each proposed facility requirement will be evaluated against several factors including the possible utilization of existing facilities. New facilities requirements will be identified where the use of existing resources is not justified. Economic analysis and cost tradeoffs will be carefully weighed in each case.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSWOMAN MAY

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon our colleague from the State of Washington (Mrs. May) addressed a luncheon meeting of the American Agricultural Editors Association, and I know the subject of her remarks—the farmer-consumer relationship—is of very real interest to everyone in this body.

Because I serve with Mrs. May on the House Agricultural Committee, I am especially aware of her deep and genuine concern over the many problems facing U.S. farmers today, and I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House her excellent presentation of the farmers' position with regard to consumer food prices.

Mrs. May's remarks follow:

THE AMERICAN FARMER: THE CONSUMERS' REAL PROTECTOR

(A speech by the Honorable CATHERINE MAY)

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm pleased and honored to have this opportunity to share some thoughts with you on the farmer-consumer relationship. But, first, I would like to digress just a little and read you a very timely and relevant article from the Boston *Herald Traveler* which was brought to the attention of our House Agriculture Committee by none other than the Secretary of Agriculture in one of our sessions a few weeks ago.

Even though many of you may be familiar with it by now, I'm going to read it anyway because it wears so well.

"Harvard's main administration building, University Hall, often the target of student radicals, was once again the site of a student protest last week.

"This time, however, the protestors were from neither Afro or SDS, but from AGRO, the Harvard agrarian society.

"About a dozen student farmers staged the demonstration to present a list of 10 demands to the Harvard administration.

"Dressed in overalls, and chanting 'Hoe, Hoe, Hoe that row—drop them books, there's hay to mow,' a parody of an SDS slogan, the AGRO's marched around Harvard Yard distributing carrots to passersby.

"Some of the students carried signs reading: 'Have you thanked a farmer today?'"

'We're all soil brothers under the skin,' and 'Iowa is bigger than all new England.'

"Addressing an enthusiastic crowd of about 100 from the steps of Widener Library, the leaders called on Harvard to establish an agricultural studies program for 'them students which feel a kinship with the soil.'"

"Represent AGRO fairly by placing a chicken on the student-faculty disciplinary committee; establish a scholarship fund for 'poor peasants' to be paid for by planting Harvard Yard to cactus in the fall and rice in the spring."

"Sever all official relations with the U.S. Department of Agriculture because of that agency's role in 'suppression and persecution' of U.S. farmers."

"Appoint as its next president Dewey Burchak, Mayor of Big Sag, Montana."

"A spokesman said that the demands were 'unnegotiable mostly, except for a couple, which are negotiable, a little,' and warned of a possible 'peasant revolt' if the demands were not met by sundown."

"After the demonstration, the crowd dispersed peacefully. Only one injury was reported. Jim Trott, of Ft. Benton, Montana, and a leader of AGRO, bit himself on the lip while reading the demands to the crowd in the Yard."

I don't know that there is any profound significance in this parody of student protest, but I find it quite refreshing that, despite all our problems, some of us—especially our young people—are able to retain that one personal characteristic so essential to maintaining perspective—a sense of humor.

I want to talk with you today, though, about another kind of protest—the protest over rising food prices. This serious and continuing phenomenon of our times is, in large part, a reflection of bewilderment and confusion on the part of the consumer—a bewilderment and confusion which all too often seems to result in a finger of blame being pointed to the producer of our food supply.

Farmers too, are concerned about that widening spread between the basic price at the farm and what it becomes when the consumer fills her shopping cart many miles and many processing steps away. But, the farmer still has not been able to get his story across—the message that he is, indeed, the consumers' real protector.

And, it is crucial to the farmer that this message be understood, for he is more vulnerable today to the outrage of this Nation's consumers than he ever has been in the past. In this age of growing interdependence, in this country where east and west coast are neighbors, he is more susceptible to their whims and fancies, to their demands for specific quality and variety, to their boycotts, and to the legislation enacted by their representatives in Congress. In this time of diminishing political strength for agriculture, it is vital that farmers inform their customers as to just who they are, what they are, and what their contribution to our society actually amounts to. And, just as it is important for all segments of our society to listen to each other, it is incumbent upon consumers—housewives—that they listen, objectively and responsibly, to what their suppliers of food and fiber are trying to tell them.

So, what are farmers really trying to say? They are saying, for one thing that they have done more than any other group to keep consumer food prices down—to keep food a bargain! They are saying that they have, over the years, dramatically increased their efficiency and productivity in the face of spiraling production costs and static prices. They are saying that the two indisputable, primary forces behind mounting food costs are inflation and consumer demand for convenience foods. Let's take a look at some of the factors which have combined to create these forces.

Marketing costs have skyrocketed in the last few years at every step in the process

from raw material on the farm to the finished product in the kitchen. They have been accentuated greatly by a switch of buying habits. The lesser priced items needing preparation at home are largely being replaced by the "instant" convenience products which reflect pyramiding labor input.

Disregarding for the moment the fact that more than 25 percent of the market basket contains items other than food, let's examine some of the valid examples for the upward surge of retail prices.

The facts show that our fondness for highly processed snacks has increased by 68 percent over a decade ago. Although this may seem to be a minor item in the family food budget, it actually has taken on more than a minor role.

Potatoes can be cited as an example of this trend, although by no means is this item unusual. For whole potatoes, farmers receive from one and one-half cents a pound up to three cents—depending upon area and supply situation. At the supermarket, potato chips sell for well over one dollar a pound, and instant mashed potatoes would run seventy-four cents per pound.

Of course, the comparison between three cents for potatoes at the farm and seventy-four cents for instant potatoes at the supermarket must be qualified, for dehydration saves on retail weight. But, labor and machinery required to peel, cut, cook, package and deliver the lightweight containers unavoidably drives prices upward immensely.

According to current USDA figure, an average of sixty percent of retail food costs come from marketing expenses.

The spread between the farm value and retail continues to widen, increasing 1.2 percent more in the first quarter of this year than in the same three months of 1969. In the past 10 years it has increased more than twenty percent.

While the price spread between farm and consumer does not tell all of the inflation story, it does reveal that farm prices have remained relatively static while the costs of operating a farm and farmer living costs have skyrocketed. Operation input is well over 100 percent more than fifteen years ago.

Food price increases are actually far down the list of contributors to the rising cost of living. A recent survey in 39 metropolitan areas across the country for the 1967-69 period showed taxes to be the fastest growing cost factor in the family budget—and the survey measured only direct taxes, not those added on indirectly to the cost of every item or service purchased. Next to taxes, the big increases included: Social Security taxes, insurance and contributions—13 to 15 percent; medical care—14 percent; clothing and personal care—11 percent. Higher food prices came along with an 8 to 9 percent boost; transportation added 8 percent; and housing costs moved up 5 to 6 percent.

Now, let's look again at food costs and the reasons for their increases.

Milk is a commodity which has fewer add-on costs at the processing level than most others. Pasteurizing and packaging are the major steps connecting producer with consumer. It is not changed in structure when sold as fresh milk, and therefore should be more of a bargain than where many labor steps are required—for example, to change cereals from a kernel of grain to a breakfast food or to snacks. Final price of the cereal or snack could be 49 cents or more, for which the farmer might receive two or three cents.

In the Federal Trade Commission study and economic report made in 1966 on bread and milk prices, it was shown that the hourly return in five dairy areas for the farmers themselves ran from 84 cents an hour down to 30 cents. At the same time, dairy plant employees were receiving \$2.20 to \$3.84. This explains why, for a long period of time, thousands of dairy owners were forced to quit business. Fortunately for consumers, the rapid decline of dairies has now halted as

dairymen are establishing a more solid economic footing for themselves in most sections.

Bringing the milk situation up to date from the 1966 study, we can explore recent developments in New York. Employees of the milk processing plants and the truck drivers negotiated a \$35 weekly wage boost last November, and office workers in those plants were raised \$25 per week.

Milk is selling in New York City supermarkets for between 58 and 60 cents per half gallon—a rise of 2 cents to 4 cents. Producers of the milk obtained about one-half cent more for that half gallon.

It would appear from this price spread that the retailer obtained a lion's share of the increase, but this is not so. The many costs in between gobbled up most of that difference.

I do not want to belabor all the various costs involved, but, as an example, transportation cost increases are having a significant impact on the price of milk as well as other food items. Wages, maintenance, taxes, licenses and scores of other items are forcing railroads and trucking companies to increase charges from 6 to 10 percent yearly.

Looking further into labor costs on the food bill, the USDA reports that employees of food marketing establishments earned an average of \$2.82 per hour in August of last year. That's six percent more than in August, 1968, and nearly double the hourly earnings in 1965.

The same trend can be seen in the food manufacturing industry. These wage earners received an average of \$2.93 in August last year—nearly 6 percent higher than the year before.

And, in the wholesale food trade, hourly earnings averaged \$3.10 per hour in that same month—again, 6 percent more than a year earlier.

Employees of retail food stores averaged \$2.54 in the same period, or 6.7 percent more than in August, 1968. And, in some areas, further increase since that time have raised food store wages even higher.

The USDA has also compared rising costs of food in relationship to labor, and has found that direct labor costs per unit of food at the market has moved up some 26 percent in the past ten years, although overall labor costs rose some 58 percent. This means that considerable efficiency has been gained at all producer, marketing, wholesale and retail levels. Had this not been the case, food prices would probably have risen considerably more.

Turning to the farm itself, production per man-hour in agriculture since 1950 has increased at a rate more than double that of all non-farm industry. Between 1957-59 and 1969, per man-hour output on the farm increased some 83 percent.

It's worthwhile, I think, to pursue this point of efficiency just a bit further. In a recent article in the *Wall Street Journal*, which I'm sure many of you saw, Norman Fischer outlined the major role played by genetics in increasing production efficiency and holding down the cost of food. In the last quarter century, he pointed out, U.S. farmers have used new genetic technology to double the average milk production of each dairy cow; halve the time and the amount of feed needed to produce a broiler chicken; reduced by three months the time needed to produce a market-weight turkey; sharply boosted a layer hen's egg output, and shortened the time need to bring beef cattle and hogs to market, with less feed and more red meat per carcass. In just the last dozen years, he noted, livestock scientists have increased the amount of ham and loin in hogs by more than 20 percent, the equivalent of adding an extra ham to every porker.

However, the new genetics, like every other field of human endeavor, has its failures as well as its successes. On the same day the *Journal* article appeared, a small item in the *National Observer* reported that an ex-

periment to develop featherless chickens didn't come off so well.

The theory was that such chickens would save the energy normally used to grow feathers, and therefore the chickens would be bigger and would lay larger eggs. It didn't work, the *Observer* noted, the featherless chickens ate more than their feathered friends, laid fewer eggs, were susceptible to ulcers, and used a lot of energy trying to keep warm. And, when fried, they taste just like regular chickens.

Well, featherless chickens notwithstanding, it is this kind of research and applied technology which, among many other factors, has helped to provide consumers with food which has risen in cost much less than other consumer goods.

One farmworker now produces food and fiber for himself and forty four other people. Only ten years ago that figure was twenty four, and in 1949 it was just fourteen. In other words, one hour of farm labor now produces nearly seven times as much food and other crops as it did in 1919-21.

This is a record of which we can all be proud—and thankful, for the direct result is that the average American family currently is spending only 16.5 percent of its income after taxes for food. A year ago this figure was 17 percent, and 20 years ago it was 22 percent. In Western Europe, incidentally, the average family has to put out approximately 25 percent of their disposable income for food, while in the Soviet Union the portion is almost 50 percent, and in Asia it is estimated at 75 percent.

And yet, while the American consumer reaps the benefit of this efficiency, the farmer faces higher costs and lower profit margins. Since 1949, the national income has shown an increase of 255 percent. But farm income, while up, is only up 18 percent.

The ability of American agriculture to feed and clothe the 300 million or more people who will inhabit the United States by the year 2000 can be assured only if the farmer receives a return sufficient to use efficient modern equipment, meet his labor costs, and use necessary fertilizers and other aids. In other words, we have to pay 1970 prices for what he needs in 1970 to go on farming. And few people realize that a minimum investment of \$100,000 is necessary just to acquire the land and machinery and other items to farm efficiently, and almost \$200,000 is necessary to provide an income to house, feed and clothe a family of four and provide an education for two children.

Turning again to food prices, it really is difficult to see where costs affecting the price of foods at the retail stores could be eliminated or reduced in any appreciable degree. Built-in escalators seem to exist, either by virtue of the inflation spiral or by demand of the housewife. Even packaging, which may seem a candidate for such cost cutting, is often determined in considerable degree by housewife preference.

The huge shopping centers are another factor, representing multimillion dollar investments, but which are demanded by shoppers because of their convenience. Regular store rentals based upon today's soaring construction and maintenance costs, and upon land values, plus perhaps a 5 percent assessment on gross sales by the shopping center owners for promotion and other purposes represents an additional cost burden which must be reckoned in the ultimate consumer prices.

I mentioned taxes as a direct major item for our families, running well ahead of food increases. That is just part of the story. Taxes and interest rates are heavy contributors to the costs of food marketing, but are often overlooked as a factor. Farmers, of course, have generally been forced to absorb the constantly burgeoning taxes on each phase of their operation. Unlike other businesses, they cannot pass on these extra costs since they have little or no control over the price they receive at the market place.

Some time ago, I saw an estimate that over

50 percent of the retail price of a loaf of bread is actually fixed by taxes of one kind or another. This was based on taxes in fractions of pennies added on at every stage of production, from the equipment used in planting and harvesting of the wheat to the final taxes on packages and trucks delivering the bread to the shelves of the retail store and the final destination—the consumer's table.

Trading stamps and other "give away" gimmicks have proven to be no small items in food costs. These often add two percent or more to the retail selling price, yet many stores have learned they must offer them or lose out in the battle for the consumer dollar.

Looking at the "big picture" of America's food bill, the facts show that of the \$60.6 billion difference between the amount farmers received for food products in 1968 and the amount consumers paid, labor costs accounted for \$27.3 billion. Other major components were packaging—\$7 billion; transportation—\$4.6 billion; and corporate profits before taxes—\$3.6 billion.

Although profits are often blamed for rising prices and expenditures for food, they obviously are a relatively small percentage of total marketing costs. Net profits of leading retail food chains average a little over one percent of sales, declining generally during the past few years. Net profits for food manufacturers in 1969 averaged about 2.5 percent of sales.

The trend in profits throughout the food industry has been downward at nearly all levels. The 1966 Federal Trade Commission report set up initial data, as did the report that same year of the National Commission on Food Marketing, of which I was a member, and subsequent follow-ups reveal little change in the profit pattern.

As we move into this new decade, we are all hopeful, of course, that inflation as a factor in rising food costs eliminated, or at least brought into some reasonable kind of control. Even if this is accomplished, however, it doesn't mean that food prices will be stabilized, for as housewives demand more and more of the convenience foods, more fancy packaging, more extras, it is simply going to mean more cost.

So, even without inflation, food prices will continue to be an issue—an issue with which farmers and the food industry in general is going to have to come to grips.

We cannot solve our problems by making any one sector of our economy a scapegoat, but I am becoming increasingly concerned over the developing conditions which lend themselves to making a scapegoat of the farmer. As I said earlier, farmers are more vulnerable now than ever before, both politically and economically. Out of 435 members of the House, only 31 are from districts which have 25 percent or more of their people on farms. Only 83 have as much as 15 percent of their people living on farms. And, 21 states don't have a single district in which as many as 15 percent of the people are farm people.

It is obvious that agriculture must have the help and understanding of urban America, not only to obtain passage—and funding—of needed legislation, but also to keep from becoming the object of punitive "food price" politics.

It's going to take, among other things, an increased awareness among farmers and their organizations of urban needs and problems—an increased realization that the problems of the cities and urban areas are also theirs, and that they must cooperate to find solutions.

Farmers also need to understand better the value of positive public relations—and I don't mean that in the "Madison Avenue" sense. I mean that farmers must make use of every available opportunity to let his city cousin know exactly what he is doing for him—that food is a bargain, and that farm-

ers are making every effort to keep it that way.

And, as I also mentioned earlier, consumers are going to have to face up more to their responsibilities to the farmer—the responsibility of looking beyond the price tag to understand a little better where their food actually came from before it got into the can, and the how and why of its cost and availability.

And, you as agricultural editors, play a major role in this communication process between agricultural and urban America. You have a very heavy responsibility here of which I know you are keenly aware. But it doesn't lie just on your shoulders, either. Every form of news media must share this responsibility, as well as those of us in Congress, in government and in other areas where thoughts may be expressed and facts presented which may influence the opinions of others. It is up to all of us to understand our responsibilities here, and to fulfill them as objectively and as effectively as we can.

Thank you.

SCENIC BEAUTY IN EAST TENNESSEE

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel fortunate that the Great Smoky Mountains, with their majestic ridges, gentle slopes, and mysterious ravines, are partially located within beautiful east Tennessee and my congressional district.

To me, nothing is more relaxing than a trip to the "mountains" to enjoy the benefits of mother nature in all her splendor—fresh mountain air, cool, meandering streams, acres and acres of trees, rocks, and other forms of God's work which combine to make the whole area so magnificent.

At a social party given to the members of the bench and bar at Jackson, Tenn., during a session of the Tennessee Supreme Court, Col. Landon Haynes uttered the following gem of oratory in answer to a charge from a member of the group that east Tennessee was sometimes called a God-forsaken country.

"Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen—I plead guilty to the 'soft impeachment.' I was born in East Tennessee, on the banks of the Watauga, which, in the Indian vernacular, means 'beautiful river,' and beautiful river it is. I have stood upon its banks in my childhood and looked down through its glassy waters and have seen a heaven below, and then looked up and beheld a heaven above reflecting, like two mirrors, each in the other, its moons and planets and trembling stars. Away from its banks of rock and cliff, hemlock and laurel, pine and cedar, stretches a vale back to the distant mountains as beautiful and exquisite as any in Italy or Switzerland. There stand the great Unaka, the great Roan, the great Black, and the great Smoky Mountains, among the loftiest in America, on whose summits the clouds gather of their own accord even on the brightest day.

"There I have seen the great spirit of the storm, after noontide, go and take his evening nap in his pavilion of darkness and of clouds. I have then seen him aroused at midnight as a giant, refreshed by slumber, and cover the heavens with gloom and darkness; have seen him awake the tempest, let loose the red lightnings that ran along the mountain tops for a thousand miles, swifter than an eagle's flight in heaven. Then I have

seen them stand up and dance like angels of light in the clouds, to the music of that grand organ of nature, whose keys seemed to have been touched by the fingers of the Divinity in the hall of eternity, that responded in notes of thunder, that resounded through the universe. Then I have seen the darkness drift away beyond the horizon, and the moon get up from her saffron bed like a queen, put on her robes of light, come forth from her palace in the sun, and stand tiptoe on the misty mountain top, and while night fled from before, her glorious face to his bed chamber at the pole, she lighted the green vale and beautiful river, where I was born and played in childhood, with a smile of sunshine.

"O! beautiful land of mountains, with thy sun-painted cliffs, how can I ever forget thee?"

Gen. Forrest stood stupefied while Col. Haynes pronounced these marvelous sentences, and said he would not have been more amazed if he had been struck by the lightning flash from the summit of Smokey Mountain.

IN SUPPORT OF GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of a bill to continue the golden eagle program, I am, of course, extremely pleased that the House has passed the necessary legislation to extend this fine program.

The bill, as passed by the House, will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to increase the price of the golden eagle passport from \$7 to \$10. The administration, in advocating this 43-percent increase of price, states that "most visitors to Federal recreation areas who have purchased the passport at \$7 will continue to buy it at the increased price."

I agree that those who love the outdoors will probably purchase the passport at the added cost. However, it seems to me that the administration is neglecting an ideal that I share with many of my constituents—the availability of our parks and recreation areas should not be limited by the price of admission.

As originally envisioned, the golden eagle passport was established to produce revenue to help provide expanded local, State, and Federal outdoor recreation opportunities. Passport sales have been between 600,000 and 700,000 annually—resulting in approximately \$4 million per year. It was originally estimated that 36 million permits would be sold during the first 5 years after its establishment. Thus, by the sole criteria of revenue produced, the golden eagle was deemed a failure.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we should, in addition, judge the golden eagle by the pleasure it brings those who love the outdoors. The retired citizen, who lives on a fixed income, finds he is able to spend more leisure hours enjoying the beauty of our forests and participating in recreational activities than he could before the golden eagle. Also, the large family has been encouraged by the program to take family outings and family vacations.

We should consider the benefits this program brings to the millions who own the passport. We cannot term the program a failure simply because it does not provide as much revenue as anticipated. I believe that we in America still treasure the outdoors and by placing a price tag on our heritage, our forests, and our lakes and waterways, we are placing an added burden on those who own our recreation areas—the people who have paid taxes that financed their acquisition.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the golden eagle passport, but want to emphasize to those who condemn this program as a financial failure that our 3,000 national parks, forests, and refuges belong to the people and the right of free access to these areas should be preserved. Thus, I am opposed to increasing the fee from \$7 to \$10.

ELECTRIC POWER SHORTAGES AND THE DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, electric power shortages and brownouts are being predicted for this summer. It appears certain that businesses and homeowners will be inconvenienced due to the inability of the private electric utilities of the eastern half of the United States to meet consumer demand for energy.

This crisis for consumers of electric energy was reported in an article published on June 7, 1970, in the New York Times, which I now submit for inclusion in the Record.

WIDE POWER "BROWNOUTS" LIKELY IN EAST IN SUMMER

(By Ben A. Franklin)

WASHINGTON, June 6.—Much of the Eastern half of the nation is almost certain to have some dislocation of electrical service this summer.

Government and utility industry officials say that in large areas of this "land of electrical living," as the advertising men put it, there is simply not enough power to go around during the sultry periods when air conditioner use is at its peak.

Pressed to meet air conditioning power demands, a number of utilities have already resorted to a systemwide voltage reduction to spread the available electricity around.

The situation differs from that of 1965 and 1967, when blackouts darkened huge areas of the populous Northeast for hours and then were repaired. The problems now are chronic and systematic. They are apt to have nagging widespread effects for months and perhaps for years.

The new worry in the electrical industry, accordingly, is the "brownout," a disruption of less than total proportions. But along the way, there may be scattered blackouts as well—some of them unavoidable but deliberate.

In most areas—if major equipment failures do not bring more total outages—the public evidence of overtaxed generating capacity may be picture shrinkage and loss of intensity in color television sets. Utilities usually do not announce that brownouts are in progress, and in many jurisdictions they need not report them later.

A brownout is the signal of an energy-rationing decision by power companies to

reduce line voltage. A voltage drop leaves more power to spread around.

According to engineers at even small voltage reductions the Federal Power Commission, cut the efficiency of such devices as electric ranges and toasters, shorten the life of fluorescent tubes and raise the operating temperatures of electric motors.

The engineers say a temporary drop of no more than 5 per cent should not damage "significantly" refrigerator or air conditioner motors. But overheating may trigger automatic cut-off switches.

Some electrical motors will restart automatically after cooling off. On others, a "reset" or "overload" button, often difficult for the unpracticed to find, must be pushed to restart when the protective device turns them off.

When the hot weather arrives, millions of consumers, who may already have unwittingly experienced voltage cuts, will be asked to make voluntary reductions in air conditioner use. And they will experience "cycling"—the intermittent shutdown of overheated air conditioner motors starved for voltage.

In their first joint action on any such matter, the Public Service Boards of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland and the District of Columbia—agencies that monitor utilities in so-called P-J-M Pool—last week ordered the 100 power systems they regulate to send cautionary letters to all their customers by July 1.

WARNING TO CONSUMERS

P-J-M consumers will be warned that some of the region's companies "will be unable to meet the need [for power] from their own resources" and requested to conserve power by setting air conditioners at "no less than 75 degrees."

Government officials say that isolated blackouts may occur even without equipment failures when power companies decide to "shed" portions of their system overloads at peak hours. In such cases, a power company simply pulls switches to cut off certain substations from overtaxed generating plants in the hope of preserving service on the rest of its system.

There may be economic repercussions as well. Some factory shifts may have to be rescheduled by large industrial consumers of electricity. The installation of electrical machinery may have to be postponed. Some home appliances—particularly air conditioners—may not be sold.

Many utility companies have already suspended their institutional air conditioning promotions and are concentrating on electrical heating advertisements instead. Winter power loads are smaller. So are summer sales of heaters.

But if summer brownouts come—and such a generating giant as the 19-million megawatt Tennessee Valley Authority is calling the present situation "an emergency"—a winter of serious disruptions may not be far behind. According to anxious Government and industry officials, the trend of sharply rising power consumption and a long-term lag in generating capacity is casting long brownout shadows for months ahead.

The reasons for the situation are as complex as the country's vast, interconnecting power grid itself.

Experts endlessly debate the causes. But nearly all agree that there is blame enough to go around to all concerned—the Federal Power Commission; other top Government energy and fuel planners, particularly the Atomic Energy Commission; the private and public electric utility industries, the coal industry and the railroads.

S. David Freeman, the top Federal energy policy planner, says they have all been "living in a dream world."

Based on interviews with spokesmen for each of these interests, the explanations and excuses are as follows:

EXPLANATIONS FOR BROWNOUTS

The coal industry is unable to deliver enough of the basic fuel of steam-electric power—more than half the total electrical energy is generated by burning coal—and it attributes the situation to the Atomic Energy Commission. In the late fifties and early sixties, its critics say, the commission persuaded the country—and therefore most coal executives and most investors in coal—that cheap, nonpolluting atomic electric power was just around the corner. It was not. Most atomic plants have experienced unexpected, recurring technical delays. At the same time, coal apologists say, the mining industry was being mechanized, but it suffered from a shortage of capital, and not enough new mines were developed. Hundreds of mines are being opened now, but it takes two to three years to begin significant production. And there is a shortage of trained miners and mechanics.

The coal railroads, also in a slump, failed to order enough coal hopper cars and, on some lines, even enough locomotives to transport the coal to markets. The rapid rise in coal exports, particularly to Japan, further disrupted the rail transportation system. Hundreds of 100-ton coal cars have stood full—and idle—for days and weeks at Hampton Roads, Va., docksides, awaiting off-loading to ships still on the high seas. And the inter-line competition for hoppers—they can also carry beets, wheat, gravel and other bulk cargoes—has left some major coal hauling lines, like the Louisville & Nashville, with thousands of its coal cars "off line," tied up elsewhere in the service of other railroads.

Government officials say the utility industry, by consistently underestimating its own annual sales growth and assuming a 7.5 percent yearly increase in power consumption when the average advance has been 9 percent or more, has laid itself open to the extreme difficulties it now confronts. Federal power economists believe the utilities also have been too cautious in adding new high-voltage transmission lines that could help meet surge demands in one region with excess power from another.

The utilities assert that they have been blocked in expansion efforts at nearly every turn by the activists and lawsuits of the new "ecological revolution." There is aggressive resistance now even by state and local governments to the air, water and radioactive pollution threats of both conventional and nuclear power plant construction proposals. Esthetic protests have blocked or delayed transmission lines. The trend of environmental opposition is up.

But the Federal Power Commission has never advised the industry that it would need the 25 percent margin of generator capacity that many now agree is essential to withstand sudden air conditioning loads. And while the coal industry has been publicly advertising its failures, the railroads and . . . ? . . utility spokesmen have been minimizing theirs.

Six months ago, A. H. Aymond, president of the biggest utility trade association, the Edison Electric Institute, described as "sheer nonsense" warnings by top coal executives that brownouts and blackouts lay ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project would help close the gap between electrical supply and demand in the East, would reduce the need for voltage reductions and would provide needed insurance against blackouts.

When the House takes up the Public Works appropriations bill on Wednesday, June 24, our distinguished colleague,

the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY) will move to include \$870,000 for the Dickey project.

The project merits our support, and I urge all Members of the House to vote for the money required to move the Dickey project toward construction.

LET'S STOP CONTEMPT FOR THE LAW

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that society's enemies tell us plainly and clearly what they are going to do to tear down society. We may not listen but this time we have been told. And we have already seen the first phase of their plan in operation.

I refer to the plans of those "organized anarchists"—there is no other way to describe them—of SDS, Weathermen, Yippies, and other assorted malcontents, radicals, and revolutionaries who have told us they intend to do everything possible to bring down our society in all respects. I refer most directly to that portion of the plan put into effect at the trial of the Chicago Eight or Seven. These people clearly intend to make it impossible to proceed against them under law, clearly intend to make a mockery of our legal system.

Judge Hoffman, acting under the greatest of provocation, may have made some mistakes. He may have imposed sentences which under applicable law may not be allowed to stand by the appellate courts.

But, instead of "tsk-tsk-ing" all over the place or strongly criticizing or defending Judge Hoffman, we should be doing something to meet the challenge. The immediate problem is what can be done when defendants so disrupt the course of the trial that in all practical effect it cannot continue.

There are two things which can be done and they come together nicely. The first has been clearly authorized by the Supreme Court and it will take an act of Congress to do the other.

In the recent case of Illinois against Allen, the Supreme Court had to decide what to do with an obstreperous defendant who continually shouted obscenities at the judge and even once threw a chair at him. The Court noted that binding and gagging the defendant was permissible but that the action led to a number of problems. The Court further noted that the defendant could be cited for contempt but although this might operate to deter disruptive courtroom conduct a determined defendant might well still engage in such conduct because his trial would be postponed and he might benefit from the postponement. The answer, said the Court, was to put the defendant out of the courtroom and continue the trial without him. He has a constitutional right to be present and to observe his accusers but he can waive that right like

any other and he can be deemed to waive it by his conduct.

Thus, trials can now continue. Disruption will gain no postponement.

But I think we still need the second step. We must make very clear to the "mod revolutionaries" that we will tolerate them little. In the context of the courtroom we can do this by enacting a statute which punishes courtroom disruption. Presumably, a trial judge will suffer for a time a course of disruption before he will put the defendants out of the courtroom, out of a sense of fairplay, a sense entirely lacking in these people. Even the prospects of being taken out of the courtroom will probably not deter their conduct since the purpose of the disruption is to show contempt for legal process and make necessary the imposition of stern measures.

Thus, although the trial will go on, disruptions may continue. Accordingly, yesterday I introduced a bill, H.R. 18156, dealing with such matters, and wish to underline again the need for its enactment. My bill will place a stiff jail sentence and/or a substantial fine on such people. This will necessitate a new trial on these charges which could be disrupted in the same way, but it can be completed in the same way as well and the law would be there with new charges as well.

In other words, a new law would operate both to deter disruption by making the price high and to punish disruption in a substantial, severe fashion.

No constitutional problem exists. Congress can provide for punishing contempt of Federal courts. The procedures used would be identical to Federal criminal procedure in all other trials. Each charge would be on a new and different offense.

Let us act now. The proposal is a modest one to meet a substantial problem. Modest but entirely sufficient. Now is the time to put a stop to the nonsense we saw at Chicago.

THE FOURTH DISTRICT SCHOLARSHIP TRIP

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this week I had the privilege of hosting the second annual Fourth District scholarship trip to Washington. Initiated last year with the help of civic clubs, service organizations, and businessmen in my congressional district, the scholarship program has, on a cumulative basis, enabled 30 high school junior scholars to make a 4-day pilgrimage to their Nation's Capital.

Since their arrival last Sunday morning this year's scholars have visited Mount Vernon, the Iwo Jima Memorial, the National Archives, the Library of Congress, and the Supreme Court. They have attended Peace Corps, State Department, and FBI briefings, and have been oriented on the workings of the congressional committee system.

This afternoon they are attending House and Senate sessions and are meeting with our distinguished majority leader, CARL ALBERT and their equally distinguished Senators from South Carolina, FRITZ HOLLINGS and STROM THURMOND.

Tomorrow, they will have a special tour of the White House, following which they will visit the British Embassy, the Wax Museum, the Smithsonian Institution, and Arlington National Cemetery. In summary, they are getting a firsthand look at our legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government as they exist and in historical perspective.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal today about the alienation of our young people by the so-called establishment. To many of our young people, the establishment is a cold, unapproachable, and unresponsive monster lurking somewhere in the marble jungle of Washington. It is something they read about in the textbooks within the clinical surroundings of a classroom. Otherwise, what they hear tends to substantiate the perverted image of a monster which has unleashed its venom in the form of war, pollution, unemployment, inflation, taxes, repression, and a score of other equally offensive scourges on an undeserving and unsuspecting society.

The purpose of the Fourth District scholarship trip is to slay the monster image, and show our young people that their Government is in fact made up of warmblooded human beings, most of whom are dedicated to solving the problems which we inherited from our forebears.

I am persuaded that this type of exposure to the realities of representative government is essential to the development of an informed, responsible, and viable leadership within our student community.

Before closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the civic clubs, service organizations, and businessmen in my congressional district who made this second annual scholarship trip possible. They are as follows:

J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., sponsor of Diane Phillips of Berea High School and Danny Harris of Ford High School; Rotary Club of Greenville, sponsor of Donald Duncan of Blue Ridge High School and Rickey Moore of Hillcrest High School; Greer Chamber of Commerce, sponsor of Nancy Cox of Greer High School; James F. Daniel, Jr. Post 3, the American Legion, sponsor of Billy Spink, Jr., of Wade Hampton High School; Greer Kiwanis and Greer Exchange Club, cosponsors of Mary Elizabeth Mullinax of James F. Byrnes High School; Hillcrest Optimist Club, sponsor of Rayfield T. Harrison of Carver High School and John "Bubba" Wolfe, Jr., of Spartanburg High School; Monterey Corp., sponsor of Debbie Branch of Cowpens High School; Roebuck Buildings Co., Inc., and Pierce Tractor Co., cosponsors of Phillip K. Sinclair of Paul M. Dorman High School; Clinton Lions Club, sponsor of Timothy G. Prater of Clinton High School; and the Laurens Exchange Club, sponsor of Janice Reynolds of Laurens High School.

POSTAL REFORM ACT

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 and 18, the Wall Street Journal carried two excellent articles regarding the union shop provisions of the Postal Reform Act. I found the Journal's reporting on these issues to be very well done and consider it the clearest analysis of the problem that has been presented in the public press.

For the information of my colleagues, I would like to insert the Journal's articles into the RECORD:

UNION SHOP COULD LICK POSTAL REFORM

(By Byron E. Calame)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon Administration's desire to reorganize the Post Office along business-like lines is putting it in an embarrassing spot with solid Republican businessmen. That's because the Administration is finding it necessary to defend the right of mailmen to demand a union shop.

How did a Republican Administration wind up allied with organized labor on such a touchy issue?

A good measure of the Administration's predicament stems from its appraisal last year of the need to win the support of organized labor for the postal reorganization plan now being debated in the House. The union shop aspects of the House bill were agreed to by Post Office and labor officials in the negotiations that followed last spring's postal strike. Both sides are thus committed to support them. Like President Nixon's original postal reform proposal sent to Congress last year, the current plan gives mailmen the same right to bargain for a union shop agreement that private workers have under the Taft-Hartley act. A union shop is one in which all employees must join the union within a specified time after they are hired.

"If the postal system is to be run on a sound, business-like basis," contends Deputy Postmaster General E. T. Klassen, "its employees must work under the same general rules that are applicable to the private sector of the economy."

THE 1968 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

But the strongly conservative National Right to Work Committee and other foes of the union shop have managed to arouse the ire of significant numbers of Republican businessmen by contrasting the Administration's present stand with the GOP's past positions on compulsory union membership. The committee, for example, has widely reprinted and distributed this excerpt from the 1968 Republican platform:

"We pledge to protect Federal employees in the exercise of their right freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal to form, join or assist any employee organization or to refrain from any such activities."

And the Right to Work Committee fired off letters to every Republican in Congress last week to remind them of this statement. Postmaster General Blount (a former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce) made before the GOP platform committee two years ago: "No free individual should ever be forced to join, or give financial support to, a union . . . in order to get or hold a job. There should be no qualification of the fundamental right to join or not to join a labor organization."

The opponents of the union shop claim they have convinced "a growing number" of GOP Congressmen to abandon the Administration on the issue. The test will come today or tomorrow, when the House votes on an amendment to be offered by Rep. Henderson

(D., N.C.). It would add language to the bill specifically affirming that every postal worker has the right to join or not to join a union.

The charges that Mr. Blount and other Administration officials have departed from traditional Republican principles have apparently been effective. At the moment, Administration allies in the House are gloomy about beating the Henderson amendment. Even if the Administration loses in the House, it will have another chance to push for the union shop provision when the Senate takes up the postal reorganization plan.

"If they can make the argument on the floor that a citizen shouldn't have to join a union to work for his own government, they'll win," predicted a Congressman backing the Administration's bill. "But if they argue it on the basis of unionism versus non-unionism they'll lose."

Rep. Udall (D., Ariz.), who has played a major role in the push for postal reform, has warned that it would be "tragic" and "a mistake of the greatest proportion" for either side of the long-standing right-to-work controversy to try to make the legislation a vehicle for their cause. Nevertheless, Rep. Derwinski (R., Ill.), who also supports postal reorganization, complains "we're almost at the point where nobody's discussing postal reform."

Representatives Udall and Derwinski, with the support of the Administration and organized labor, hope to win approval for a substitute version of the reorganization bill that would replace the much-amended measure cleared by the House Post Office Committee. The substitute, however, takes the same approach toward the union shop issue. Both versions would specifically remove postal employees from the jurisdiction of an Executive order by President Nixon and put them under the Taft-Hartley Act that covers all workers in private sector. The act makes the union shop a bargainable issue in all but the 19 states that have passed their own right-to-work laws.

The basic idea of postal reorganization doesn't appear to be in great danger, though it still isn't completely clear how organized labor might react to approval of the Henderson amendment.

AFL-CIO officials aren't saying publicly what they might do if the right-to-work clause should be added. But some backers of the bill on the Hill claim that they have been informed privately by labor men that the AFL-CIO won't accept the measure with the right-to-work clause in it. And in a rare personal letter to all House members last week, AFL-CIO President George Meany warned that the amendment "would place employees in the postal service under a seriously unfair and discriminatory disability."

Mr. Meany has made it clear that he's firmly committed to winning the collective bargaining beachhead contained in the bill and expanding the principle eventually to all Federal workers. And he is said to see the right to bargain for a "union security" agreement as a key part of the beachhead. Similarly, most postal union officials call this right a "gut issue."

Still, some union leaders admit privately that the immediate impact of the Henderson amendment wouldn't be terribly significant. One major reason: 87% of all post office employees already are union members through the present Executive order governing Federal labor-management relations. The order gives workers complete freedom to join or not to join a union.

Moreover, it would be difficult for postal union chieftains to reverse course and fight the reform proposal just because the right-to-work clause was added to it. Abandoning the provisions in the bill for an 8% pay raise and the right to go to the bargaining table this fall to negotiate additional wage increases for 1971 and 1972 could be extremely hard to explain to some rank-and-filers.

TWO OPPOSING ARGUMENTS

The general outlook for postal reorganization in the Senate appears to be favorable. But the union shop aspect of reform is already evoking threats of a filibuster by such Republicans as Paul Fannin, who warned in a recent Senate speech:

"This U.S. Senator, for one, does not plan to sit idly by and watch the U.S. Congress pass legislation which can require an American citizen to join a union before he can work for his own Government."

Rep. Udall and Post Office officials argue that the union shop provision of the bill would simply bring postal workers up to equal footing with workers in private sector. But as the right-to-work people see it, this is precisely the danger.

Reed Larson, executive vice president of the Right to Work Committee, argues that this "would set a precedent that would have enormous ramifications—and all of them bad. Unquestionably, it would sweep rapidly through the rest of the Federal Government and down to the state and local levels."

Some ardent right-to-work advocates have even predicted that if the Administration bill is passed in its present form, "control of our postal service is bound to pass from the hands of Congress into the hands of the AFL-CIO."

Mr. Blount and other Post Office officials complain that the Right to Work Committee is seeking to make "the public and the Congress believe that the Administration advocates, and the Postal Reorganization Bill proposes, that there be a union shop in the postal service." Declares Mr. Blount: "Utter nonsense."

The rationale for giving postal unions full collective bargaining rights—except for striking—has been spelled out this way by the Post Office's Mr. Klassen: "Postal employees would no longer have to depend on the political climate in Congress for wages and other benefits, but would instead bargain for their rights through the same procedures as the private sector." Under present laws, the wages of mailmen and most other Federal employees are set by Congress; their unions can bargain only about working conditions and other non-pay issues.

Mr. Klassen continues: "Since the thrust of postal reform is toward a complete reorganization along efficient and economical business lines, labor-management relations must come under the jurisdiction of the nation's major labor laws. . . . To do otherwise would be to take the heart out of the reform effort."

Despite this business-oriented pitch, both the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have lined up in opposition to the union shop provisions.

"Instead of postal reform," the Chamber of Commerce said in a June 12 letter to all Congressmen, "we can anticipate that the bill's main effect would be to turn over postal management to the postal unions, and thus erect a permanent obstacle to the modernization and improved use of manpower necessary to provide better postal service. Under such a situation, we could expect nothing more than ever increasing costs and deteriorating service."

A CLEAR-CUT ISSUE

For the National Association of Manufacturers, however, it's a "clear-cut issue of compulsory unionism." The trade group advised its members earlier this month that "The NAM believes the Postal Reform Bill has merit . . . but NAM also believes that no Federal employee should be required to pay union dues or to join a union as a condition of employment."

Backers of the Administration's postal reorganization scheme ruefully credit the persevering efforts of the Right-to-Work Committee with arousing the wrath of such GOP strongholds as the Chamber of Commerce and NAM. But some question why the committee chose to wage its massive drive in the first place.

Rep. Udall told his House colleagues recently that he found himself "wondering" about that. "I don't know the answer, but I suspect it may have something to do with fund-raising," he said. "After all, if businessmen are frightened into believing 'compulsory unionism' is on the march, they're more likely to contribute generously to the organization that is leading the fight against it."

Mr. Larson denies the suggestion of opportunism on the committee's part. "We've been hammering away on it for a year," he claims. His assessment: "Blount was naive. He thought he had to have it (the right to bargain for a union shop) to get union support, but he misjudged the situation."

All of which is perhaps a back-handed tribute to the bargaining ability of organized labor and AFL-CIO boss Meany.

POSTAL-REFORM BILL GETS RIGHT-TO-WORK CLAUSE ATTACHED IN HOUSE VOTE

WASHINGTON.—The House attached a "right-to-work" amendment to a pending postal reform bill, giving mailmen the privilege of declining to join unions that would bargain with a proposed new postal service.

The nonrecord 179-95 vote theoretically is subject to reversal on a later roll call, but the heavy margin indicates it almost certainly will be included in the bill the House finally sends the Senate.

The House action would torpedo a key part of the bargain reached by the Nixon Administration and AFL-CIO postal unions after the postal strike last March. That agreement resulted in vital union support for the Administration's plan to reorganize the Post Office into a semi-independent service within the Executive Branch.

The section the House struck from the bill would allow unions to bargain with the new postal service for a union-shop arrangement. A union shop requires employees to join a union after they're hired.

Despite strong Administration backing for the union-shop clause, almost all House Republicans voted for the "right-to-work" amendment offered by Rep. Henderson (D., N.C.). Proponents argued that the amendment was necessary to avoid opening the way for "compulsory unionism" for postal employees.

The National Right to Work Committee was instrumental in mustering House support for the Henderson amendment. In letters to Congressmen, the committee pointedly noted past Republican pledges for "right-to-work" arrangements for Government employees.

Opponents of the "right-to-work" plan argued futilely that approval of the Henderson amendment would jeopardize union support for the overall postal-reform plan. They maintained that postal unions were giving up their access to Congress for pay raises by supporting the reorganization plan and thus should have the right to bargain with the postal service for union-shop arrangements like unions in private industry.

The House didn't complete action yesterday on the complex postal reorganization bill, but will resume work today. One amendment that would have gutted the entire reform plan was defeated 105-to-57.

THE CRISIS IN HEALTH CARE

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the burgeoning crisis in the Nation's health care programs will not be helped by the President's action yesterday in vetoing the measure passed by the Congress to provide \$2.7 billion for new and improved

hospital construction which is so badly needed.

Just how the White House sense of priority works these days is an ever-increasing mystery to me. The \$2.7 billion authorized in the measure Mr. Nixon vetoed will, I am sure, ultimately cost us \$5 billion when we do finally get around to building these absolutely essential facilities. All of us in this House know that postponement of essential construction of this nature is just bound to cost more money when we ultimately start to break ground. We are going to have to have these new and improved facilities and so, the sooner we begin the better. Unfortunately, the President's action yesterday will delay this badly needed program and in my judgment will ultimately cost the taxpayers of the country more money.

Another equally important aspect of the Nation's health care crisis is in the field of medical education and manpower training. Some weeks ago one of the major networks featured in a news documentary program a profile of this particular mounting problem. I had the good fortune to watch that show and it frankly crystallized for me the nature and scope of the crisis we face. I probably need not tell Members of this House that the education process for physicians is indeed long, complex, and an expensive process. A surprising statistic that was made available to me was that in the academic year of 1968-69, the total enrollment of students in American medical schools was only 35,000. This figure, of course, did not include M.D.'s currently in the process of improving their medical knowledge in specialized areas. We simply have to have more physicians and more health-related professionals.

Medical education is, of course, not conducted at a medical school alone. Rather, it occurs in a hospital or medical center. The hospital and medical centers are responding by shouldering greater costs and responsibilities in educating and turning out those needed professionals. The number of medical students admitted to the first year in 1969 was 1,000 greater than that just 3 years ago. This is expansion, but it is not fast enough. Increases in interns, residents and clinical postgraduates will also occur in the immediate future. But the burden will fall on the same hospitals and medical centers that have been trying to cope with these rising demands for years and at the same time provide increased community health care service. However, in the meantime, the income to support these absolutely vital facilities has not risen. It has actually declined. In these centers, there is often no income for the support of the training of interns and residents. Endowment income, student fees, and private contributions have appeared to be drying up in recent years and the proportion of these sources of revenue has dropped precipitously.

This brings me to the real point, support for increased medical education and manpower training will simply have to be borne by the Federal Government. I stress this since Mr. Nixon's statement with regard to his veto specifically stated that new construction and improved facilities could be accomplished by some system of Government-guar-

anted loans from private sources rather than from direct Federal grant programs. I categorically disagreed. In my view, the progress that we have made over the last 10 or 15 years has been due, primarily, to the awareness within the Congress and past administrations that what was needed in this area of health care, was a massive Federal commitment backed up by appropriations.

The hospitals and medical centers in this country today simply cannot make it with a system of guaranteed loans. They need direct help and they need it now. In support of this point, I will include at the conclusion of my remarks a recent article which appeared in the *Baltimore Sun* commenting on the situation at the famous Johns Hopkins School of Medicine in my fair city of Baltimore. According to the reports that I have received from Hopkins, they are currently facing the worst financial crisis in the history of this renowned institution.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our badly strained medical education system in this country has already reached the bottom of the barrel in trying to find ways of meeting this mounting financial crisis. What is needed now are not more vetoes and pious sayings about the availability of financing in the private sector but a turning back to the proven ways of the past. I, of course, mean a massive recommitment on the part of this Congress to provide the funds required now for our medical education system and a gearing up for those future needs that we all know are just around the corner. I shall have more to say on this subject in the days that lie ahead.

The *Baltimore Sun* article referred to follows:

CRISIS IN HEALTH—III: HOPKINS IN WORST SHAPE EVER

(By Frederick P. McGehan)

The Johns Hopkins School of Medicine is in the worst financial shape in its 77-year history.

For the current fiscal year it faces a deficit of \$910,000. A \$2,233,980 deficit has been predicted for the fiscal year beginning July 1.

One of the nation's leading medical and research centers, the Hopkins lost \$1.5 million in federal support during the past year for projects that were either not renewed or severely cut back. The school also lost about \$440,000 in grants supporting the post-doctoral education of medical students.

LION'S SHARE

About \$20 million of the Hopkins \$32 million annual budget comes from the federal sector.

The University of Maryland School of Medicine is termed in "bad" financial shape but, because of continuing state support, it has not been put under as severe a strain as the Hopkins.

In the biggest single cut, the University of Maryland lost \$440,000 in federal support for a 10-bed clinical research center. School officials are now deciding whether to proceed with a scaled-down project.

The state school has also experienced cuts up to 20 per cent in federally supported research projects; although a precise total is not available, fiscal officials estimate these cuts will total more than \$200,000.

In the past school year, the University of Maryland had student requests for \$500,000 in loan and scholarship aid; the school was able to fund only \$317,000 of this. A similar picture looms next year.

Similarly, the Hopkins had scholarship and loan requests this past year totaling \$750,000; because of decreased federal support it could fill only \$350,000 of these requests.

In a recent interview, Dr. David E. Rogers, dean of the Hopkins medical school, clearly indicated that the school cannot continue to sustain sharp financial losses without drastic consequences.

USES ENDOWMENT

Noting that the Hopkins has been offsetting its losses by using endowment funds, Dr. Rogers said the school's board of trustees "won't stand for this very long."

"We are going to have to retrench at a time when retrenchment is a disaster on the national health scene," he said.

Some retrenchment has already begun. Dr. Rogers said about six faculty members have been laid off and another 12 positions will remain unfilled when the faculty members leave. "There are a number of areas where we would like to initiate new programs, and we can't," the dean said. He mentioned a medical scientist training program and curriculum reforms designed to reduce class sizes and offer more electives as examples of programs that are "sitting dead in the water."

HOSPITAL DEFICIT

The impact on the medical school is also being felt in the Johns Hopkins Hospital, which is currently running a \$1.5 million deficit.

The hospital, Dr. Rogers noted, "desperately needs" a new emergency room and new ambulatory care and obstetrical units. "Here," he said, "the crunch is the inadequate payment for services rendered."

Dr. Rogers also expressed deep concern about the Hopkins' research programs, many of which have brought the institution international fame.

"It takes 15 to 20 years to build up a biomedical team, we can disassemble it very fast if we can't support it," he said.

Dr. Rogers expressed fear that "we might wipe out a whole generation of biomedical researchers." If this happens, he said, "we could really be in for the Dark Ages."

He said the school is "trying desperately" to get outside sources of funding.

One of the school's main thrusts is to obtain support from the state, as have schools in six other states recently.

In a recent letter to Blair Lee 3d, the Maryland secretary of state who handles education matters for the Mandel administration, Dr. Rogers said "this possibility of state aid at this medical school is exploring the time because it is facing a financial crisis, caught between static or diminishing support and sharp increases in cost."

DOCTORS WHO STAYED

To offset contentions that Hopkins doctors do not stay in the state after their educations, Dr. Rogers said 2,284 physicians residing in the state have received part or all of their training at the Hopkins.

He noted that the state of Ohio recently granted support to Case Western Reserve Medical School in the form of \$4,000 per capita grants to students over two years.

"Our situation is very similar to that of Western Reserve. We are the only private medical school in a state which has only two schools of medicine. Thus, we represent a major medical resource in our ability to attract and supply a continuous source of physicians to the state of Maryland," he told Mr. Lee.

FEDERAL ATTENTION

In a recent interview, Dr. Rogers expressed concern that the Hopkins and other medical schools will receive little attention from the Nixon administration.

"From what I've been able to see, support of the medical school base has a pretty low priority in the current administration," he said, adding: "It may take the closing of

several medical schools to get the national administration to take notice."

This pessimistic outlook is shared by Dr. Rogers' West Baltimore counterpart, Dr. John H. Moxley 3d, dean of the University of Maryland Medical School.

Dr. Moxley, in a separate interview, noted that, on one hand, the Nixon administration is pressuring the nation's medical schools to turn out more doctors and to offer more opportunities to minority groups.

"At the same time, on the other hand, it is slowly turning off the flow from funds to medical centers," Dr. Moxley said. "It is this dichotomy that is putting an awful, awful squeeze on medical schools in this country," he added.

Dr. Moxley also expressed fears that one or more medical schools may have to close down before the situation is taken seriously. If this happens, he predicted that society will demand reforms in the methods of financing schools.

"It is a pity that you have to go that route to come up with a rational solution," he said.

THE MILITARY DRAFT—THE ROOT OF STUDENT DISSENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the need for comprehensive draft reform was well documented this past Sunday in the *Washington Post* in an article entitled, "Draft Sired Youth Revolt," by Samuel Lubell. Mr. Lubell cites a 35-percent jump from 1,401,000 18-year-olds in 1964 to 1,897,000 the following year as the greatest single factor which has made today's youth a truly revolutionary generation.

Mr. Lubell points out that the population explosion occurred in the same year that President Johnson plunged America deeper into the Vietnam quagmire, bringing to the forefront each young man's personal confrontation with the draft and the possibility that he might be told by his country that he must travel halfway around the world to kill people in a war he does not understand or support.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not one accepts Mr. Lubell's thesis that this population explosion and the resulting confrontation with the draft is the root of student dissent today, one cannot deny the fact that the military draft is a major issue and one that has caused much confusion and disillusionment in this country. Complete reform of the draft is urgently needed.

I have introduced the National Service Act of 1970—H.R. 18025—with a bipartisan support. This bill will completely replace the Selective Service System with a new plan which will give a young man of 18 three choices:

One, to volunteer for military service; or

Two, to volunteer for civilian service as an alternative; or

Three, to volunteer for a draft lottery.

This plan would enable any young man who feels strongly about military service to serve in a useful civilian capacity for a period of up to 4 years. Not only does this plan meet many of the objec-

tions to an all-volunteer army by retaining a lottery but it assures a much needed pool of manpower to perform work in areas where manpower is now short or unavailable.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate my hope and expectation that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will meet his commitment to hold comprehensive hearings on the draft in this session of Congress. It is essential that we not let this opportunity to enact meaningful reforms pass.

The text of Mr. Lubell's article follows:

DRAFT Sired YOUTH REVOLT

(By Samuel Lubell)

(Lubell is an author and journalist who has covered every presidential campaign since 1952 by interviewing people. The following is excerpted by permission from his new book, "The Hidden Crisis in American Politics," to be published this month by W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.)

When the story of the Johnson Administration comes to be written, at least the more kindly disposed historians may marvel at his incredibly bad luck in deciding in 1965, of all years, to plunge the nation into a deeper Vietnam conflict.

No worse year could have been selected for such an action. For 1965 was destined to mark the emergence of a new political force, one which in the three years that followed was to disrupt hundreds of colleges and university campuses, undercut support for the war, split the Democratic Party and contribute to Mr. Johnson's decision not to seek re-election.

Homer would have blamed the behavior of his Greek gods for this preordained rigging of history. Actually, what was responsible was the intimate behavior of earthlings—specifically, of those millions of GIs who returned home from World War II in 1946 and promptly married, and whose wives almost as promptly—in 1947—began babies in record numbers.

Exactly 18 years later, the number of males reaching draft age leaped spectacularly. The 1964 count of 18-year-old males stood at roughly 1,401,000. Just one year later, the figure had jumped 35 per cent, to 1,897,000, continuing at roughly that level in the years after.

More than any other single factor, it is this spectacular increase in sheer numbers that has given this generation its distinctive stamp, making it the human carrier of so many diverse unrests and giving it an almost instinctive predisposition: if in doubt, change.

Because of their numbers, almost everything that happened to them was to have a chain reaction effect. The Vietnam war was to agitate them into a unifying grievance against society; their numbers were to render tragically obsolete the form of draft that was in operation; with 34 per cent of all 18- to 21-year-olds attending college, our institutions of higher education had to expand and change. These youths were also to constitute a sufficiently large commercial market so that it was profitable to sensationalize them as a self-conscious subculture.

For some years to come, these numbers will continue to generate pressures for entry into society, for new types of careers, new standards—or lack of standards—of personal behavior, new concepts of politics.

A CLEAR WARNING

With the draft, if ever a crisis could have been averted, this was it. The births after World War II warned unmistakably of the approach of a profusion of males far beyond any foreseeable military needs. In 1962, in fact, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ordered a study of how the draft should be changed.

But the Pentagon manpower planners, reasoning that the situation was "not expected to become acute for two to three years," contented themselves with requesting mere renewal of the Selective Service Act unchanged.

This failure to adjust the draft in 1963 can be said to mark the beginning of our youth crisis. The absence of draft reform would mean that when our involvement in Vietnam deepened, for every young man taken into the service, three to four times as many would feel they had to find ways of evading the draft, postponing career decisions and building up resentments against society.

These grievances would enable tiny minorities of student agitators, often fewer than a hundred on a campus, to radicalize a sizable part of all college students across the country. Antidraft sit-ins and other "peace" demonstrations were to bare the critical weaknesses of our universities—from the lack of authority of college presidents to faculty desires to be considered as "the university" but not to bear the responsibility of running it—inviting further student onslaughts and even armed upheaval at Cornell and San Francisco State.

Curiously, through all these happenings, the same unchanging label of "generation gap" was usually employed to caption what was going on. From the beginning, it has been a misleading concept that blocked understanding of the nature of the youth crisis. For one thing, the term implied that the basic trouble was a clash between two generations, of young people differing so much from their elders that they could not communicate with one another.

But the crisis has never been one of communication or "alienation." The real gap has been a "fitting into society" gap; of how a particularly populous generation, while resisting an unpopular war, was to mature and find entry into society.

By 1968, most of the public saw the campus disorders as a defiance of reason. Some persons said sympathetically, "I can understand why students protest against the war" or "They seem to want better teachers." But generally the tactics of disruptive dissent had shouted down whatever sympathy people might have felt or any merit they might have seen in these demonstrations.

THREE DISTINCT GROUPS

Why should a politics of physical violence—seemingly the very antithesis of rational behavior—take hold at, of all places, our leading intellectual centers? Much of the mystery evaporates if one examines who these campus rebels were and how they were brought together.

From interviews spread over four years with more than 1,100 students at 37 college campuses, one can identify at least three distinct streams of protest among the students who described themselves as part of the "New Left."

1. Easily the most important single stream was the sons and daughters of onetime socialists, Communists and other leftists. These students comprised the organizing core for the Students for a Democratic Society; they also supplied the "revolutionary" ideology and tactics.

2. Sizable numbers of "draft insurgents" arose, concerned primarily with protesting against the war. Their interviews reveal no evidence of politicalism until our involvement in Vietnam.

3. Lastly, there were the "career rebels" who rejected moneymaking pursuits in favor of "working with people and ideas"; quite often they had businessmen fathers.

The hippies, overpublicized because their long hair and masquerade clothing make such good TV copy, have not been especially important politically.

The real drama of campus rebellion has revolved around the fusing of the old Marxist addiction for playing at revolution with the

current grievances of the draft insurgents and career rebels.

The offspring of the old-time leftists—Staughton Lynd and Bettina Aptheker come to mind as two much-publicized examples—can hardly be pointed to as evidence of a "generation gap." Far from being in family revolt, these students were projecting the radicalism of their parents.

The sense of grievance that animated these radicals did not originate in any current performance of our society, nor was it caused by the war, nor could any possible restructuring of the universities satisfy them. For them, the specific issue of agitation was less vital than to be "agin" something.

This "agin something" desire would probably have remained a minor nuisance if the war and draft had not developed as "the cause" to agitate the students generally. I recall how gloomy the head of the SDS chapter at the University of Texas was during the winter of 1965.

He talked sadly of the small SDS membership and said, "We protest against anything that comes up, hoping to find some issue that will arouse the students." He was particularly depressed because an SDS effort to organize draft card burnings and a "strike" against the draft had fizzled that October not only in Texas but across the nation.

At that time, our Vietnam policy was supported by two of every three students interviewed, which was no different from the sentiment of the public generally.

The first draft demonstrations were regarded by most students as more of an emotional outburst than a political revolt. In response to the question, "What kind of students take part in these demonstrations?" nearly everyone distinguished three types of participants:

Some demonstrators were pictured as "sincere" or even "rampant idealists." Others were dismissed because "they're trying to avoid the draft, that's all." Still others were termed "just hangers-on out for kicks."

At New York University, a 20-year old co-ed had been invited by a classmate to a demonstration. She recalled: "I asked him, 'What are you demonstrating against?'"

"He said: 'You name it. We'll march for a couple of hours, then get a six-pack and go over to so-and-so's and talk about truth.'"

"Oh," I replied. "You mean you want a cheap date."

The first of the draftcard burnings were denounced by college presidents and prominent public officials, including former President Eisenhower. Some students were fearful that the demonstrations might bring a draft crackdown on students generally, and others were so angered that they donated blood or marched in parades in support of President Johnson's policy.

Still, even though there was little open opposition to the war in 1965, as I went from campus to campus I was struck by how demoralizing an impact the draft was having. At every college, students talked openly of how "I'm here to avoid the draft." To hang on in school, many were taking courses they disliked or in which they had little interest.

Since only a small proportion of the available males could be taken, Selective Service had been extremely liberal in granting deferments to anyone going to college. One effect, though, was that many of the students felt themselves draft evaders. This often stirred a sense of guilt or exaggerated attacks on society beyond the campus, as if the students were seeking to justify their own withdrawal.

At Berkeley, one group of activists was expounding on how "cold, cruel and impersonal" business was. One Iowan said, "I worked for business for two years. All I found was that it was boring."

The antisociety phobias stirred by the draft were also being fed by widespread political restiveness and a groping search for new careers. At every campus, two conflicting trends of political change were going on.

One in every 11 students from Democratic families was becoming more conservative and switching to the Republicans. Generally these converts came from poorer families—they were sons or daughters of an Akron rubber worker, of a bookbinder in New York, a policeman in Providence, a shoemaker in Chicago, a tenant farmer near Memphis, a steelworker in Pittsburgh, a union organizer in Richmond.

All were targeted toward professional or business careers and believed that "a man ought to make his own way without government help." These Republican converts were particularly numerous in the South, where backgrounds of family hardship generated a philosophy of competitive individualism.

Among students with Republican parents, in contrast, one in seven had turned Democrat, socialist or anarchist. This leftist trend centered almost entirely around the offspring of middle-class and well-to-do families. Among them were the son of a real estate developer in Los Angeles, a geological consultant in Oklahoma, a wholesale druggist in Baltimore and a purchasing agent in Battle Creek.

Generally they talked of wanting careers in public employment, college teaching or university research, or of "working with people." Often these students resented bitterly their fathers' business occupations, protesting, "I don't want to just make money like my father" or "I couldn't stand dog-eat-dog competition."

There they were, three outpourings of protest waiting to be brought together—those rebelling against the careers of their fathers, the draft protesters and the SDS radicals looking for some cause to agitate. The catalyst that united them was the intensified opposition to the war in the whole country.

DRAFT BECOMES TARGET

By the winter of 1966, in my second round of interviewing, faculty members and college administrators were protesting publicly against the war and were often encouraging the SDS in its demonstrations. Possibly because the Selective Service Act was coming up for renewal in 1967, the draft had become the main target of protest, with students and faculty pushing a well-organized campaign to kill the draft and replace it with a volunteer army.

Student comments were also more ideological than a year earlier. The war and the draft were being attacked not simply as "immoral" but as evidence of "a sick society" and of "a system that has to be changed."

Capitalizing on these antiwar sentiments, the SDS pressed demonstrations against Dow Chemical, Army and Navy recruiting, ROTC, defense research and anything else that could be made to stink of "war." When students were asked if the demonstrations were Communist-led, the common response was, "Maybe some Communists are involved," but that didn't trouble the students, since fighting the draft was their own personal battle.

Each succeeding year, as war resistance intensified, the radicalizing process cut deeper. Each year also brought some students closer to the end of their education—and closer, perhaps, to the war they hated.

Early in 1966, a Columbia College freshman had urged escalating the Vietnam bombing because "it's to our national interest to stay in Southeast Asia." He talked of becoming a business economist and a Republican even though "my parents vote for any Democrat."

A year later he had changed sufficiently so that he thought, "We should get out of Vietnam." At that time it seemed that student deferments were to be ended and a lottery taking 19-year-olds put into effect instead.

"Being at the most draftable age," he said, "I'd rather the draft stay as it is." He also revealed he had begun smoking marijuana for the first time.

By April, 1968, he was one of the militants who seized the Columbia University buildings. He no longer wanted to become a busi-

ness economist, saying, "I'm completely undecided about my career."

FOCUS ON SENIORS

At campus after campus, the forests were dry and ready for burning and the hardcore radicals were playing with matches. Throughout the 1967-68 school year, my interviewing caught this tightening of emotional tensions.

The draft law that had been passed July 2, 1967, had aggravated the situation. Congress had changed the law so that on graduation, seniors would be drafted first along with graduate students, whose deferments had been cut off.

By shifting the immediate burden of being drafted to seniors, the law solidified the anger of whole graduating classes. Moreover, these were the older students, including much of the non-radical leadership, who normally should have exerted a stabilizing influence on the younger collegians. Instead, they became among the more impatient and belligerent of the student leaders.

The 1967-8 school year had also brought an abrupt upsurge in Negro militancy, adding a new dimension to the crisis in the universities. In the early war years, Negro students had been much less opposed to the war than white students, stronger for the draft, and twice as many felt the patriotism was important.

But the rioting in the summer of 1967 swung many of them to black militancy. Also, the debate on draft reform had given considerable publicity to the fact that more Negroes—in proportion to their share of the population—were fighting in Vietnam than whites. And the new draft law, in granting all college students a four-year deferment, actually sharpened the discrimination against Negroes who couldn't get to college.

During the spring of 1967, two-thirds of the Negroes interviewed answered yes to the question, "Is it right for the government to draft young men?" That fall, only half of them replied yes.

A welder's son, a 20-year-old sophomore at CCNY, had urged a step-up in the Vietnam fighting when first interviewed. On the draft he had said, "Everyone should serve at one time or the other."

In September, 1967, though, he wanted to pull out of Vietnam and bitterly denounced the draft as "a system where the majority of white youths are deferred because they're in school, but blacks are excluded from the system and get drafted."

Earlier he had talked of becoming a teacher. When reinterviewed he said, "I want to go into law." Asked the reason for the change, he replied: "As a lawyer, I'll know what I can get away with. I want a gun. A lawyer will know how to get around it."

This militancy of the black college students marked an agonizing new turn in the crisis of the universities. Many college administrators had consoled themselves that the war would end sometime. With peace, they daydreamed, student radicalism would die out. But after 1968, these administrators faced the more forbidding prospect of the universities being turned into a battleground for the nation's racial conflict.

One question naturally arises: Why did this steady process of student radicalization go unchecked for so long? What SDS was up to was always clear; so was the urgent need for draft reform. Yet every inaction and action of the university administrators only aggravated the difficulties, as did the changes made in the 1967 draft law.

Let us look at the draft first, and then at how the crisis at the universities changed.

On May 13, 1969, President Nixon requested Congress to revise the draft law to limit a youth's exposure to just one year. On reaching his 19th birthday, a young man could let his name go into the lottery pool and, if not selected, would be clear of draft vulnerability unless a major war broke out. Or, at 19, he could take a college deferment for four years

and then have his name dropped into the lottery pool for a year.

Had the proposal been enacted into law in 1967, much of the campus turmoil, including the seizure of the buildings at Columbia, might never have happened.

What has been happening to our universities provides some insights into how dangerous leaving a crisis unresolved can be to a democratic society. During the early Vietnam years, much was written about how the student generation had become "alienated" by the size to which universities had grown, by professors preoccupied with research leaving the teaching to youthful assistants and by students being treated as IBM cards instead of warm, loving bodies.

These and other practices probably needed reforming and later were to become active issues. But at first, my interviewing was damaging to student psyches or that they were a significant cause of campus turmoil. What was rocking the campus lay beyond the university walls and out of reach, in the war and the draft.

Still, at some point in a crisis that remains unresolved, frustrations apparently build up to a point where something has to give, and the crisis takes a new form. This seems to have happened at Columbia in 1968 with the SDS seizure of the university buildings and the administration's decision to bring the issue to a showdown. When the use of the police to clear the buildings split the faculty, student unrest turned into a double crisis, going beyond resistance to the war and the draft to envelop the university as well.

THE "RESTRUCTURING" THEME

The immediate issue in the new crisis which spread across the country centered around the university's ability to keep order on its campus, with or without the police, with a united or divided faculty. At Columbia, the commission headed by Archibald Cox which investigated the campus disorders picked up the thought of "restructuring the university" that had been advanced while the students were on strike. This became a common theme at other campuses as student pressures intensified.

Across the country, schools began yielding up some rule or ritual: a relaxation of curfew hours, wider student participation in faculty meetings, new courses, even the resignation of a university president.

These actions bought time for some schools but could hardly cool student impatience with the war and the draft. Nor have the "restructurings" been directed toward the deeper crisis that lies ahead of our colleges and universities.

At stake, of course, is what kind of intellectual legacy our universities will be able to pass on to future generations. On that score, it is intriguing to note that the professional schools, such as those in medicine and engineering, have remained quiet through nearly all of the campus disorders, while the agitations and uproar have been most intense among students in the liberal arts and social sciences.

What needs restructuring is the fragmented manner in which the knowledge and teaching of the arts of self-government are organized. Unfortunately, the individual faculties—government, sociology, psychology, etc.—are the equivalent of craft unions and aren't structured to present a comprehensive, unified approach to governing ourselves.

Black studies agitation will be bringing onto the campuses the pressures of another unresolved conflict that divides the nation. The black cause will probably prove a positive attraction for many white students. At Harvard Law School, nearly a third of the students do some kind of legal assistance work in the slums of Cambridge and Boston. Similar involvements are found at most schools in or near a major city.

Politically, we are likely to see some merging of black militancy and university radicalism. Any such alliance or coalition will

also be markedly antiwar and antisociety, embracing faculty members as well as students.

Many faculties are ideologically split between those professors who believe a university should stick to education and research and the more "activist" professors who think the university has a positive mission to remake society. The activists are unlikely to accept a quiet role for the university without a fight which could polarize much of academia.

UPBRINGING IMPORTANT

The antiwar feelings of many of the students have been converted into a general hostility toward society. How long these antagonisms endure will hinge, I suspect, on two main influences: what kind of family upbringing they have had, and what happens to them when they leave school and go into "the world outside."

My interviews reveal that resistance to radical action largely reflects the strength of the self-restraints that have been lodged within a student by his family upbringing. Often in discussions of the so-called "generation gap," parents have been pictured as being virtually obsolete. Actually, almost no restraint they planted in their children was without some continuing effect.

Among the "quiet majority" of students at every campus visited I found fewer non-religious students, less of a tendency to smoke pot and more of a feeling that self-discipline is a virtue on its own. The non-activists were also more definite in their career choices than the radicals, many of whom had no idea of what vocations they wanted to follow.

But even among the nonactivists, the generational trend is toward greater permissiveness. Of the students interviewed, only a fifth said their parents were "not religious," but half of the same students described themselves as "not religious." This suggests that within one generation, the proportion of "not religious" has almost doubled.

Nor is a strict childhood upbringing any longer the norm among college-going families. Only a fifth of the students interviewed reported having had a strict upbringing. Of these, a third would raise their own children more freely, which suggests that further liberalization is likely.

Such changes underscore the importance of what will happen when these students leave school. Will the outside world stabilize them? Will they change society?

Perhaps the most revealing single question to ask any young person is, "What career or occupation do you intend to follow, and how does that compare with what your father does?" The responses leave little doubt that the choice of vocation operates as both the carrier of a young person's sense of economic self-interest and as a major force shaping the way he identifies with the future, both economically and politically.

The predictable consistency with which career change links up with political change largely reflects the economic imagery attached to our political parties by students generally.

Whatever their political learnings—whether they are Democrats, Republicans or shifters—the students agree in viewing the Republicans as "the party of business" and the "advantaged class," as cool to government spending and welfare, conservative and slow to accept change. The Democrats are seen primarily as the party of welfare and government spending, as "liberal" and eager to push for social change.

When a student breaks from his parents' party allegiance, it is almost always in terms of this party symbolism. To many older voters, the main conflict between the major parties is that of labor against business. But with college students, the crucial political divider seems to have become whether one

identifies with the public or the private sector of the economy, a division which was evident in interviewing I did as early as 1962.

At every college visited, the sons and daughters of Democrats turning Republican were motivated by an upward economic drive and a bent toward conservatism. In contrast, the offspring of Republican fathers who were swinging Democratic were aiming for careers in government service, teaching at the university level or varied forms of research, social welfare and psychology.

The importance of career selection in determining party choice is underscored by those students who say they are "undecided" politically. Most of them turn out to be either undecided about the vocation they intend to follow or unclear about whether they will be working for private industry or in the public sector.

It is not surprising to find so high a degree of career uncertainty among the student political activists. A career is the door through which a student walks out into the adult world, and many campus radicals have not wanted to open that door.

Of every 10 New Left students interviewed, four wanted to stay on in college teaching, three talked of careers such as psychology, art or journalism while three more were undecided about what they wanted to do.

THE 22D ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION OF POLISH AMERICAN VETERANS OF MASSACHUSETTS HELD AT WILBRAHAM: JOHN J. MASTALERZ OF SPRINGFIELD ELECTED STATE COMMANDER

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 22d annual State convention of the Polish American Veterans of Massachusetts was held at Wilbraham in my Second Congressional District during the weekend of June 5, 6, 7.

Two of my good friends from the host Wilbraham post were elected to State office. They were John J. Mastalerz of Springfield, who was elected State commander, and Frank J. Morawiec of Ludlow who was elected junior vice commander—west.

The Polish American Veterans, brought together in 1948, now have more than 10,000 members throughout the State of Massachusetts alone.

The convention adopted several resolutions, including requests that the President and Members of the U.S. Congress take more positive and firm action against those who desecrate the flag, and more vigorous prosecution of those who purposely evade military service.

It was an honor for me to be the principal speaker at the Saturday night banquet held June 6 at the host post of the Polish-American Veterans and Auxiliary of Wilbraham, Mass. I was also pleased to have bestowed upon me the position of honorary State commander.

It is with great pride that the Polish American Veterans of Massachusetts serve their respective communities in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I have included with my remarks the Springfield Sunday Republican story of June 7, 1970, concerning the 22d annual convention of the Polish American Veterans of Massachusetts, the

convention program, the officers of the host Wilbraham Post and its auxiliary, a short history of the Polish American Veterans of Massachusetts, and my address to the convention:

POLISH AMERICAN VETERANS ELECT MASTALERZ AS STATE COMMANDER

Two Wilbraham Post men were elected to state office at the 22d annual state convention of the Polish American Veterans this weekend at the Wilbraham post.

John J. Mastalerz of Springfield was elected state commander and Frank J. Morawiec of Ludlow was elected junior vice-commander—west. The organization has 10,000 members throughout the state.

The convention adopted several resolutions, including requests that the President, and the members of the U.S. Congress take "more positive and firm action" against those who desecrate the flag, and "more vigorous prosecution of those who purposely evade military service."

The convention also lauded the Wilbraham Post Commander, and former state commander, Michael Rostkowski, and his committee for their successful effort in establishing the Kosciuszko Garden at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

U.S. Rep. Edward P. Boland was main speaker at the banquet Saturday night. He was named honorary state commander. Other speakers were Mayor Frank Freedman, State Sens. Stanley Zard and Philip Quinn, and State Reps. David Vigneault, Steven Chmura and Rudy Chmura.

Today, the delegates will attend memorial Masses at Christ the King Church, Ludlow and at Immaculate Conception Church, Indian Orchard. There will be a parade and a picnic at the Wilbraham Post to wind up the convention.

CONVENTION PROGRAM

FRIDAY, JUNE 5

Registration, 12:00 noon.
Open House, 7:00 p.m. to 8:15 p.m.
Dancing, 7:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m.—Music by Melody Minors.

SATURDAY, JUNE 6

Registration, 9:00 a.m.
Business Meeting, 9:30 a.m.—Main Ballroom.
Auxiliary Meeting, 9:30 a.m.—Lower Hall.
Delegates Luncheon, 1:00 p.m.
Banquet, 6:00 p.m.—Main Ballroom.
Banquet Speaker, Honorable Edward P. Boland, U.S. Congressman.
Convention Ball, to 1:00 a.m.—Main Ballroom.

SUNDAY, JUNE 7

Memorial Mass for Father Radzik, 6:00 a.m.—Christ the King Church, Ludlow, Mass.
Convention Memorial Mass, 10:00 a.m.—Immaculate Conception Church, Indian Orchard, Mass.

Assemble at P.A.V. Club at 9:15 a.m. Convention assembly time: 12:00 noon. Convention Parade: 1:00 p.m. sharp. Polish Style Picnic at the P.A.V. grounds next to Home Post Headquarters (after parade).

BANQUET PROGRAM

Posting of Colors: Edward Moninski State Commander.

National Anthem: Hedwiga S. Kochanowski.

Installation of Officers: Edward Moninski, State Commander.

Installation of Auxiliary Officers: Nellie Lisak, State President.

Invocation: Rev. Edward S. Nicewicz, State Chaplain.

DINNER

Address of Welcome: Michael Rostkowski, Post Commander.

Introduction of General Chairman and Master of Ceremonies: Theodore Piwowarczyk.

Presentation of Awards and Citation: Ed. Moninski, State Commander.
Presentation of Citation: By Incoming State Commander.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Wieloch of Indian Orchard: State Senator Stanley Zarod.
Rev. Xavier Baranowski of Ludlow: State Senator Phil Quinn.

Selectman William Sullivan, Jr. of Wilbraham: State Representative Dave Vigneault.

Selectman William Avezzie of Ludlow: State Representative Steve Chmura.

Mayor Frank H. Freedman of Springfield: State Rep. Rudy Chmura.

GUEST SPEAKERS

Remarks: Maurice Donahue, President of Massachusetts Senate.

Remarks: Thaddeus Buczek, State Auditor.

Principal Address: The Honorable Edward P. Boland, Member of the United States House of Representatives.

Benediction: Right Rev. Msgr. John Wieloch.

Polish National Anthem: Hedwiga S. Kuchanowski.

OFFICERS FOR 1970

President: Michael Rostkowski.
First Vice-President: Frank Ostrowski.
Second Vice-President: John Pluta.
Recording Secretary: Walter J. Midura.
Financial Secretary: John Mastalerz.
Treasurer: John Chmura.
Service Officer: Edward A. Neils.
Board of Directors: Stanley Bernatowicz, Ted Hudyka, Ed Sidur, Longin Jachym.
Historian: Stanley Strycharz.
Custodian: Henry Sidor.
Sergeant-at-Arms: Adam Labaj, Stanley Chwalek.

AUXILIARY OFFICERS FOR 1970

President: Mildred Kielbania.
Vice-President: Ursula Jashym.
Treasurer: Rita Chmura.
Financial Secretary: Helen Mastalerz.
Recording Secretary: Betty Hudyka.
Sergeant-at-Arms: Lillian Piwowarczyk.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Barbara Motyl, Chairman; Adelle Barden, Barbara Bator, Ann Frydryk, Helen Jacek, Connie Kszepka, Jane Ostrowski.

STATE CHAPLAIN'S MESSAGE

To all Officers and Members of the Polish American Veterans of Massachusetts, to all Delegates, Alternates, who are presently participating in the functions of this 1970 State Convention, I send forth my warmest and sincere greetings and felicitations.

We all look forward toward better things, to the future and in a future the hope that all may be for the best. Yet, it is good and indeed necessary, to look back into the past from time to time, in order to examine and to weigh those contributions that have been made by the Polish Americans, toward Peace, Progress, Prosperity in our land, and to the assistance toward our fellow-man. We must not forget, and should remember, that it is our solemn responsibility, to respect the good that has been accomplished, especially by our forefathers in America. We, of this generation, through the Polish American Veterans of Massachusetts, have made much, in the way of progress. Our respect by others has increased immensely by the good work established in making the memory of one of our Great Polish Patriots alive, by the Restoration of the Kosciuszko Gardens. Thus, we are, indeed, keeping alive the past and with God's help, we shall build for a better tomorrow, not only for ourselves and our children, but for those who will be members of our Community, the State and the Nation of tomorrow.

May you continue to prosper, you the Polish American Veterans because only

through united effort will we achieve the purpose for which we find in our existence and which will continue to motivate us to greater achievements through our intelligent deliberations and decisions, as we have in all our past Conventions.

To the Officers of the State Department, the Officers of all Posts and all those affiliated with the State Department. I wish God's blessing follow you one and all.

Rev. EDWARD S. NICEWICZ,
State Department Chaplain.

SHORT HISTORY OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF THE POLISH AMERICAN VETERANS OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.

To make our Country all that for which the Founders of our Nation so earnestly labored, it became incumbent upon each and every American of Polish descent to join in a bond of understanding of the principles set forth in Our Constitution and its Amendments.

It was thus, that the organizers of the State Department proceeded, making it cognizant to all Peoples of this land, that all the Freedoms exemplified in services and those paid for in blood, were eternally perpetuated.

These men of prospective vision, joined in fellowship in 1948, calling forth Americans of Polish ancestry from Lawrence, Lowell, Springfield, New Bedford, Woodrow Wilson of New Bedford and Worcester, in order to formally commemorate these sacrifices and eternally promulgate the services of the one-half million of Americans of Polish descent who gave their lives for these United States.

The continued devotion to duty and to obtain the benefits as guaranteed by the Constitution and its Amendments brought forth the unification of these men in the creation of a sympathetic and intelligent organization, which now exists, not for what has transpired in the past, but to engender these sacrifices for the betterment of all citizens.

At the Convention in 1949 the Honorable Paul A. Dever, then the Governor of this Great Commonwealth, formally and officially presented to this organization its CHARTER at the New Bedford Convention. It was truly a happy and momentous occasion, because it bestowed a stamp of approval upon the ideals for which this organization was organized.

However, it was necessary that we acquire the same prerogatives as other veteran organizations enjoyed in the Commonwealth. Much work, time, money and sacrifice on part of many, had necessitated the Great and General Court of this Commonwealth to pass sixty-four Bills in the Legislature for the performance of our business and its proper functioning. This to the benefit of the Department and each affiliated Post. For this we are extremely grateful and pay our respect and homage to the many and sincere devoted public servants of this Great Body in the Legislature, for permitting us to be of service, not only to our respective communities, but to the State and the Nation.

In 1967 an ideal was set forth in the acquisition of a purposeful endeavor in the restoration of the Kosciuszko Gardens at West Point, where stands the United States Military Academy. The State Department undertook a project in the amount of not less than \$12,000.00, which project nears completion. It fostered much State and National publicity to the organization. People of all races and ethnic backgrounds complemented the organization and many people from every State in these United States became aware that the Polish American Veterans of Massachusetts exist.

The members of our State Department and of the various Posts throughout the Commonwealth have served and are serving their respective communities and this Commonwealth, whether the service be civic, the youth or the handicapped. Many function in the various branches of our Town, City, County or State Governments, holding offices of great responsibility and evidencing pride

to their respective communities. Several have occupied high places in the Command of the Armed Forces, and are still in the conduct of service, with honorable distinction. Thus, this sincerity of purpose and devotion to government, constitute the basis for which mitigates the very existence of our Posts and the State Department. For each in their own way infuse much to the performance of duty owed to its Country.

It is with great pride that the number of Posts has increased, so that now we number Posts in Cambridge, Chelsea, Chicopee, Clinton, Fall River, Gardner, Uxbridge, Southbridge, Turners Falls, Webster-Dudley, Wilbraham and Boston, in addition to the original group established in 1948.

Each Post is guided by the principle of devotion to fellow-man, to enable our communities to establish a better place in which to live, and an ardent and zealous energetic cooperation for the establishment of all, regardless of race, creed or color.

The Wilbraham Post should be complimented on its desire to serve and project the ideals of the State Department. It has thus far, accepted its responsibility twice in its short affiliation with the State Department. Yet, it has already produced one State Commander and we are sure, in the very near future, will produce another. It is agreed that all who have participated in this Convention will agree, that Wilbraham Post made each participant, a second home by providing comfortable environment and sincere hospitality. Its endeavors necessitated much time and effort on part of all of its members and the community to enable all delegates, alternates and visiting guests as comfortable and at ease as in his own community.

The Post congratulates its sister Post, Wilbraham, in the making of another milestone of achievement in the history of this great organization, so that those who have preceded us, and those who will follow, will find that all effort on part of this Post and its sister Posts have not been in vain.

CHARLES S. SAMBORSKI, P.S.C.,
State Judge Advocate.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN BOLAND, JUNE 6, 1970, WILBRAHAM, MASS.

I am grateful for the invitation that brings me to this 22nd Annual State Convention of the Polish American Veterans of Massachusetts.

I am proud that the Wilbraham Post, in this Tri-Town area, hosts this convention. For this organization, as well as other PAV posts, in this community, have contributed, and are contributing, much to the betterment of this locality and to the assistance of its members.

My congratulations are offered, too, to this convention and its delegates, for honoring Monsignor Wieloch, and Bolac and Sophie Midura.

For 46 years, Msgr. Wieloch has been administering to the spiritual and material needs of all who have had the privilege of being a part of the parishes where he had served. For what he has done for his church, his parishioners, for the Polish people and his God—this honor is richly deserved.

Bolac and Sophie Midura need no praise from me. Their service to the community, and their devotion to this country and to the Polish Community, are written large—for all to see and acknowledge. For years they have enriched this area by their dedication to Polish culture, language, music and Polish History. The Polish American Veterans does itself honor as it singles them out, at this convention, for their years of effort in behalf of their countrymen, this Nation and Veterans generally.

I bring, too, my own congratulations to this great organization—the Polish American Veterans—for the magnificent service it renders—to its own members and the deed concern it has for the young and the old. Your

athletic and educational programs, in which all of your posts engage, help build a better community and give magnificent opportunities for youth to better themselves.

So it has always been with the Polish American Veterans and its auxiliary.

You are contributing to the preservation of your ancestral heritage—and generously sharing that culture with your fellow Americans.

You are heeding the command of the Bible to assist the sick, and the injured—to care for the widow and the orphan.

The Polish American Veterans and the auxiliary can be truly proud of the thousands of dollars which its members have raised, over the years, to make life a little bit brighter—a little bit better—for thousands of sick and wounded veterans in our VA hospitals.

You have used your concern, your interest, and your influence in all of these programs—and, together, with other veterans organizations, you have succeeded.

I carry some credentials to testify to this. There are many programs and legislative proposals that the PAV has supported since its birth and most of them have been enacted by the Congress . . . more recently, "the Veterans Education and Training Assistance Act" of the last session of Congress. Again, you interested yourself in the *Veterans Outreach Service* program—seeking out eligible veterans to advise them of benefits to which they are entitled.

And most importantly, the PAV expressed its deep concern and dismay with the serious deficiencies in the Veterans Administration hospital system. This hospital system—with 166 separate institutions—all over the nation—is the biggest hospital system in the world. It treats more than 800,000 patients a year!

The cooperation of veterans organizations in seeking to rectify the shortage of funds and medical personnel has paid off. I sit, as a member of the committee, that funds the Veterans Administration. I am pleased to tell you that this committee is providing \$15 million supplemental appropriation in this year's budget to correct the problems of understaffing and better facilities. In the next year, fiscal 1971, we have provided for \$122 million more than fiscal year 1970, for a total of some one billion, 700 million dollars for the Veterans Administration hospital system.

The concern of the Polish American Veterans for the security and strength of the United States has many times been expressed and proclaimed.

More than a half century ago, the United States entered a war, then described, as "the war to end all wars." Thousands of young Americans sacrificed their lives in the conviction that victory would bring enduring peace to the world.

Yet, little more than two decades later, the United States was again at war—a war more harrowing than any in the nation's history.

Many—perhaps, most of you—were a part of that conflict.

And on this day, we mark the 26th anniversary of "D" day. For on June 6, 1944, the fate of Western Europe hung, for 7 thunderous hours, on the outcome of the battle on Normandy Beach!

Many here, tonight, can relive that period! You can recall the command, "Now the die is cast" as elements of the 1st, the 4th, 29th infantry divisions, together with the 101st and 82nd airborne divisions swarmed ashore on the "Omaha" and "Utah" Beaches.

In the early 1950's came the Korean conflict, and we were thrust into our third war of the century.

And now Vietnam!

It is never easy to go to war. It is harder, today, than ever before!

The strategic and political issues in the Vietnam war are muddled by dissension and doubt. It is asking an enormous price to

sacrifice your life and the damage caused at home and abroad, for a cause that eludes your understanding.

No matter what you think of the Vietnam war—whether you are a hawk, a dove or something in between—you can agree that our Armed Forces in Vietnam are among the most courageous in the history of human conflict.

This frustrating, complex, painful war has given rise to the doubts of our generation—yours and mine!

But, don't let anyone sell you the idea that ours is a sick society.

It's far from perfect, but it is also far and away the most enlightened, most unselfish, most compassionate in the history of the world.

There are still challenges to be met, hopes to be realized and goals to be attained.

They will be attained by the men and women who believe in a better and brighter tomorrow, and are willing to work to that end.

They will be attained by the combined interest and influence of organizations like the Polish American Veterans.

For what you have done, are doing and will do—not alone for your own members, but for mankind, for your community, state and nation, I express the gratitude of the United States of America.

ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have reemphasized on numerous occasions the belief that we must give priority attention to programs combating water and air pollution. This is the concept behind the proposed new agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, recommended by the President. It was with great interest and pleasure that I noted the editorial carried June 20 on WBBM News Radio 78, Chicago, a division of CBS, commenting on the proposed agency.

The article follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY

President Nixon's proposed new federal agency to combat pollution seems to us to be a good idea. It is what is needed to start to clean up our environment.

The President will submit to Congress a new agency plan tentatively called the Environmental Protection Agency. It would take over the direction of clean water programs from the Interior Department; from the Health, Education and Welfare Agency it would take over the duties of cleaning up the air and disposal of solid wastes; research and standards on pesticides would be taken from the Food and Drug Administration; and monitoring of radioactivity would be taken from the Atomic Energy Commission.

We recognize that this concept is one of a so-called super agency. But the idea may be worth following. For one thing, the federal government's efforts at fighting pollution is now split up among many agencies. Too often this leads to wasted efforts. By placing all the functions under control of a single agency, it might be possible to fix the blame for failures in any particular program.

Whether this program will work, depends upon the kind of people who are picked to run it, the powers which they are given to

carry out the job, and the amount of money appropriated for the job at hand.

In any event, it is an encouraging sign that the President recognizes the grave nature of our environmental problems.

FAITH GIVES PAROLED CONVICT A CHANCE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, a story in the June 18 Cleveland Press should serve as a poignant lesson to those in the White House and on Capitol Hill who have opted for simplistic and atavistic solutions to crime in America.

The autobiographical tale relates how a paroled convict with three recorded convictions was offered, accepted, and flourished at a job with the Press. Not only has the author performed admirably in the newsroom, but he has also become an active member of civic organizations and has begun work on his college degree.

Mr. Speaker, 70 percent of those arrested for major crime in this country are "ex-cons." Time and again they return to their previous patterns of antisocial conduct because they have been given no hope by our society for anything better. Mr. Wargo, the writer of the column was given a chance. To the lasting credit of both himself and the Cleveland Press, that chance has paid off. Mr. Wargo will never again be a crime statistic. And it was all accomplished without the addition of a single policeman, prosecutor or judge.

I include the column in the RECORD at this point:

FAITH OF FEW GIVES PAROLED CONVICT CHANCE TO REGAIN A PLACE IN SOCIETY (By Douglas A. Wargo)

While I worked in The Press editorial department as a copy boy for one year, only Press Editor Tom Boardman; Dick Campbell, Press Managing Editor; Ed Stankiewicz, my supervisor, and a few other Press staffers knew that I was a paroled convict who served a one-year prison term for the crime of forgery.

If I were to violate any of the conditions of my parole—especially the rule which required me to maintain stable employment—I could have been returned to the Ohio State Reformatory, Mansfield, to serve the remainder of my sentence as a parole violator.

However, my story with The Press does not begin at the employment office where the average person might expect one to apply for a job; because I wasn't an average person.

I was a "tax-burden." A ward of the State of Ohio, who before my imprisonment, couldn't "make it" honestly on "the streets."

I wasn't proud of myself and where I had to make my job applications. When I applied for jobs it was from my prison cell at the Ohio State Reformatory, and in my letters I would include my present status and criminal record:

Inmate of Ohio Reformatory with one conviction of forgery; two convictions of petty larceny and one probation violation.

In addition to this information, I stated that if given a job, I would need a letter of employment verification from the employer,

which would have to be submitted to the parole officials prior to my hearing.

As half-expected, I received no response—except for a job application from The Cleveland Press, where I mailed a letter inquiring about employment two weeks before.

I filled out this application as honestly as possible. I stated that I never held a job longer than six months; and on one occasion, was fired from a job for tampering with the firms office equipment.

The only things that I could offer that were favorable was a high school diploma—earned at the reformatory—and promises of coming to work every day on time; and being dependable, responsible and a productive employee for The Press.

Two months later, Howard Dye, Ohio Reformatory institutional parole officer, smiling, told me that he had received a letter from The Cleveland Press.

The letter was from Editor Tom Boardman, and it read:

DEAR MR. DYE: This will inform you and the board that the Cleveland Press will hire Douglas A. Wargo, No. 75192, if and when the board acts favorably on his parole application.

His initial employment would be in the editorial department, doing general clerical duties, at a salary of about \$84 a week. The hours of the job would make it possible for him to continue his education.

Cordially,

THOMAS L. BOARDMAN.

Then in May, 1969, after I was notified I was granted a parole, I wrote Mr. Boardman a letter notifying him of my release date: June 19, 1969.

Shortly after, Mr. Boardman mailed me a personal reply at the reformatory—he wrote:

DEAR DOUGLAS: We were pleased to receive your letter of May 20, and impressed by your desire to join us here, and to make a career in journalism.

We will look forward to seeing you here on June 20, and will try to work out a schedule of hours which will best fit your continuing education at community college.

I will be gone on the afternoon of June 20, but if I am not in the office, see Mr. Richard Campbell, who knows all about your job here, and he will discuss hours, etc., with you.

Cordially,

TOM BOARDMAN.

On June 20, I came to the Press and met Mr. Campbell and my supervisor, Mr. Stankiewicz, for the first time. Four days later, I met Mr. Boardman; also for the first time.

Being a copy boy may be trivial work for some individuals. But for me it generated enough hope that my criminal record did not forfeit my right to make an honest living and a chance to make a place in the community.

Even though many convicted felons are willing to work, facts in recent surveys reveal that many convicted felons will never have the opportunity to do so, and as a result, will be returned to prison for committing more crimes.

What happens to those labeled as "ex-convicts" is often a crime in itself.

Deserving men, who have paid their legal debts to society are often shrugged off by employers and are denied employment. Perhaps for some reason, they fear having their firms name associated with "ex-convicts," and public reprisal may result.

In addition to being on parole and working at The Press, I have attended Cuyahoga Community College part-time, and have been an active member of the Cleveland Junior Chamber of Commerce.

I have visited a dozen Greater Cleveland area high schools and have warned thousands of students about the pitfalls of crime and prison life in the Ohio Adult Parole program: "Operation Prevention."

Next fall, I plan to attend college full-time and will strive to earn a degree in journalism.

But it was a parole, a job and a little understanding from Tom Boardman, Dick Campbell, Ed Stankiewicz and several other unselfish individuals—including parole officers Tim Walker and Dominick Lijoi—that helped make this story possible.

Without their help, I wonder if I would now be languishing somewhere in a world of hate, insanity and overcrowding at Mansfield Reformatory—bitter, frustrated, defeated and confused?

But instead, it's only the beginning.

HARD-HITTING WORDS BY ICHORD OF MISSOURI

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in so many instances remarks made outside this Chamber by our colleagues go unrecognized and even unknown because of the failure of some of us to preserve such good things in the Record.

One such instance is the address of my fellow Missourian, RICHARD H. ICHORD, whose congressional district is to the East and who delivered the principal address on Memorial Day, May 30, 1970, at Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery in St. Louis.

This service was under the auspices of the Inter-Veterans Memorial Day Service Committee and sponsored by the 11th, 12th, and 13th Districts, Department of Missouri, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The general chairman of this year's Memorial Day service was Primus F. Majda who was a past commander of the Department of Missouri VFW. "Prim," as he is known to his friends and associates, is a sincere man. The fact is, the Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery is dear to his heart. Unless he is out of the city because of his duties with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, he visits the cemetery once each week to pay his silent tribute to those who are interred there.

Representative ICHORD in his address detailed the history of Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery pointing out that the barracks is a landmark of the western expansion, established as a military command shortly after the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, and subsequently established as the national cemetery in 1863.

After reading the remarks of my colleague, DICK ICHORD, I commend him for his appraisal of the wrong way to conduct the struggle in Vietnam. I hail his analysis of the absence of any real cause and effect relationship between an unpopular war and the prevailing demagoguery of young extremists who would seek to destroy America's institutions.

Mr. ICHORD's discussion of the best method of disengagement is straightforward and factual. While it was only by a teller vote, I can vouch that he was one of only 32 Members who on the final vote supported the Findley amendment after

the hawks and doves turned against it. I know because I was one of those 32 who walked through the teller count with him. His action entitles him to be referred to neither as a hawk nor a dove but as an eagle. Representative ICHORD's address contains many thoughts we all need to keep in mind.

For all of us, Memorial Day this year, and next year, and in the years to come is a reminder that it is the responsibility of Congress to provide the needed authorization and the necessary funding for not only Jefferson Barracks but all of our national cemeteries. By providing a last resting place for those who have served their country, we can say: "We knew them in life. Let us not forget them in death. May they rest in peace."

The speech follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN RICHARD H. ICHORD AT THE INTER-VETERANS MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE, JEFFERSON BARRACKS NATIONAL CEMETERY, MAY 30, 1970

I thank you, my friends, for the honor you have bestowed upon me by inviting me to join in this Memorial Day service to pay tribute to America's fallen sons.

This, indeed, is hallowed ground. It is not only the fourth largest national cemetery in our country containing the mortal remains of some 48,000 American servicemen, it is also the last resting place for men who died in service to their country over a span of history that stretches back to the early 1800's. The first burial is said to have taken place here in 1827.

This Barracks is a landmark of the westward expansion of these United States. In 1803, President Thomas Jefferson negotiated the Louisiana Purchase and not many years later, Jefferson Barracks was established as a military command on the eastern boundary of that vast territory.

In a day and age when our American heritage is so often misrepresented by the propaganda of our external enemies and by the mindless distortions put forth by the militant extremists of revolutionary fervor here at home, it is helpful to remind ourselves that most of our nation's land growth resulted from peaceful real estate transactions, rather than by military conquest.

There were some exceptions, admittedly. But from the acquisition of Manhattan, the Louisiana and Gadsden purchases and the buying of Alaska, together with numerous but lesser known agreements, we may fairly assert that the territory of the United States—in the main—was acquired by treaty and diplomacy.

The Louisiana Purchase, of course, was the largest and most important single addition to our territorial enlargement. It gave America its heartland—the richly productive Middle West coursed by those mighty arteries of commerce, the Ohio, Missouri and the nearby Mississippi rivers.

And in the heart of this mid-America lies this National Cemetery, a final resting place for those willing to pay the supreme sacrifice to secure our future and keep alive the torch of liberty.

It is about that future and that liberty that I would like to speak today.

America is not doing a very good job of seeing to it that those who are buried here did not die in vain.

We are a nation divided by a very unpopular war, by the demagoguery of extremists who seek to destroy America and its institutions, and by a real or imagined gap in generations wider, perhaps, than any we have ever known.

Campus radicalism this spring has reached such extremes that the entire system of higher education is in jeopardy. Among those most militant student elements who find

virtue in violence, reason has been replaced by riots, common sense has been scuttled in favor of four-letter rhetoric, and book burning has been substituted for book learning.

Though many of our young people are sincerely motivated by concerns for the inequities in our social, economic and political life, as well as the bitter taste of a long and costly war in South Vietnam, many are not.

Some of those who are not are the products of upper middle-class affluence—part of Dr. Spock's spoiled generation—who received so much and gave so little that life became a terrible bore and riotous behavior provides considerably more excitement than hard work and self-discipline.

Then, at the very core of today's militancy is a highly disciplined band of revolutionaries at the extreme Left of the political spectrum whose avowed objective is simply the destruction of the United States of America.

These dedicated cadres are the exploiters of unrest. Many are Communists, either in thinking, in political affiliations, or both. A few are just plain anarchists. Others are nihilists, neo-Nazis clothed in the modern trappings of the New Left. They brand this nation as a hated imperialistic regime, a corrupt capitalistic society which must be destroyed.

These hard-core exploiters employ established Communist revolutionary techniques for raising the tenor of dissent to the level of violent confrontation by such methods as giving perfectly acceptable words like peace, democracy and free speech contradictory meanings. When they speak of "peace" they actually mean "surrender." When they speak of "democracy," they actually mean "totalitarian control." For example, "free speech" at Berkeley campus in California was the banner issue used to deny freedom of speech to those who disagreed with that militant minority bent on using the facilities of the University of California as a base for prompting revolution.

Many of the New Left exploiters are in key positions on the faculties of our schools of higher learning. They are effectively feeding the impressionable young minds of today's youth with Marxist concepts while tearing down the American heritage.

Is it any wonder that young people who are subjected to such instruction and then attend a campus rally to hear the harangues of radical leaders like Abbie Hoffman, Rennie Davis, David Dellenger and Jerry Rubin, then turn to mob violence on the slightest pretext?

Just two weeks before the tragedy at Kent State University, Rubin told 1,500 students at that institution (and I quote):

"We've all got to become criminals. We've got to break every law—disrupt every institution—we have to invent new laws to break."

In that same speech he repeated what he has been saying in his lectures of hate all across America in recent weeks—that to be a real revolutionary one must be prepared to kill his or her parents and destroy our schools.

By the same token, others convicted in the recent Chicago conspiracy trial—thanks to the benefits of our judicial system which allows bail bond freedom to defendants appealing the decision of the court—are traveling up and down our land preaching a message of hate for the United States and receiving generous honorariums and enthusiastic receptions for the privilege. It is easy to play the part of a daring Che Guevara when one is guaranteed all the constitutional protections in time of peace. But these men make a mockery of the very freedoms that the men buried here at Jefferson Barracks fought so hard to win and preserve for all of us.

I stand before you today as one ashamed

to think that this great land of ours has become so permissive and tolerant of the excesses of its radicals that some of its foremost spokesmen and some of the most influential news media frequently generate more sympathy for advocates of student violence than for the tortured American servicemen imprisoned in North Vietnam.

I deeply resent an attitude of intellectual arrogance that prevails in some quarters today which tramples over the rights, manners and morals of hard-working, sincerely religious and deeply devoted middle class workers in our society while extolling the virtues of drug users, "hippie" cultists and Black Panthers.

Vietnam is a frustrating problem that has seriously divided this country. We became involved, and then we started to debate our involvement. We began to brand one another as "hawks" or "doves." As many of you know, I have disagreed with the way the war in Vietnam has been fought from the very beginning. I am opposed to war as strongly as any one in this audience. I cannot justify war on a moral basis. War is horrible as well as expensive. One salient truth has emerged from Vietnam; namely, "wars must be fought to win or not fought at all." This has always been my criticism.

How many are prepared to give their lives for limited war, with limited means, for limited objectives?

President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson apparently thought that our interests and the interests of world peace necessitated our involvement, but political conditions were considered to be such that we could not fight to win. This was the fatal error. If political conditions were such that we could not fight to win, we should never have become involved.

But all the mistakes of Vietnam are now history. We became involved and we are still involved! There is no need to cry over spilled "milk"!

If I were in the President's position, my approach to Vietnam would vary in many respects, but I am not in the President's position, and this is true of all the critics of the plan of Vietnamization and the orderly withdrawal of troops from the war.

The President's plan of Vietnamization, in my opinion, outlines a reasonable course of action under the circumstances.

There is no guarantee that it will work, but its chances of success, I think, are reasonably good. Whether it works or not must be left to the future. There is, however, one certainty. It will not work if we listen to the carping voices that offer no responsible alternatives.

Americans do not have to agree with the policies of this or that national administration. We do not have to agree with the administration's foreign policy or specifically the policy in Vietnam.

I applaud our freedom to disagree.

But I will never accept the proposition that American fighting men committed by higher authority, many no doubt committed against their wishes in the furtherance of our national policy, deserve any less than our unswerving support until such time as they are brought safely home and the policies or requirements make their further contribution unnecessary.

This is why I have not criticized the action in Cambodia to destroy the enemy sanctuaries that should have been destroyed from the military standpoint years ago. I am concerned about the spread of the war, but I cannot bring myself to criticize the destruction of bases which have been used as a springboard from which to kill my fellow Americans.

115,500 troops have already been withdrawn. We should not compel those who remain to stand and fight with one hand tied behind their backs.

Despite all the confusion, the principal

area of disagreement, in most cases, appears to center around the method of disengagement and this confusion apparently extends to us members of Congress if the deliberations of May 6, by the House of Representatives are any criteria. After rejecting amendments that would have prohibited American combat troops in Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and North Vietnam by votes of 215 to 70 and 215 to 132, the House adopted the Findley substitute by a vote of 171 to 144. The Findley amendment would have forbidden combat troops to be deployed to Cambodia or Laos without the prior consent of Congress except for an emergency to be determined by the President. But, on the final vote on the Findley amendment, both the "hawks" and "doves" turned against the amendment, and only 32 Members voted for it even though the President had stated he would accept it. I was one of those 32 people who voted in favor, and as long as some people insist on discussing the war in terms of "birds," I would hope that my action entitles me to be referred to as an "eagle."

But all of this goes to show that peace is not served by emotion and hysteria, carping and demagoguery, or even flamboyancy and chauvinism. This nation cannot shout its way out of the war in Southeast Asia. It is a hard and difficult problem.

One of the headstones on a grave in this cemetery names Private Richard Gentry of Virginia. His remains were transferred to this site less than thirty years ago by his great-grandson, Mr. William R. Gentry of St. Louis. The grave bears this inscription regarding Private Gentry—"Present at the capture of Cornwallis at Yorktown."

The others buried here were defenders of this nation in the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, two World Wars, Korea and Vietnam.

I would be quite willing to guess that many of those buried here did not always agree with the policies of their government. This certainly applies to the 1,140 members of the armies of the Confederacy whose bodies lie buried here alongside the more than 12,000 Union soldiers whose last resting place is on this site.

But the fact remains that those we honor this Memorial Day, 1970, died in service to their country whether they came from North, South, East or West. And out of the blood they shed and the lives they gave has been built the greatest nation under God ever consecrated beneath freedom's banner.

They fought in the American heritage to preserve our future. You and I must fight to see that these men cradled now in the arms of their Maker, did not die in vain.

OUTDOOR WRITERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Outdoor Writers Association of America, at its annual conference at Coeur D'Alene, Idaho, on June 22, 1970, unanimously adopted a resolution supporting efforts in the House to secure full funding of \$1.25 billion for the construction grant program authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

Since the House will be considering this appropriation on Wednesday, June 24, I include the text of the OWAA's resolution at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the OWAA has played an active role for many years in the conservationist's fight for clean water and air, and

Whereas the OWAA has continually brought to the attention of the public through the writings of its members the dangers of air and water pollution, and

Whereas air and water pollution have reached a critical stage in many areas of this country, and

Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives is currently considering the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971,

Therefore be it resolved that the OWAA go on record as supporting the efforts of conservationists to obtain full funding in the amount of \$1.25 billion in appropriations for the construction grant program of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

RAILWAY SAFETY LEGISLATION
A MUST

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a major holocaust was somehow averted this past weekend when a freight train carrying tank cars of compressed propane gas derailed at Crescent City, Ill.

Some 70 persons were injured, seven of them requiring hospitalization. Thanks to good fortune, however, there were no lives lost.

A detailed account of this accident appeared in the June 22 edition of the Washington Post and I request permission to have that news item placed in the Record at this point.

WRECK, FIRE RAVAGE ILLINOIS TOWN

CRESCENT CITY, ILL., June 21.—A freight train carrying tank cars of compressed propane gas derailed today, setting off explosions and fire that raged across one-third of the town and destroyed half its business district.

Officials said about 70 persons, most of them firemen, were injured. Most of the injured were treated and released from area hospitals, but seven were hospitalized.

Residents of the community of 700 persons, about 100 miles south of Chicago near the Indiana border, were evacuated and the town was sealed off.

State police said at least 10 homes and a block-and-a-half section of the town's business district, near the railroad tracks, were destroyed and other buildings were damaged.

CAUSE UNKNOWN

Authorities said the cause of the derailment was unknown.

Chemical foam was brought in to fight the explosions but heat from the blasts kept firemen from getting close enough to use the foam effectively.

The explosions ruptured mains at the water pumping station near the tracks and water was trucked in by fire departments from 15 surrounding communities.

Telephone and electrical service was knocked out.

Witnesses said metal fragments from the exploding tankers were shot as far as three blocks away from the derailment and gouged holes in the ground. One resident said half of a tank car landed in a yard two blocks from the tracks.

State police said the derailment occurred as an eastbound Toledo, Peoria and Western

Railroad freight train moved through the center of town. They said 11 cars containing compressed propane gas and one car containing acid left the tracks. The freight-only feeder railroad operates in Illinois, Indiana and Iowa.

CARS BACK OFF

Railroad officials said the derailment occurred near the front of the 113-car train. The cars behind the gas tankers were backed off out of town and the crew went on with the first 25 cars to Effner, Ind.

Police said the tanker explosions shot flames to nearby buildings and that fires spread rapidly throughout town because there was no water.

Fire departments from surrounding communities were called in but their pumping trucks were running low on gasoline, he said, and additional fuel was being driven in.

A wave of heat followed one of the explosions, which shot "a massive ball of orange flame and black smoke into the air" said one newsman. Another said the heat of the blast could be felt three miles away.

Mr. Speaker, the cause of this accident is not known at this time and probably will not be documented for some days or even weeks. However, the seriousness of this accident and the potential for disaster that existed at Crescent City illustrates the urgent need for railway safety legislation which has far too long been unfulfilled.

Fortunately it is reassuring to note that just recently the gentleman from West Virginia ordered reported from the House Interstate and Commerce Committee a new railway safety bill along the lines of legislation which I have cosponsored for several years. The committee bill has been termed by one member of the Washington office of the United Transportation Union as "the most progressive legislation in this field in years."

This bill is now before the Committee on Rules and should be before the House in the very near future. Passage by the Congress cannot come too quickly. The provisions in the new bill may just prevent a reoccurrence of another Crescent City accident or disaster of greater magnitude.

SIXTY-FIVE YEARS OF DEVOTED
PUBLIC SERVICE OF MISS EMILIE
LIMBERG

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that one is privileged to pay tribute to a person who has devoted 65 years of her life to working for the people of one county, but that is the record held by Miss Emilie Limberg, who has reigned over the Travis County clerk's office since 1933, and before that serving as a deputy clerk since 1905. "Miss Emilie," as she is fondly known by all the legions of people who have come in contact with her, celebrated her 86th birthday recently, and at the end of her term in January, she will retire after a job more than well done.

On April 1, the Austin American Statesman ran the article which follows about "Miss Emilie." With it was a photograph showing her, as aptly described in the article, at an "Oliver" typewriter like the one she learned to type on 65 years ago. Mention of this machine alone brings back many fond memories to some of the longtime citizens of Travis County, especially to the countless who secured their marriage licenses from her.

It has been my personal privilege to know Miss Emilie Limberg through many years, and along with her host of friends, I wish to publicly wish her much happiness when she leaves her office next January. She will never leave the hearts of her fellow citizens in Travis County.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Austin American Statesman:

COURTHOUSE PARTY TODAY TO HONOR
MISS EMILIE

(By Bill Cryer)

The old Westinghouse refrigerator still chugs away in the store room in the Travis County Clerk's office like it has for the past four decades, making ice in "less than an hour" for Miss Emilie's daily ration of sipping water.

Miss Emilie Limberg, the state's first woman deputy clerk and by all accounts the elder governess of the Travis County Courthouse, is 86 Wednesday—All Fool's Day.

This will be her last birthday as county clerk. At the end of her term of office in January she retires after 65 years of working for the county.

Miss Emilie, the picture of what a county clerk ought to look like—rimless glasses, sweater and reddish hair, which is remarkably less grey than persons decades her junior, sits in the center of her realm.

To one side of her desk is the stemmed beer mug which is constantly refreshed with ice water from the old Westinghouse refrigerator, to the other side is usually a flower.

In the middle sits Miss Emilie watching her 33 deputies go about their duties recording volumes and volumes of deeds, abstracts, marriage licenses and mortgages.

She is, as she has been since 1963, master of all she surveys.

In 1933, Miss Emilie became county clerk after serving as a deputy clerk since '05.

In that year, fresh from graduating from Griffith Business College and a job "just for the experience" with an attorney, Miss Emilie joined the clerk's office as one of five deputies.

Mrs. Bertha Zuch remembers those early days when Miss Emilie was a deputy for Fred C. Malone, the county clerk.

"She was the one who softened things," recalled Mrs. Zuch who is a deputy clerk for Miss Emilie.

Mrs. Zuch was always late for work and each morning as she sneaked into the office, then at 11th and Congress, she would invariably step on a loose stone in the old courthouse causing a rattle which caused Malone to notice her tardiness.

Miss Emilie, however, sometimes would aid her tardy friend by saying something to Malone to distract his attention from the tattle-tale noise of that loose stone.

Mrs. Zuch, who gave Miss Emilie her famous beer mug 15 years ago, recalls that Miss Emilie can eat almost anything and, in fact, has a fondness for hamburgers—all the way with onions.

Above all, Mrs. Zuch tells visitors, Miss Emilie has been good to her employees—"She's been too good to us. Somebody else would have kicked us out," she said.

As for Miss Emilie herself, her 86th birthday will be marked as the last of a court-

house tradition—an afternoon of coffee, cakes and punch.

"I'll be 86 years old tomorrow, it's about time I retire," she said adding quickly, "not that I want to."

She will, of course, miss the people most of all.

("We love ya," an old gentleman told Miss Emilie Tuesday afternoon. "We're going to miss you.")

"I like the office, I was in the office so long and it was part of me," Miss Emilie said. When she leaves she doesn't know what she will do, "I haven't made up my mind yet."

She undoubtedly will do a lot of resting in her home at 2000 University Ave.—where she has lived for 76 years of her life.

She will also undoubtedly listen to music and watch television—two of her favorite pastimes.

She will also undoubtedly go to bed before 9 p.m. and get up before 4 a.m. to watch the sun come up, as she has always done.

Her time will be spent with Buddy, her dog, (all her many dogs carried the name Buddy after a favorite nephew) and a niece who lives with her.

Her time, she said, will not however include "making Freida (Whacker, a long-time deputy clerk) behave" and it will not include a beer mug full of ice water.

"To tell you the truth," Miss Emilie confided, "I'm not particularly crazy about ice water."

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I have the distinct privilege of sharing with this distinguished body an essay written by a young man from my State, Mr. Stacy Taniguchi. Mr. Taniguchi is 17 years old and the author of the award-winning speech that won the Alaskan portion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest.

Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed with Mr. Taniguchi when I met with him in Washington a few months ago. I found him to be a thoughtful young man of intelligence and character. My talk with Mr. Taniguchi convinced me once more that the vast majority of American youth is better educated and better informed about the affairs of the world than we were at their age. I sincerely believe that we can indeed be proud of Mr. Taniguchi and the majority of young Americans whom he so excitingly epitomizes.

In order that I may share Mr. Taniguchi's thoughtful ideas with all of you, I include his essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

As I stand in front of a huge marble sculpture, I see what is freedom's challenge. I visualize in that sculpture all the contentions that man had to face in order to keep his liberty.

There is a touch of his ambition and spirit that made freedom as we experience it today possible. The scars of war and fear that made him suffer and die for what he so faithfully believed in are clearly marked in the marble stone. The long hard struggle to organize a democratic government out of the

turmoil and spoils of a bloody war is symbolized in the unique formation of this piece of art. The threats toward the destruction of their freedom that was established are molded distinctly for each experience. And the doubts and confusion that plagued the minds of men are crudely stained on the sculpture, indicating the doubts and confusion that still exist today.

I feel a sensation of helplessness as I gaze upon this symbolic masterpiece. Seeing what is the challenge that my generation must face is terrifying and makes me wonder if I have the same ambition and spirit to battle this challenge. Then I think of the men that live today and their spirit and ambition to conquer our defiers. Those who fight the enemy in foreign lands and who suffer and die to keep the ways of life free and peaceful here for us. I think of the men who remember the hard and grueling pains that were suffered to bring us that freedom and peacefulness and how they keep that memory alive in our books and schools. I think of the men who give of themselves to serve their constituents and to work towards the betterment of our country and society.

The world today seems to be filled with the challenge, even though everyone desires that same freedom and peacefulness. It's hard to believe that even with the same longing, man must still combat the greed and deceit of this need.

As I reflect on these thoughts, I begin to note the sculpture again and the part I play to face freedom's challenge. I gaze on its dare and the defiance that gives me an inspiration to prepare myself. The preparation is no easy task. It requires hard work and study to understand the challenge. I must be willing to pay any price, bear any burden, confront any hardship, help any friend, and oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty. I must believe in the freedom and the essence of life. To give of myself in order to gain this victory and most of all to understand man himself.

For the sculpture that I stare at is a statue of man. His body stands as a Greek god with all the hate, greed, and desires inscribed in his facial features. He makes no gestures except that of his hand reaching out to take something away. And the horror of it all is that I can see myself in this statue. My inequities are visible and the nature of my existence is portrayed in its work. We are the challenge to freedom. You and I must realize that we are a part of this sculpture. For centuries man has desired liberty, and every time there was an opposition. Who stood in his way? What was the course of our early Americans coming to a new world? Why was the American Revolutionary War fought? Man wanted freedom but man was also the obstacle. He confronted his own species, fought his own kind, and died because his brother had different ideals. This statue represents freedom's challenge, for only man can destroy freedom, only man can take away liberty. Man will be the everlasting challenge.

But as I look over the statue once again, I see that the statue is still unfinished. This symbolizes the future; and maybe someday, somewhere, someone will carve man's destiny.

A TANGLED TEXTILE WEB

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there is much concern among the textile employees of this country over the failure of the Nixon administration to support the Mills bill or to use its full clout in bring-

ing about a favorable agreement with Japan. The dismissal of Assistant Secretary of Commerce Kenneth N. Davis, Jr., has revealed that Mr. Nixon is being strongly influenced by the free traders and internationalists on his staff. It is my hope and the hope of millions of Americans whose livelihood is threatened that Mr. Nixon will recognize the threat to our domestic economy and act accordingly. The Greenville News has analyzed recent developments very astutely. I include their editorial of June 21, 1970, at this point in the RECORD.

A TANGLED TEXTILE WEB

This is a weekend of suspense for 2.5 million American textile workers, their families and countless others whose economic well-being depends upon the health of the textile industry.

The past week saw another in a long, dismal series of postponements of positive action to control foreign imports which threaten to wreck the domestic industry. Ahead is a period of uncertainty while American officials negotiate once again with hard-nosed Japanese in an effort to get a voluntary agreement on controls.

Although Commerce Department officials express hope for a "breakthrough" in negotiations, requesting postponement of a hearing on control legislation pending in Congress there are ominous signs of division within the administration on the subject.

The abrupt dismissal of Assistant Commerce Secretary Kenneth N. Davis, Jr. on Friday is disheartening. His ouster came shortly after Secretary Davis said high-level White House staff members were misleading President Nixon on the imports question and were trying to undercut efforts to get reasonable controls. The assistant secretary named the powerful Harry Kissinger, Peter Flanigan and Paul McCracken, all regarded as internationalists who put overseas development ahead of domestic economic considerations.

The timing of the Davis dismissal is most alarming. It came on the brink of textile talks between Secretary of State Rogers and Commerce Secretary Stans, representing the United States, and Foreign Minister Aichi and Trade Minister Miyazawa, representing Japan. The meeting is scheduled for Monday.

Although Secretary Davis courted dismissal by criticizing other high government officials, the fact that he exposed the antitextile element in the administration would indicate he and others felt they had failed to win a firm administration commitment for textile imports quotas. This is underscored by Secretary Davis' dismissal before rather than after the American-Japanese talks.

By announcing the Davis ouster before the high-level negotiators sit down, the administration exposes to the Japanese the weakness of its pro-quota position. No doubt the Japanese will exploit that division and weakness to the fullest.

Even should the Japanese accept any trade terms, the agreement will be less favorable to the American textile industry and its workers because of the Davis episode and the way it was handled.

So another dreary development comes atop the many delays of the relief promised by President Nixon those many months ago. All of last year dragged by with fruitless negotiations. Relief was promised for February. Then for April or May. Now June is waning and an obvious split within the administration is exposed.

Perhaps something positive will develop next week. If not, so far as 2.5 million textile employees, including about 160,000 in South Carolina, are concerned, the time has come for President Nixon to take personal charge, and straighten this thing out once and for all.

PRESERVATION OF THE REPUBLIC

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, early in June an old friend of mine who has made his mark both as a lawyer and a banker delivered a speech he titled: "The Business of Banking in the Preservation of This Republic." His thoughts are so attuned to the problems on this present hour, I was so impressed as to say that I have heard or read no words that appeal to me more for their weight and their articulate zeroing in on the target.

The speaker was Mr. Jack T. Conn, chairman of the board of the Fidelity National Bank and Trust Co. of Oklahoma City, and former President of the American Bankers Association. He has also held national office in the American Bar Association. I share this excellent speech with you. It follows:

THE BUSINESS OF BANKING IS THE PRESERVATION OF THIS REPUBLIC

The classic story of indifference in time of peril is that of Nero fiddling while Rome burned. Under like circumstances, there is little difference between fiddling and silence. Were I to take these minutes to discuss with you the limited area of present danger to the commercial banking system and to omit the ominous portents of the destruction of this Republic and this society, that omission would indict me as apathetic, insensitive and unmindful of the "signs of the times." Commercial banking is identified with the establishment as an integral part of the capitalistic system and as the strong bastion of this democratic form of government. We are the number one enemies of anarchists and revolutionaries committed to supplanting this government and this economic system with some form of communism.

Were a stranger to this world to objectively assess the accomplishments of this nation and to weigh them against purported errors, he would be amazed and incredulous at the attacks made upon it by its own citizens.

What has this nation accomplished? Let it be said that I refer to ancient glories, let's examine the past seventy years. In that time:

We have fought and won two world wars. In 1917-1918, we helped turn back the armies of Kaiser Wilhelm bent upon conquering France and England, and in 1940-1945, stamped out Hitler, whose hate-filled, paranoid mind encompassed the utter destruction of Western civilization and the resolution of the Jewish question by the simple and ungodly process of utter and complete extermination of every Jew, and we brought to a halt the aspirations of conquest of the Japanese Empire.

Those who endorse peace at any price and who refer to government officials from the President of the United States to police officers and the R.O.T.C. as "pigs" have forgotten their right to dissent has been vouchsafed to them by the blood of those who gave their lives for this country. They have forgotten:

"In Flanders fields the poppies blow between the crosses, row on row—"

Following World War II, we engaged in a program of rehabilitation and reconstruction worldwide in scope and never approached in cost and depth in all the long history of mankind.

Through the Marshall Plan this nation rebuilt the economies of Turkey, Greece, Aus-

tria, Italy, France, West Germany, Belgium, Holland and England, and we committed substantial aid to our fallen foe, the Japanese. Never had man witnessed such an outpouring of monies in aid of world neighbors. The Marshall Plan, the Point Four Program and other projects, including the Peace Corps, stopped the advance of communism and since 1946, not one single major power has succumbed to the Russia orbit. The Iron Curtain, as epitomized by the Berlin Wall, has literally justified its appellation.

What has this nation, this democracy, this capitalistic system, this establishment, done for its own people?

At the turn of the century, the average life expectancy was fifty years. Today, it is seventy-two years. Contagious diseases, like small-pox, diphtheria, scarlet fever have almost become extinct. Poliomyelitis is no longer an unconquered disease. No one in this nation need want for medical care or requisite hospitalization. Through Medicare, those of 65 years of age are assured of medical treatment and hospitalization without cost to them.

Unemployed are paid unemployment insurance; our aged receive pensions, and social security grants are ever widening with increasing benefits. This country aids its blind and provides support to dependent children.

No nation boasts of a better public school system and there is no young man or woman who is now prevented from attending a college or university through lack of funds.

The average per capita income is the envy of lesser lands and Americans enjoy the highest standard of living in history.

In the past twenty years significant advances have been made in the fair and equal treatment of ethnic minorities. Like the walls of Jericho, the bars of discrimination are beginning to come tumbling down. Nowhere is the right to vote denied because of race. Our public schools are open to children and youth of all races. There are no longer restrictions prohibiting where one may live because of his race. Equal opportunity in jobs and advancement is becoming more of a reality and less a cliché.

This country's tremendous achievements in heeding the admonition, "love thy neighbor" have been attained through democratic processes and fueled by the free enterprise system. We have had no dictatorships and there has been no responsible suggestion that the liberties of freedom of speech and of the press be inhibited or constrained. We have been and still remain the land of opportunity. As testimony to the absence of an economic, hereditary oligarchy, one may point to the salient fact that a substantial majority of this nation's businesses and its banks are run by those whose origins were middle class families.

While in these times one is almost persuaded to refrain from measuring national success in terms of the material wealth of its citizens, on that basis the future of the United States glows with economic brightness. J. J. Servan-Schreiber in his book, "The American Challenge," predicts that within thirty years from 1968, the annual per capita income in America will be \$7,500; that a working year will be comprised of 39 work weeks and 13 weeks of vacation and with weekends and holidays, there will be 147 work days a year and 218 free days.

What I have said should not be construed as a claim that this country has done in the past all that it should have done, nor should my remarks be interpreted as assurance that the problems which now beset us can be or will be solved with alacrity. The elimination of pollution, the clearing of slums and ghettos and the rebuilding of our cities cannot be effected in weeks or months or a few years. The prejudice toward racial minorities cannot in finality, be exterminated save through the passage of time, and true

equality shall come to minority groups only through education. Some day prejudice shall be eradicated and we shall accord to men their right and due of human dignity and some day I hope we will all become color blind—to see a man as a man and not the color of his skin.

We have not succeeded in removing the threat of total nuclear annihilation, an annihilation so complete as to make this planet as devoid of human life as the barren and lifeless moon.

American democracy claims no easy panacea. It does claim that its efforts, sometimes halting, sometimes mistaken, to achieve peace in this world and to better the life of every man, woman and child who inhabit it, shall never cease. It does claim that no nation has done so much for so many.

Many of our citizens do not agree with this appraisal of our accomplishments and vehemently disagree in the prediction that the vast problems confronting us can be or will be solved within the framework of this government and its capitalistic system. They say America will not seek world peace, for the military-industrial complex cannot afford peace. They assert that pollution will not be eradicated so long as pollution is profitable. They believe the managers of the free enterprise system will continue to successfully oppose a better and more equitable distribution of wealth. They contend that equality of economic opportunity for minority groups shall never be realized. In summary, they say that those exercising governmental and economic power have no real concern save the maintenance of the status quo; that reform within this government and within this system is impossible of attainment, and, therefore, both must be extirpated root and branch. They subscribe to the slogan, "a bas l'etat".

It is not clear what they would substitute for this democratic form of government and for this economy predicated on free enterprise. They offer no proposals beyond destruction. They appear to promise nothing save the hope that out of the ruins there will emerge some form of government, some type of economic system which will speedily effect their aspirations and ideologies. From their words and actions the sole decipherable certainties are that some of them are indoctrinated with Marxism and most of them are convinced their goals can only be achieved by anarchy and revolution.

Although the characterization of an alarmist is not a pleasant one, I risk it to say that what we see today, if the past be prologue, is the evolution of revolution.

The undergirding of every stable government and of every great civilization has been respect for law and in democracies it has been the willingness to abide by the laws established by the majority. Today, the phrase "law and order" is treated with opprobrium as witnessed in the scandalous conduct of defendants and counsel in the celebrated Chicago Seven Trial. Those who burn down buildings on college campuses justify their acts by the appeal to what they characterize as the higher law of conscience—that if conscience dictates universities be closed and destroyed, the state should not interfere. After burning down a bank in California the arsonists felt they were exculpated by saying they had forewarned banking officers of their intentions. Some disidents believe if acts of violence are motivated by political considerations the actors should be exempt from punishment since imprisonment for political crimes is contrary to the guarantee of liberty.

The asserted right to flout the law, to insult courts and to escape punishment by intimidation and threats is not limited to acts of violence allegedly dictated by conscience or political tenets. Some would set at naught the entire judicial process. In a recent paper published by the Center for the study of Democratic Institutions the author asserts

that juries should be informed that they are not bound by the instructions of courts—that is that juries are not bound by law. This concept would transform the nation from a government of law to a government of men.

Lewis F. Powell, Jr., Past President of the American Bar Association made this correct evaluation:

"An ordered society cannot exist if every man may determine which laws he will obey—that only just laws need be obeyed and that every man is free to determine for himself the question of justness."

In increasing degree, we are confronted with what Brinton in his book, "The Anatomy of Revolution" refers to as "the transfer of allegiance of the intellectuals." We can view with disdain the actions of college students who take over college buildings, occupy the administrative offices and generally interrupt the orderly life of the colleges and universities. We can find some consolation by iterating and reiterating that student protesters represent only a small minority of student bodies. While that may be poultice for our pain, there is no room for discounting the fact that in many instances members of the faculty have joined in and, indeed, led the student demonstrations and riots. We are naive if we do not realize the presidents of some of our colleges and universities agree with the ideologies of their student dissidents and that they, too, decry reform and tacitly embrace revolution as the sole realistic answer.

There are signs that a few in the higher echelons of both the executive and legislative branches of the government are beginning to distrust their own abilities to meet the present challenge and the multitudinous problems that face us in the future. They see the weakness of reliance on centralized power yet fear its relinquishment. They find themselves vacillating from support of the chief executive to control of executive authority through legislative restraint. They are beginning to wonder if democracy is equal to its task.

Thus far the forces of revolution have been contained through the prosperity of the American economy. We have not had a financial breakdown. Are we headed for one? The hope of a sound fiscal policy and a balanced budget have "gone a glimmerin'." Inflation has not been stopped and if prices and wages be the criteria it has not even been curtailed. Monetary policy, designed to reduce inflation to a sustainable rate, has moved toward the objective of slowing down price and wage advances by precipitating a reduction in the gross national product, an increase in unemployment, and a recession and it has inadvertently contributed to the fears of a depression, as reflected by the appraisal of the stock market. Inflation can be stifled by monetary policy but the price of a pronounced recession at this time is too high. We cannot afford an economic debacle.

Unless there is a return to respect for law and the judicial processes of our courts; if the movement of our intellectuals to the cause of revolution be not abated; if distrust in our own ability to rule ourselves shall mount and if we permit a significant recession

accompanied by a financial breakdown, then we shall be confronted with the classic elements on which revolutions have heretofore been fomented.

If this analysis be not grim enough, we must consider the frightening impact of the Vietnam War and its extension into Cambodia. That the Vietnam War has contributed to and, perhaps fathered the elements of revolution about which we have commented, cannot be denied. The argument involves only the issue or degree. While history may bear out the wisdom of the nation's intervention in Vietnam, one must question whether the gaining of every objective in the prosecution of that war counter-balances the divisiveness which it has created.

Most of us have neither the will to win the war nor the heart to accept defeat with its sure, swift and brutal punishment of our allies, the South Vietnamese. The more we vacillate, the deeper our troubles become. As John Gardner, an eminent Republican who heads the Urban Coalition, observes:

"While each of us pursues his selfish interest and comforts himself by blaming others, the nation disintegrates. I use the phrase soberly, the nation disintegrates."

The sharp and divergent polarization of the flanks with vacillation in the center contain little hope of an immediate, acceptable, honorable peace. The longer the war continues the more it strikes at the heart of this nation—the will to fight. When the people of a republic lose that quality the nation becomes prey to those who would conquer it as so clearly noted in Shiller's, "Collapse of the Third Republic."

Are we nearing the fulfillment of Mac-Aulay's somber prophecy? One hundred thirteen years ago the great English historian said in a letter to his American friend, Henry S. Randall:

"Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand; or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the Twentieth Century as the Roman Empire was in the Fifth—with this difference . . . that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

What then is the business of banking? The business of banking, my friends, is the preservation of this republic.

As a Republic the affairs of government are controlled by officials whom we elect by democratic process. This Republic shall survive and shall live to confound its critics and silence its enemies if the executive and legislative branches of the federal government be occupied by men capable, desirous and committed to meeting the problems that beset us. We should choose those who believe in this Republic and in democracy and who hold that no other system offers or can offer so much for its citizens. We should elect those who in matters critical to the nation will rise above partisanship. We should send to the Congress members who recognize that if the President, whoever he may be, shall be made their vassal, then the nation will want for direction and be bereft of its one clear voice. We must defeat those whose sole

answer to dissent is incarceration of the dissenters for they would, in finality, proscribe the liberty of all and substitute for this Republic, founded on the guarantees of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, a police state as evil as that of any dictatorship. Finally, we must choose those who are dedicated to uniting the people of this nation, whose armament is the power of reason and suasion rather than the spear and arrows of diatribes and pejoratives which when employed do little but drive us apart.

How may we elect those meeting these criteria? We must divest ourselves of the comfortable role of spectators and become political activists. We must campaign for and financially support candidates of either party whom we judge best able to serve this Republic. The day of apathy has expired.

The business of banking is the preservation of this Republic. The challenge is here, our duty is patent, the time is now. What is your answer?

AGAINST CONTINUATION OF THIS WAR

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the war in Indochina has raised indignation from many sources. Recently, I received a letter from the Locust Valley Religious Society of Friends, which I include in the RECORD as evidence of another important group calling out against the continuation of this war.

The letter follows:

JUNE 16, 1970.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: At its regular Meeting held Sixth Month 14th, 1970, Matinecock Monthly Meeting for the Religious Society of Friends approved the form and substance of the following minute which was approved by the Representative Meeting of New York Yearly Meeting and directed me, as Clerk, to forward a copy to you and to our Senators:

"The Representative Meeting of New York Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends expresses its opposition to continuing American participation of any kind in war in Indo-China. It encourages a general reordering of national priorities away from military goals and methods to give first emphasis to programs which contribute to the dignity and growth of the individual, both in this country and throughout the world. Consequences of this should include a sharp reduction in expenditures for armaments, their elimination in the near future, and the elimination of the draft."

Faithfully yours,

FREDERICK E. WILLITS,
Clerk.