PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 18286. A bill to provide for the establishment, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of a National Information and Resource Center for the Handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIESTER (for himself, Mr. BROCK, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. REES, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. TAFT):

H.R. 18287. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to assist in meeting the savings and credit needs of low-income persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 18288. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 18289. A bill to amend section 700 of chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for showing disrespect for the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 18290. A bill to amend the Hazardous Substance Act to provide for more effective protection against the hazards caused by economic poisons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 18291. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide for the rail transportation of freight for the Department of Defense in general purpose boxcars owned by the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 18292. A bill to repeal section 7275 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970) providing a penalty for offenses relating to certain airline tickets and advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 18293. A bill to provide for a program of Federal assistance in the development, acquisition, and installation of aircraft antihijacking detection systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 18294. A bill to amend section 7275 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain requirements with respect to what must and what must not be shown on airline tickets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. MOSS):

H.R. 18295. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to assist in meeting the savings and credit needs of low-income persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 18296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit airline tickets and advertising to state the amount of tax on air transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (for himself, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. OLSEN):

H.R. 18297. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 18298. A bill to amend the Central Valley Reclamation project to include Black Butte project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 18299. A bill to make rules respecting military hostilities in the absence of a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.J. Res. 1289. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H. Res. 1126. Resolution designating January 22 of each year as Ukranian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H. Res. 1127. Resolution designating January 22 of each year as Ukranian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

417. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to air traffic control, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

532. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO, relative to a national health insurance program, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE STATES AND THE SCHOOLS: LAST CHANCE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the July 1970 issue of American School Board Journal contains a provocative article by Tom McCall, Governor of Oregon, and chairman of the Education Commission of the States. I commend it to the attention of those of you who may have missed it:

THE STATES AND THE SCHOOLS: LAST-CHANCE ALLIANCE

(By Tom McCall)

It is not a flat plane we have here in education. It is a many-faceted extension of the world's bumpy social geography. It is a time of audacious students, angry teachers, bewildered school boards, and parents catatonic with conflict they often seem unable to understand.

But why should me expect otherwise? The entire world is spinning into a new phase of existence. And, as in all phases, we stand forever in danger of losing the fresh, young mind of the student at its most productive moment. We stand forever in danger of selling him out and selling him short; of ignoring the very human signs he flashes to us; of assuming that classrooms—unlike the universe—can stand still.

It is the nature of youth to demand rather than to ask; to question rather than to accept; to embrace tomorrow rather than to revere yesterday; to go beyond bondage rather than run into it. There is much complaint about "campus unrest," be it the campus of a junior high or a famous college. There has been so much talk about it—and so many scuffles—that we may be having a counter-reaction. We may be, in 1970, ripe and ready to shut off our reason and open the passion valve.

But—in every carefully considered and thoughtfully written document about this stirring in the young hearts—there is only one recurring message: Listen to them before you condemn them. Listen to what they are saying and attempt to judge why they are saying it. And stop assuming they are automatically wrong because they're making uneasy noises.

We should not forget that it is 5 percent of the students who are throwing bricks and fire bombs. The other 95 percent are throwing ideas. Put out the fires—but don't put out the ideas. And do not make the mistake, nearly all experts urge, of trying to lump the restless students into one growling metaphor. They don't even do that to themselves.

Some students clearly feel that—as far as their sources of education in America are concerned—they are not getting all of the right kind of raw material for building a 21st Century maturity. Speaking of one school, a student said: "Here is where it isn't."

There have been many periods of the dynamic. This is only one. Perhaps we feel it to be more crucial because it's the one we're in. It is not comfortable to be assigned to a dynamic age. It requires constant, alert, and creative participation, or you just get kicked off into the bramble. Not very kindly, but very common.

Perhaps some students are making outrageous demands. But, to and beyond the limit of patience, we must make an effort to translate from the statement of their grievance to the concept of its cause. Then we can perhaps judge.

But these students aren't the only angry segment. Parents have become wary and weary of the whole imbroglio. It sometimes seems they wish merely an end to the noise and a return of elm trees and swimming holes—devoutly to be wished but realistically out of reach.

And the teachers. They are not tall, stern, and quiet in their workshops, either. *Life* magazine recently published an article called "Our Angry Teachers." It had some flaming quotations from members of the profession. A brief sampler:

"We teachers are tired of all this being nice guys; now we're applying some muscle."

"The public rendered us sterile. We never talked about salaries, even though every other profession was demanding more money. Education was left way behind because those

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

who should have been fighting for education were told it was less than professional to do so. Then we teachers were blamed for the bad schools because we remained silent."

"We're bloody and scarred but tougher than ever. And we're not as naive as before. We learned a lot. We learned it takes money to make your point."

"I think the best thing that can happen to the country is a nationwide teacher strike."

We know we have to remake the basic framework of our educational systems in order to stabilize the onrushing future. Innovation must stop being a cliché and start being a rally cry for truly original action. We will have to reassess what a 21st Century curriculum ought to be. We'll have to examine the means and methods of helping the great and growing masses of young, beautiful minds.

Education is not only geared to change, it is the author of change. So we are not facing a brand new problem. We're merely being asked to rediscover the intellectual fire that has always been the heritage of all places of learning.

There are basic housekeeping problems: financing; coordination of educational districts; cooperative growth with federal aid; and the sheer logistics of buildings, hardware, software and space.

Those of us with direct connections in educational activity must make all of these assessments immediately. And we'll have to work for the key causes with strident and continuing pressure. We are running out of time.

Gain, for yourself, the sense of urgency that the educational picture generates, and do not overlook the paradoxes: We roar in the streets for the subtle rights and the nuances of educational administration—while there are millions in our society who can't even read what the issues are. For those who deal in education, leadership is their panache. And never before have they been given such a vast field for battle. The complexity of it simply *demands* that we do not get bogged down in old arguments or in mossy, moldy points of view. America is no longer a quiet expanse of agrarian and small town charm. We have to retool. When the attack came on Pearl Harbor, we retooled from nothingness to victory; when we decided to stroll on the moon, we did it in massive ease. Now we have an educational moonshot coming up in the 1970s. It is, in every conceivable way, more important than footprints on the moon. And it commands the attention of zealotry, for the job is awesome.

In my state of Oregon, the constitution clearly charges the state to provide for the "establishment of a uniform and general system of common schools."

Even though we have created a series of districts to perform this task, it is, clearly and constitutionally, the state's problem. The success or failure of our general system of common schools must be assigned to the state, where real responsibility lies.

The courts are going to tell us soon and emphatically that we are denying some children a good education because of where they live.

It is my belief that, before the Seventies have passed, priority will be given to 16 years of public education, including two years of preschool and two years of post-high school education.

The expense will be considerable. But not as great as the expense of not supplying the added education necessitated by the greatly increased burdens being placed on man's shoulders in this age. Children as young as three can and should be taught elementary learning skills. Disadvantaged children who are taught virtually nothing until they are six have lost the race with life by the time they are ten.

It is on these critical early-age periods of human life that the survival of this race rests, not on late-hour racial laws, patchwork punishment procedures, finger-in-the-dike relief programs, and mass-media "love thy neighbor" jingles. We will get the world of freedom, of law and order, of love, if we plant the seeds of purpose, tend the garden with diligence, and are realistic.

In education, as in so many fields, we have allowed our problems to pile up on us. We have delayed planning until the crisis becomes a collision course. There is no longer any doubt about the extensive rethinking, reshaping, and replanning that must be done in our schools. The only question is: Who will do the planning?

As Florida Congressman Robert Graham said in one of the occasional papers for the Education Commission of the States: "Some higher education administrators have despaired because my political colleagues have not treated rational state higher education planning with great receptivity in recent months. I can offer as solace the fact that a basic element of the politician's personality is the desire to avoid decisions."

But there are many decisions now past due. And we'll have to reach some kind of coordinated planning structure for uncovering these problems, diagnosing them, and prescribing cures. For half a century, state influence on the significant social, economic, and political issues has waned. This was happening while a coalition was forming between the federal government, large cities, and the farmer.

For years, the states' excuse for this has been malapportionment. Failure to represent the people rendered states impotent to contemporary problems. Now in all states the impact of reapportionment has eliminated the excuse. We will soon see, as Representative Graham has said, if the states' 50 years of failure have been cosmetic or congenital.

Responsiveness of the states is only a step in what must ultimately be a major reform in the structure of our school system, but it is a vital and basic step—and it must be made now. It is a keystone in the future development of the United States.

We owe it to the cause of logic. We owe it to our peace of mind. We owe it to fiscal responsibility. We owe it to the ethos which has given our nation its very special personality and imprint. But, most of all, we owe it to the children and to their future.

There is no intellectually honest way to downgrade the importance of our educational system. Education gives us the principal process of character formation. Education makes possible the mass knowledge that empowers a democratic society to weigh issues and to make decisions about them. Education gives the selective skills and mental dexterity by which democratic action is possible. It is, in fact, the dynamo of democracy.

HOSPITAL AID AND INFLATION

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in its editorial columns today the Washington Post commented on the President's veto of H.R. 11102, the Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments, considered in the House last week. The Post's comments in support of the President's action on this legislation are indeed most timely; and I include the editorial in the RECORD:

HOSPITAL AID AND INFLATION

In overriding the President's veto of the hospital aid bill the House appears to have lined up strongly for improved medical care—a highly popular stance in an election year. When the Senate votes on Tuesday, it should give more thought to the valid objections which caused the veto. Foremost among these is the fact that Congress is trying to force the President to hold a tight rein on federal spending and at the same time compel spending beyond the limits of the budget.

The House has already passed a bill fixing a ceiling on 1971 federal expenditures, and it has been approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee. In the bill extending the Hill-Burton program for hospital construction and modernization, however, Congress authorized direct grants amounting to $350 million more than has been budgeted for fiscal 1971. It also provided that funds for these programs through 1973 must be spent. Fearing that this will become a precedent for additional compulsory spending requirements, the President vigorously protested that the Congress is "withdrawing with one hand the authority necessary to do what it requires with the other."

There are some basic differences between the President and Congress on the granting of federal funds for hospital construction at this time. The executive view is that the government should guarantee private loans to construct and modernize hospitals where additional beds are necessary, while specializing in grants for facilities to provide less intensive care for ambulatory patients and those in need of rehabilitation. This is in keeping with the modern trend of relying more heavily on less costly and sometimes more effective treatment centers as an alternative to hospitals. But Congress voted for expanded hospital construction grants in addition to the new program, thus piling one on top of the other.

That generous gesture might be justified if Congress had not attempted to force spending of the funds, regardless of actual need, and if Congress had provided a comfortable surplus in the Treasury. Actually Congress slashed taxes in a most reckless fashion in the Tax Reform bill last December, and the Treasury is confronted by a growing deficit. If Congress insists on thus turning on the spending spigots without regard for where the revenue is coming from, it will give new impetus to inflation at a time when the economy is still suffering from the effects of the war-inspired expenditures of the late 1960s.

If the Senate feels strongly that all the medical facilities authorized by this bill are essential, it should indicate its willingness to accept a tax bill to pay for them. Otherwise it will be voting a new shot in the arm for inflation. The wiser course, we think, would be to sustain the veto and promptly to repass the bill with the objectionable features eliminated.

PRAY FOR PEACE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial written by O. B. Augustson in the West Central Daily Tribune of Willmar, in our Sixth Congressional District.

This editorial appeared in the West Central Tribune the day before Memorial Day, but it is just as appropriate as we approach our Nation's 194th anniversary on the Fourth of July.

Editor Augustson speaks of praying for peace. But he says we must do more. We must be "men of good will," we must seek peace, we must deserve it. He points out the Biblical admonition that those who live by the sword perish by the sword.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD:

PRAY FOR PEACE

There is a cartoon on this page about Memorial Day. It talks of a prayer for the future and the drawing is a scene which suggests a prayer for peace. For the crosses of a Flanders Field have continued to be scenes all over the world, in one war after the other. And here again we are in another—more crosses. Those of the dead and the hospitals overflowing with the hundreds of thousands of the wounded. It is all so appalling—such a tragedy upon mankind.

Pray for peace? Of course. But not just idle words. May better be on the knees and with a lot of self examination—also some understanding and concern as to those things that cause wars. They do not just happen—they are the decisions of men—of governments first of all and then a people who condone and cheer for it.

Two thousand years ago an angelic host sang something about peace on earth "to men of good will." Suggesting that perhaps before crying for peace one must first seek peace and be of good will. And if this is true of individuals—it is also true of nations, of governments, of peoples. And if their judgments are in terms of war, not terms of peace, if material greed is in the picture, if the ways of peace are not trod but the gory path is used—there will always be wars as Holy Writ reminds us.

One is reminded of the pharisee and the publican and one found that the despised latter went out of the temple more justified than the one who thought he had it all and despised others. Some of this is found in our changing world where by force ideologies are fought over and behind the conflicts are so often found the material more than the principle.

One does honor to those who have died in our country's wars. But the constant cry always arises that it must not be again. Yet it is again because men are not of good will and men seek the paths of force, bred with intolerance and even greed.

Guess there could be almost complete consensus of opinion that in most wars the almighty dollar has been in there some place. Many have to look for it under the smokescreen of some trumped up high principle of some kind.

Pray for peace? To be sure. On the knees. But let us not forget that man has a free will, so has a nation. That there is also something about God helping those who help themselves. If men or nations choose to walk war roads there is penalty to pay. What one sows one may reap is an adage as old as the hills. This free choice is there even though in the long run the ultimate may be in the hands of the Almighty. But in the course of it all—man makes decisions and will reap the ill fruits. For those who live by the sword shall perish by it—is as true today as when it was uttered twenty centuries ago.

The message of Memorial Day must be peace—not war. But one admits that words such as these are easily spoken. Fulfillment is a far different task. Especially in a world still engaged in proper politics, still in armed camps to carry out such politics, still at each other's throats for this world's goods and the battle grounds are usually found where those goods are located. A study of past history and some of the present will sustain such conclusions.

ANNUAL REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to the annual report on the educational exchange program for fiscal year 1969 transmitted by the President to the Congress on June 15 of this year. The report is made by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State, which has primary jurisdiction and coordinating responsibility for these activities within the U.S. Government as a whole.

As President Nixon points out, this report—

Is largely devoted to an aspect of the program too often overlooked—that is, the extraordinary extent to which it receives the cooperation and assistance, including financial assistance, from United States private groups, private individuals, private educational institutions and business corporations.

The President also rightly emphasizes the point that—

Perhaps in no other way have the American people made so direct a contribution to our foreign policy objectives for the 1970s.

The report by the State Department to the Congress is carefully argued and filled with excellent examples of private cooperation. To pick and choose among the many instances of collaboration and financial contribution by private resources would ignore so many worthwhile activities that I would prefer not to select particular passages for notice. On the other hand, I cannot pass up the opportunity to quote the first three paragraphs of the report under the title "Partners in Exchange":

Strictly speaking, the educational and cultural exchange program of the Department of State is not a "government program" at all. Rather, to an extent extraordinary in any Government-sponsored enterprise, every step depends upon the expertise and collaboration of private groups, private individuals and private institutions. At most, the State Department serves as a catalyst, a go-between among members of a vigorous partnership.

Certainly, if the State Department had no private partners, it it *were* the only agency involved, the whole exchange program would change drastically in character. Quite possibly, it could not be carried on at all in its present form.

Even the financial contributions from private sources are sizeable. A calculation for the 1968–69 academic year shows that $9,199,778 in scholarships, grants or services were provided for academic grantees alone, by U.S. schools, colleges and universities and by American private foundations and similar agencies. This is roughly one-fourth the State Department's entire budget for all exchanges in that period. So large a proportion of private contribution is by no means unique to this year; it has been characteristic almost since the program's beginning.

Mr. President, having praised this report for its contribution to our understanding of the role played by the American public in the exchange program, I feel compelled to draw attention as well to certain disturbing aspects it contains. In its statistical profile, the report shows very clearly the effects of financial cutbacks imposed on the exchange program since the peak year of 1965. I would also surmise that the full effects of the tragically low level of appropriations in fiscal years 1969 and 1970 have not as yet been experienced. It has only been through stringent measures that the State Department has managed to avoid an even greater reduction in the actual number of people exchanged than has occurred.

The dismal picture presented by some of the statistical tables in the report is at least mitigated by the recent action of the House Appropriations Committee in approving roughly $5 million more for the exchange program for fiscal year 1971 than was appropriated in the current fiscal year. On the other hand, perhaps a quarter of this increase will have to go for pay raises and another portion—if not the remainder—will disappear simply because of inflation. I am not in any way criticizing the Appropriations Committee of the other body, and I am certainly glad to see this scheduled limited increase. The fact remains that the State Department requested $45 million for the 1971 program, in place of the $31.4 million which was appropriated for fiscal year 1970. The Bureau of the Budget cut the request back to $40 million and the congressional process thus far has reduced it again by about $4 million more.

Mr. President, in mentioning these figures I am struck by the coincidence that the State Department requested for the exchange program almost the same figure of roughly $44 million which the Pentagon now admits it spent on public relations in fiscal year 1969. There is something profoundly wrong about our scale of values when we can maintain a $44 million program just to try to make the American public happier about our military programs, while at the same time we kept our worldwide educational and cultural exchange program activities going on $31.4 million and only now are trying to get back to a level of roughly $36 million. This kind of contrast makes me too sick at heart to want to dwell on the subject.

I would like to raise one more specific issue which is presented so well in the report on the exchange program. There is a table in the report which shows that during fiscal year 1969 no less than 16 countries—almost all of them in Western Europe—made an overall contribution of almost $1.8 million toward our mutual educational and cultural exchange activities. In addition, we should point out that currencies from Ireland and Finland are also employed in the program, as they have been for so many years in the past. This is a fine testament to the worth of the program and it goes some distance toward counteracting the bitterness one might feel about the low pri-

ority accorded the program in our overall foreign policy operation.

Unfortunately, as our appropriations fell off during fiscal years 1969 and 1970 the contributing foreign governments felt that they too had to cut back. They did so on the logical premise that if the United States did not care sufficiently for the exchange program to give it ample support, then other countries could not justify higher expenditures to their own peoples. Thus in fiscal year 1970 these contributions from foreign governments fell from $1.8 million down to $1.35 million. They would have fallen even further had the State Department not convinced these other countries that it would make a special effort this year to obtain greater appropriations.

There does seem to be a good chance for a slightly increased appropriation as noted above. However, there is a particular problem which arises in connection with our programs in Western Europe. The great majority of foreign governments which share the cost of the exchange program are located in Western Europe. And no matter how much the program might benefit in other areas of the world, unless more money is made available for our Western European programs, there is almost certain to be a further slippage in foreign government support. In other words, just by keeping the program at its current low level in Western Europe, we could lose a quarter of a million dollars in contributions by other countries.

This is not an easy matter for us to discuss on the floor of the Senate and I will only say that I hope very much that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee will give full weight to these remarks at the appropriate stage in their consideration of the State Department budget for fiscal year 1971.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table derived from the State Department report which gives the foreign government contributions for fiscal year 1969. I also ask unanimous consent that the report as a whole be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 7.—COUNTRIES WHICH SHARE COSTS OF EXCHANGE [1]

Country	Cost-sharing agreement signed	Fiscal year 1969 contribution
Australia	Aug. 28, 1964	$229,600
Austria	June 25, 1963	150,000
Belgium/Luxembourg		45,000
China (Taiwan)	Apr. 23, 1964	15,300
Cyprus	Sept. 7, 1968	2,420
Denmark	Feb. 25, 1965	20,000
France	May 7, 1965	225,225
Germany	Nov. 20, 1962	668,000
Iceland	Feb. 13, 1964	1,137
Israel	Mar. 23, 1967	4,286
Italy		240,000
Netherlands		45,858
Norway	Mar. 16, 1964	28,000
Spain		75,000
Sweden	June 28, 1963	10,638
United Kingdom	May 10, 1965	34,000
Total		1,794,464

[1] In addition, Ireland provided $89,608 in Irish counterpart funds under a special exchange agreement.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the annual report on the international educational and cultural exchange program conducted during the Fiscal Year 1969 under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256, the Fulbright-Hays Act).

This program, in Fiscal Year 1969, exchanged more than 6,500 teachers, scholars, students and distinguished leaders between the United States and 132 countries and territories. More than 2,000 of these were leaders, potential leaders and professionals from other lands who came to observe and study the United States, its people and institutions. Cumulatively, from 1949 through 1969, 132,380 United States and foreign grantees have been exchanged under this State Department program.

This exchange has directly contributed to the achievement of our foreign policy objectives. Observing and working with colleagues here on mutual problems, our visitors have established personal and institutional relationships which persist through the years. They have realized what they have in common with us, as well as our differences. Together with American grantees studying and teaching abroad, they have contributed greatly to the store of knowledge and understanding of our respective cultures, penetrating below the surface news and impressions of the mass media.

This report for the Fiscal Year 1969 educational and cultural exchange program is largely devoted to an aspect of the program too often overlooked—that is, the extraordinary extent to which it receives the cooperation and assistance, including financial assistance, from United States private groups, private indivduals, private educational institutions and business corporations. This private cooperation not only indicates the high level of citizen interest in exchange but gives the program its essential character and effectiveness.

Perhaps in no other way have the American people made so direct a contribution to our foreign policy objectives for the 1970s which I defined in my February 18 message to Congress.

I commend this report to the thoughtful attention of the Congress.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 15, 1970.*

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE, 1969

(Fiscal year 1969: July 1, 1968–June 30, 1969)

PARTNERS IN EXCHANGE

Strictly speaking, the educational and cultural exchange program of the Department of State is not a "government program" at all. Rather, to an extent extraordinary in any Government-sponsored enterprise, every step depends upon the expertise and collaboration of private groups, private individuals and private institutions. At most, the State Department serves as a catalyst, a go-between among members of a vigorous partnership.

Certainly, if the State Department had no private partners, if it *were* the only agency involved, the whole exchange program would change drastically in character. Quite possibly, it could not be carried on at all in its present form.

Even the financial contributions from private sources are sizeable. A calculation for the 1968–69 academic year shows that $9,199,778 in scholarships, grants or services were provided for academic grantees alone, by U.S. schools, colleges and universities and by American private foundations and similar agencies. This is roughly one-fourth the State Department's entire budget for all exchanges in that period. So large a proportion of private contribution is by no means unique to this year; it has been characteristic almost since the program's beginning.

The cooperation of universities and the academic community generally, both in the United States and abroad, is, of course, the heart of educational exchange, and accounts for by far the largest share of funds and efforts contributed from private sources. But in other types of exchange as well—arranging observation tours of the United States for foreign leaders, mounting special study programs for selected grantees, counseling the Department on professional exchange problems—private agencies and individuals are essential to the program's basic quality and success.

Cooperation comes from private groups and individuals overseas as well as in the United States, but we will look here particularly at the program's American partners. The lists on the next pages of some representative U.S. private groups, other than universities, which cooperate with the U.S. exchange program, give an indication of how broadly the program involves the American private community and its professional, scholarly, business and community organizations. The organizations listed—and it is at best only a partial list—are largely national groups. Not included are the hundreds of local service agencies, radio and TV stations, museums, schools, labor unions, Chambers of Commerce, and social welfare and other organizations with interests roughly paralleling those on the national level, which take part either as active hosts or sponsors of foreign exchange visitors.

For example, private U.S. business and professional organizations give valuable support by helping foreign visitors get a firsthand view of how the United States "works" and of the people who make it work.

America's press and its radio and TV broadcasting companies cooperate generously, repeatedly opening their offices and studies to foreign media visitors on tours of inquiry and consultation. The hosts include not only major newspapers and networks, but local papers and broadcasters, including student publications, to help give visitors a real sense of the meaning of "freedom of the press" in this country. Nor are all their foreign visitors merely observers. Each year a group of 15 to 20 foreign radio and television professionals is offered a 3-month program which includes 6 weeks of actual working experience at broadcasting stations as well as a seminar at Syracuse University. Syracuse University is given a State Department grant to conduct this program. With the cooperation of local newspapers, Indiana University has carried out a similar program for foreign journalists for nearly 20 years.

Other American businesses receive many foreign visitors interested in American management and the U.S. economic system. For example, 1969 leader grantee Dr. Jaime Abut, Dean of the School of Business Administration at National University, Rosario, Argentina, whose special interest was management training, was able to discuss many practical problems of business management training, and see actual training programs in operation at IBM, the National Cash Register Company, the Gillette Company and the New York Stock Exchange, as well as to visit schools of business in U.S. universities. In another instance, Farmland Industries in Kansas City, one of the largest farm cooperatives in the United States, was a principal host to Mr. John Poku, the National Secretary of Ghana's National Farmer's Union, who is organizing farm cooperatives in Ghana. In addition to detailed discussion on cooperative methods, Mr. Poku received a gift of 12 training films for use in the Ghana union.

Private U.S. organizations which have developed valuable expertise on special areas of the world regularly assist with exchanges with those areas. The Japan Society, Operation Crossroads Africa, the English-Speaking Union and the Center for Inter-American Relations are but a few of those listed in the next pages. The State Department may

consult with one or more of these groups in arranging the U.S. program for visitors from the area; or one of the organizations, acting under contract with the Department, may take on the major responsibility for visitor programs in the United States.

For example, when young African leaders come for a 4–6 week observation tour to the United States, Operation Crossroads Africa, under a contract agreement, arranges their observation/study program here. Because of its help, young Americans who have served with Crossroads in Africa are available to meet the Africans and offer them home stays with people who know Africa and its people, needs and problems.

Exchange of teen-agers is conducted entirely by private groups; State Department grants only supplement these groups' private resources. The American Field Service and Youth for Understanding are two examples of such groups which bring young people to live and attend school for a year in American communities. At the pre-graduate college level, the University Religious Conferences of the University of California at Los Angeles and Santa Barbara have, over the past 15 or more years, taken 6–8 American students each summer on a work-study trip to countries of South Asia. Their privately raised funds are supplemented by a small grant from the Department, and they have full responsibility for planning the students' program and activities. In 1969 the National 4–H Clubs Foundation under its International Farm Youth Exchange (IFYE) program, using a supplementary grant-in-aid from the Department, enabled some 50 young farm leaders (mostly agricultural college graduates) from the United States and 11 countries to exchange 6-month visits. In this program, which has been carried on for over two decades (the Department has contributed since 1960), young farmers are chosen and their program on local farms arranged by the IFYE organization.

Many professional organizations bring selected leaders here for short-term intensive study periods, with the State Department providing individual grants to those selected. The American Society for International Law, for example, in 1969 brought a group of legal officers from foreign governments here for an international law seminar developed with Harvard, and 14 exchange grants were arranged for these legal specialists. When the Association of American Law Schools similarly arranged a 1969 program for distinguished foreign jurists to study U.S. legal education, exchange grants were made available to eight of the jurists.

In the arts, the international writing program conducted at the University of Iowa regularly brings foreign creative writers for a year's study and work. In 1969 the State Department jointly sponsored six participants for this program. A unique example of a private exchange in the arts this year was that of Mrs. Adamantia Economides, Keeper of the National Numismatic Museum in Athens, where the holdings of ancient Greek, Roman and Mediterranean coins are of great historical importance. The American Numismatic Society, which provides curatorial training for people from museums in Europe and the Middle East, wished to offer Mrs. Economides a special study program here on museology. An exchange grant was provided to cover her travel costs, and the Society planned her program and paid her living expenses in the United States. Her greater familiarity with American methods will be of considerable value to American scholars who pursue research at her museum in Athens.

Private women's organizations, at their national headquarters and in local communities, are active hosts to foreign women leaders. On occasion they also sponsor special grantees. For instance, the American Association of University Women has for several years sponsored with the State Department a summer-school study program for African teachers. The Department pays travel costs for the teachers and works with AAUW on developing the study course. AAUW pays the grantees' tuition and maintenance. The League of Women Voters, through its Overseas Educational Fund, puts on, under a contract with the Department, a 2-week seminar on development, welfare and public affairs for Latin American women leaders selected by U.S. Embassies in South America in cooperation with League members there. In 1969 14 such leaders received exchange grants to participate. The seminar was followed by a well-managed visit to U.S. cities where state and local League leaders had prepared a full and varied program.

Professional women's groups are also involved. For example, each year for the last several years the American Women in Radio and Television (AWRT) has brought foreign women broadcasters to the United States. AWRT takes major responsibility for the visitors' program, and provides half their maintenance while they observe broadcasting facilities and techniques in the United States. The exchange program pays international travel and supplementary maintenance.

Substantial private exchange takes place, of course, without government contribution. The scope of private involvement in exchange is suggested by these figures: in 1969 some 2,200 American universities, corporations, private organizations, and teaching institutions such as hospitals, were authorized by the State Department to conduct exchange programs for receiving and training foreign visitors. Of the 45,000 exchange visitors who came to the United States in that year, about 80% came under these authorized private programs. Some were students, others advanced and distinguished professionals in their fields. The State Department reviews applications for private U.S. exchange programs, as it has a legal obligation to do so as a protection to exchange visitors, and designates those which meet necessary standards. Visas for travel to the U.S. to participate in private U.S. programs are issued only when the programs are so designated.

The academic exchange program of the State Department—the exchange of graduate students, professors and research scholars—is perhaps that part of exchange most indebted to private individuals and agencies[1] for its conduct and effectiveness. A good many academic grantees indeed rarely see a government official, or the inside of a U.S. government office. To be sure, some of the private agencies which help a grantee with his exchange arrangements act under contract to, or have financial support from, the State Department, but they are essentially private groups. All, moreover, are under the general policy supervision of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, a private body of U.S. educators, appointed by the President from the private academic and cultural community.

Take the case of Mr. Yasuo Ueda, a graduate student from Japan in the 1968–69 academic year, who was selected by the binational Commission in Japan to receive a grant for a year of advanced study in the United States in managerial marketing. The Commission, although initiated and supported, like 46 others around the world, under U.S. exchange legislation, is a quasi-private group. Mr. Ueda's grant, awarded by the Commission from State Department funds, provided him with travel costs. In the United States, the Institute of International Education (IIE), a private U.S. educational exchange organization, arranged a fellowship for him to study at the University of Rochester. IIE, under contract to the State Department, helps secure such placements in U.S. colleges and acts in a generally supervisory capacity to the students while in the United States.

On his arrival in the United States, Mr. Ueda went first to the University of Minnesota for a month's orientation and language training before he began his formal studies. At Rochester, he had in addition to the usual faculty adviser, counsel and supervision from the campus foreign student advisor, a member of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, a private organization which receives funds from the State Department to promote such counseling services. During his study year, Mr. Ueda visited with an American host family on weekends and holidays and attended some community activities. In short, his entire exchange experience was a private one. His only direct contact with the American Government, beyond accepting and signing his travel grant agreement, was a series of pre-departure "orientation-to-America" talks arranged by the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo before he left Japan. Foreign exchange professors and research scholars find their exchange experience in the United States an equally private affair.[2]

A largely private mechanism is also used in selecting American academic grantees. For American graduate students, campus screening committees and the IIE (or, for professors and scholars, the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils) do preliminary screening of candidates before final selection by the Board of Foreign Scholarships. Taken as a whole, about 1,300 private faculty members and other educators—most of them serving either as volunteers or with only per diem recompense—cooperate on preliminary screening of grantees and on program development for exchange of all academic grantees, including teachers.

In addition to providing study and lecture opportunities to foreign academic grantees, American universities and colleges give the exchange program other important forms of cooperation. For example, a university will undertake, on contract to the Department, a special series of exchanges, usually planned over a period of several years, to help strengthen a particular university overseas in one or more special subjects. The University of California's exchange agreement with the Chinese University of Hong Kong is one of these projects. Another example is the Iowa-Istanbul political science project set up in 1966, under which the University of Iowa is assisting the University of Istanbul to develop a chair in political science, by selecting an American professor each year to lecture at Istanbul and by providing advanced study in political science at Iowa for one or more Turkish scholars.

Other U.S. universities may conduct special seminars, at the Department's request, for particular groups of grantees. In 1969, the

[1] School teachers are the fourth major category of academic exchange grantees and form an important part of the State Department's total academic exchange program. Teacher exchange is, however, carried out by a government agency—the U.S. Office of Education (Institute of International Studies) under a cooperative arrangement with the State Department. All teacher exchange is supervised by the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

[2] For foreign professors and advanced research scholar grantees, not IIE but the Committee on International Exchange of Persons of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, arranges placements. This Conference Board's Committee, which works under contract to the Department, was formed by four leading U.S. scholarly and professional societies to assist the exchange program.

University of Pennsylvania, for example, arranged a seminar on urbanization for Latin American leaders; Georgetown University organized seminars on English-language instruction for Mexican teachers; and the University of Colorado at Boulder presented a special science teaching program for Uruguayan science teachers. Lincoln University has for several years administered part of the exchange program for Southern African students; and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee provides, in its school of education, a special program for educators from French-speaking African countries.

Only about 10% of the more than 121,000 foreign students in the United States are here on U.S. government grants. Providing adequate counseling and placement for "non-grant" students as well as grantees is a matter of special interest and concern to the Department, and the cooperation of private professional academic organizations on this problem has been unique and invaluable. Groups such as the Institute of International Education and the American-Korean Foundation, for example, work in specific countries on counseling students who plan to come to the United States for study, whether or not under Government sponsorship. English-language testing procedures for students around the world have been worked out with the help of the Center for Applied Linguistics, the American Language Institute of Georgetown University and the Educational Testing Service.

The Department has also had the constant advice and counsel of private agencies on the crucial questions of the comparability of U.S. and foreign academic credentials, and of suitable college entrance examinations for non-grantee as well as grantee foreign students. Among these agencies are the College Entrance Examination Board, the Council of Graduate Schools, the Council on the Evaluation of Foreign Student Credentials and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Some of these organizations have worked on direct contracts with the Department, others have acted in a voluntary advisory capacity.

For all exchange visitors, from student to dignitary, direct acquaintance and talks with everyday Americans in their home communities are often the most eye-opening part of any visit here. Such person-to-person meetings are regularly arranged by private agencies and individuals. Local volunteer groups include world affairs councils and international visitor and hospitality centers. COSERV (The National Council for Community Services to International Visitors), the largest agency, was founded in 1961 by such groups in nearly 75 major cities, specifically to help develop and coordinate services to introduce foreign visitors to American people, homes and communities. Members of these groups—almost all volunteers, men and women—meet foreign visitors upon their arrival in town, help arrange their visits to local leaders and professional organizations, and provide home hospitality and home stays. Altogether, there are 800 or more local groups working to the same purposes, handling well over a quarter million individual local visits a year. Although few similar groups exist overseas, many private individuals and agencies abroad make a particular effort to assure that American visitors meet (and, if they are students, live with) local families, and get a personal immersion in local social and cultural life.

Finally, among the distinguished private groups concerned with exchange are seven advisory boards and commissions whose members, chosen from the educational and cultural world, counsel the State Department on the program. From the Advisory Committee on the Arts which counsels and assists the Department on the support of U.S. performing artists abroad, to the Presidentially appointed senior advisory group, the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, and the Board of Foreign Scholarships which supervises all academic exchange, these groups represent the high level of citizen interest in exchange, and help assure the program's quality and effectiveness.

In all, then, looking at exchange in the broad view, it is far indeed from being a "government program." Rather, the American people and their private organizations and institutions have made it largely their own, in a partnership as remarkable for its variety as for its mutual trust, shared benefits and responsibilities.

Some of the private organizations cooperating in exchange [1]

Business and Trade Associations

American Association of Advertising Agencies.
American Bankers Association.
Association of American Railroads.
Committee for Economic Development.
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Farm Organizations

American Farm Bureau Federation.
Cooperative League of the United States.
Farmers and World Affairs.[2]
National Farmers Union.
National 4–H Club Foundation.[2]
National Grange.

Scholarly Professional Associations

American Council of Learned Societies.[2]
American Economic Association.
American Library Association.
American Political Science Association.
American Psychological Association.
American Sociological Association.
Modern Languages Association of America.
National Academy of Sciences.[2]
National Geographic Society.
Social Science Research Council.

Medical Organizations

American Dental Association.
American Medical Association.
Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates.

Press, Television, and Radio

American Broadcasting Company.
American Press Institute.
Associated Press.
Columbia Broadcasting System.
Communications Satellite Corporation.
Mutual Broadcasting System.
National Association of Broadcasters.
National Association of Educational Broadcasters.
National Broadcasting Company.
National Educational Television.
United Press International.
Major local newspapers and radio and TV stations in the U.S.

Political and Government Organizations

Democratic National Committee.
Governors' Conference.
Republican National Committee.

Women's Organizations

American Association of University Women.
American Women in Radio and Television.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
National League of Women Voters (and its Overseas Education Fund [3])
National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Law Organizations

American Bar Association.
American Society of International Law.
Association of American Law Schools.
Inter-American Bar Association.
International Legal Center.[3]

Labor or Other Union Organizations

Actors' Equity Association.
AFL–CIO (American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations).
American Federation of Musicians.
American Guild of Musical Artists.
United Automobile Workers.

Social Welfare and Civil Rights Organizations

American Friends Service Committee.
American National Red Cross.
Boys' Town.
Congress of Racial Equality.
Council of International Programs for Youth Leaders and Social Workers, Inc.[3]
General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
National Federation of the Blind.
The National Urban League.
Southern Christian Leadership Conference.
Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Service Organizations

International Voluntary Services.[3]
Lions International.
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
Rotary International.
Young Men's Christian Association of the U.S.A.
Young Women's Christian Association of the U.S.A.

Organizations in the Arts

American Association of Museums.
American Educational Theatre Association.
American Institute of Architects.
American Numismatic Society.
American Society of Stage Directors and Choreographers.
American Symphony Orchestra League.
Association of American Colleges, Arts Program.
Association of American Dance Companies.
Institute of Advanced Studies in the Theatre Arts.
Intercollegiate Music Festival.
International Theatre Institute.
Music Educators National Conference.
National Association of Schools of Music.
National Music Council.

Organizations With Area or Country Interests

Africa

African-American Institute.[3]
African-American Labor Center.[3]
African Studies Association.
Operation Crossroads Africa.[3]

Asia and the Near East

American Friends of the Middle East.
American Institute of Cypriot Studies (Cyprus).
American Institute of Indian Studies (India).[3]
American-Korean Foundation.
American Research Institute in Turkey (Ankara).[3]
American Studies Research Center (India).[3]
Asia Foundation.[3]
Asia Society.

[1] Does not include all organizations which may serve as members of advisory groups and commissions, such as the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, the Overseas Schools Advisory Council, and others.

[2] Under contract agreements with the U.S. State Department.

Association for Asian Studies.
China Foundation for the Promotion of Education and Culture.
Japan Society, New York (and other cities).

Europe

American-Scandinavian Foundation.
Bologna Center, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University (Italy).[3]
English-Speaking Union of the U.S.
Institute of American Studies (Paris).
International Research and Exchanges Board.
Salzburg Seminar in American Studies (Austria).[3]

Latin America

Center for Inter-American Relations (New York).
Council for Latin America.
Inter-American University Foundation.[3]
Pan American Union.
Partners of the Alliance Committees.

Foundations

Barnes Foundation.
Carnegie Corporation of New York.
The Danforth Foundation.
The Ford Foundation.
Hazen Foundation, Inc.
Indiana University Foundation.[3]
The Johnson Foundation, Inc. (Racine, Wisconsin).
Mayo Foundation, Inc.
Research Foundation, State University of New York.[3]
The Rockefeller Foundation.

Research Institutes and Organizations.

Brookings Institution.
Center for Applied Linguistics.[3]
Hudson Institute.
Institute of Defense Analyses.
International Marketing Institute.[3]
Rand Corporation.
Stanford Research Institute.

Sports Organizations

Amateur Athletic Union of the United States.
American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.
National Association of Inter-Collegiate Athletics.
National Collegiate Athletic Association.
U.S. Collegiate Sports Council.
U.S. Olympic Committee.

Private Business

American Telephone and Telegraph Co.
Bank of America.
Boeing Co.
Braniff International.
Chase Manhattan Bank.
Chrysler Corporation.
(John) Deere & Co.
First National City Bank of New York.
Ford Motor Co.
General Motors Corp.
IBM (International Business Machines Corporation).
Kaiser Industries Corp.
Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Lockheed Aircraft Corp.
McDonnell Douglas Corp.
New York Stock Exchange.
North American-Rockwell Corp.
Pan American Airways.
Standard Oil.
Trans World Airlines, Inc.
Westinghouse Electric Corp.
Weyerhaeuser Co.

Educational Organizations

Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
American Council on Education.
American Studies Association.
American Vocational Association.
Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S.
Education and World Affairs.
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
National Education Association and its affiliates.
World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Professions.
World Education, Inc.
Youth Leadership and Exchange groups

Teen-age exchanges

American Field Service.[3]
Experiment in International Living.[3]
International Christian Youth Exchange.[3]
U.S. Catholic Conference.[3]
Youth for Understanding.[3]

Other

Boy Scouts of America.
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Inc.
Girl Scouts of America.
U.S. Youth Council.
University Religious Conferences of the University of California at Los Angeles and Santa Barbara.[3]
World Youth Forum.

Student Counseling and Programming

American Council of Young Political Leaders.[3]
Council on International Educational Exchange.
Institute of International Education.[3]
International Student Service (YMCA).[3]
National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.[3]

Student Testing and Accreditation

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.[3]
College Entrance Examination Board.
Council on Evaluation of Foreign Student Credentials.
Educational Testing Service.

Facilitative Agencies for Exchange Visitors

COSERV (National Council for Community Services to International Visitors).
Council on Leaders and Specialists.[3]
Governmental Affairs Institute (International Visitor Service).[3]
International Exchange Program, National Assembly for Social Policy and Development.[3]
People-to-People, Inc.
State Department.

1. Total grantees.
2. Grantees by area.
3. Grantees by fields of interest.
4. Grantees by category of grant.
5. Grantees over the past decade.
6. Women as percent of all grantees.

*Figures include "arrivals" only—persons who began their grants in 1969.
[3] Under contract agreements with the U.S.

TOTAL GRANTEES

	United States	Foreign	Total
1949–69	37,649	94,731	132,380
1969	1,613	4,937	6,550
1968	1,764	5,043	6,807
Percent change, 1969 over 1968	−8	−2	−4

GRANTEES, BY AREA

	Percent of total grantees	Number of grantees: United States	Foreign	Total
Latin America	23	192	1,317	1,509
Near East-South Asia	11	193	526	719
East Asia-Pacific	15	177	829	1,006
Western Europe	39	947	1,604	2,551
Eastern Europe	4	59	148	207
Africa	8	38	513	551
Multiarea		7		7
Total		1,613	4,937	6,550

GRANTEES, BY FIELDS OF INTEREST

	Percent	United States	Foreign	Total
The sciences:				
Physical and natural	11	157	569	726
Agriculture	2	27	120	147
Medical	3	19	176	195
Engineering transport	5	29	307	336
Subtotal	21	232	1,172	1,404
Humanities and the arts	21	718	687	1,405
Social sciences	43	[1] 509	2,259	[2] 2,768
Education	15	148	810	958
Other (sports etc.)		6	9	15
Total		1,613	4,937	6,550

[1] Includes area studies.
[2] Includes area studies and observation of United States.

GRANTEES, BY CATEGORY OF GRANT

	Percent	United States	Foreign	Total
Students	37	723	1,694	2,417
Research scholars	9	148	452	600
Teachers	12	182	626	808
Lecturers	9	413	162	575
International visitors	33			
Educational travel	8	44	505	549
Short-term professionals	5	103	213	316
Leaders	20		1,285	1,285
Total		1,613	4,937	6,550

GRANTEES OVER THE PAST DECADE

	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
United States	1,939	1,942	2,103	2,326	2,286	2,331	2,250	2,130	1,764	1,613
Foreign	4,977	4,861	5,117	5,613	5,889	6,053	5,948	5,405	5,043	4,937
Total	6,916	6,803	7,220	7,939	8,175	8,384	8,198	7,535	6,807	6,550

PERCENT OF WOMEN IN EACH GRANT CATEGORY, 1969

	United States	Foreign	United States and foreign
Students and educational travel	40	23	28
Teachers	45	39	40
Lecturers and research scholars	7	9	8
Leaders, short-term professionals	12	9	9
As percent of all grantees	27	19	21

TABLES

1. Exchanges with Each Country, 1949–1969.
2. Fields of Specialization by Category of Grantee.
3. Distribution of Grantees in the United States.
4. Total Participants in the Program.
5. Women Grantees as Compared to Total Exchangees.
6. Sources of Funds, Fiscal Years 1968 and 1969.
7. Countries Which Share Costs of Exchange.
8. Total Funds Obligated, Fiscal Years 1965–1969.
9. Expenditures by Country, fy 1969.

APPENDIXES

A. Performing Arts Groups and Athletic Teams Sent Abroad in 1969.
B. Advisory Groups and Commissions.

TABLE 1.—NUMBER OF EXCHANGES WITH EACH COUNTRY, 1949-69

[Arrivals only]

Area and country	U.S. grantees: Academic: University students 1949-68	University students 1969	Research scholars 1949-68	Research scholars 1969	Teachers 1949-68	Teachers 1969	International visitors: University lecturers 1949-68	University lecturers 1969	Educational travel 1959-68	Educational travel 1969	Short-term grantees 1949-68	Short-term grantees 1969	U.S. totals, cumulative 1969	U.S. totals, cumulative 1949-69	Foreign grantees: Academic: University students 1949-68	University students 1969	Research scholars 1949-68	Research scholars 1969	Teachers 1949-68	Teachers 1969	University lecturers 1949-68	University lecturers 1969	International visitors: Educational travel 1957-68	Educational travel 1969	Specialists 1949-68	Specialists 1969	Leaders 1949-68	Leaders 1969	Foreign totals, cumulative 1969	Foreign totals, cumulative 1949-68	U.S. and foreign total 1969	U.S. and foreign total 1949-69
Africa:																																
Algeria			1				1	2			2		2	6	66								7		13		29			111	2	117
Angola							1							1	23										5		2			30		31
Botswana			1				1							2	3								4	1	6	3	6	1	5	24	5	26
Burundi	1				1		1	1			1			4	17					1			11	5			4		6	38	7	42
Cameroon					1						1			2	19	2							29	5	8		24	8	15	95	15	97
Canary Island															2		1													1		1
Central African Republic											1			1	2	3			2	1			26	2	3		14	2	8	55	8	56
Chad					1									1	2				2	1			11		3		17	4	5	40	5	41
Congo-Brazzaville							2							2	5				2				2	5	3		23		5	40	5	42
Congo-Kinshasa							9	1					1	10	7				2	2			41	13	26		85	6	21	182	22	192
Dahomay					3	2							2	5	1				5	1			20	1	3		34	5	7	70	9	75
Equatorial Guinea															1												2			3		3
Ethiopia							25	3			7		3	35	49	3					1		13	1	26	6	45	10	20	154	23	189
French Somaliland																							1							1		
Gabon															1				1				11	2	2		10	1	3	28	3	28
Gambia, The					1									1	8				1				7	1	4		4	5	6	30	6	31
Ghana	2		2		5		13	2			14		2	38	82	13	4		15		1		31	7	55	4	82	14	38	308	40	346
Guinea					2		3				2			7						1			13		5		20	6	7	45	7	52
Ivory Coast							2				1			3	1				3	2			11	5	24	1	31	10	18	88	18	91
Kenya	3		9		3									15	208	8			15		1		28	6	42	1	66	11	26	386	26	401
Lasotho							5							5	5				2				2		3		7	8	8	27	8	32
Liberia					8		18	6			2		6	34	15	2			18	3			6	1	7	1	9	2	9	64	15	98
Libya					9	1	7				10		1	27	11										13		30	5	5	59	6	86
Malagasy Republic					1		1				3			5	1				3	2			3		17		47	8	10	81	10	86
Malawi					2						3			5	14	1			14				5		6		13		1	53	1	58
Mali					2						2	2	2	6	4				2				12	1	5	1	35	5	7	65	9	
Mauritiana															1								2		1		6			10		10
Mauritius															3	1			1		1				1		5	7	8	19	8	19
Morocco					47	1	1	1			10		2	60	125	2			4				31	13	24		63	9	24	271	26	331
Mozambique											4			4	28	1									1		7		1	37	1	41
Niger															1				12	2			2		3		29	7	9	56	9	56
Nigeria	66		4		10		4		22		10			116	111	7	8	1	10		6		104	15	82	6	109	21	50	480	50	596
Portuguese Guinea															1															1		1
Rwanda							3	1					1	4	3				2	3			1				5		3	14	4	18
St. Helena					1									1																		1
Senegal							3				8			11	7				5	2			52	8	12		32	8	18	126	18	137
Seychelles Island					2									2													1	1	1	2	1	4
Sierra Leone			1		3		2	2			2		2	10	34	6	4	1	7		3		18	5	24	3	48	7	22	160	24	170
Somalia					2			1			2		1	5	83	5							5	1	3		54	8	14	159	15	164
South Africa	7		1		3		18				6			35	140	1	11				3		5	1	41	3	88	11	16	304	16	339
Southern Rhodesia			1		1		4				3			9	78		6		14				1	2	49		32	1	3	183	3	192
Southwest Africa															13										3					16		16
Sudan							18				6			24	65		1		4		1		14		19		21			125		149
Swaziland								1				1		1	9										4	1	6	3	4	23	5	24
Tanzania			3		7		5				4			19	97				22				8	5	29		51	4	9	216	9	235
Togo															5				2	1			15	4	14		38	8	13	87	13	87
Tunisia					22		2				3			27	48	1	1		44				38	35	14	2	42	8	46	233	46	260
Uganda	7		23		5		17	2			2		2	56	130	10	3		6		1		15	5	34	5	44	5	25	259	27	315
Upper Volta															1				2				4		1		15	5	5	28	5	28
Zambia			10		13		6				2			31	41		1		12				5	1	21	5	18	6	12	110	12	141
Multicountry							1	2	13		87	7	9	110																	9	110
Total	86		56		155	4	173	25	35		197	9	38	740	1,569	66	40	2	234	22	18		615	151	659	42	1,349	230	513	4,997	551	5,737

Footnotes at end of table.

Western Europe:																															
Austria	598	26	89	3	77	3	121	6		8		38	931	910	38	179	14	99	4	83	5	3		49	5	251	5	71	1,645	109	2,576
Belgium	284	10	70	2	61	2	50	2		3		16	484	441	13	136	10	122	10	25	3	3		14	2	178	11	49	968	65	1,452
Canada					4	1						1	5					8	1					1		85	1	2	96	3	101
Denmark	243	11	107	8	39	2	132	4		4		25	550	592	22	209	12	91	2	56	3			40	2	162	3	44	1,194	69	1,744
Finland	104	4	66	6	69	2	172	10		19		22	452	786	26	227	19	259	5	25	2	48		196	5	437	16	73	2,051	95	2,503
France	4,217	146	413	11	468		353	19		24		176	5,651	4,044	222	707	41	720	17	319	29	48		161		602	20	329	6,930	505	12,581
Germany	2,971	148	293	19	548	38	423	29		598		234	5,067	5,390	122	610	24	890	24	153	17	30		258		5,490	42	229	13,050	463	18,117
Gibraltar																		2											2		2
Iceland	17	2	7		9	1	12	1	3	25		4	77	130	7	5		48	1			3		78	1	134	1	10	408	14	485
Ireland	23	2	15	2	3	1	49	6		3		11	104	103	21	23		279	34	5		4		29	2	21	1	58	522	69	626
Italy	1,669	65	406	24	575	5	331	12		20		106	3,107	1,429	68	725	42	374	26	128	13	3		75	4	538	13	166	3,438	272	6,545
Luxembourg			1		2		1			4		1	8	44		2		15	1					3		22	2	3	89	3	97
Malta	1		3		4		4	1				1	13	9				15						4		12			40	1	53
Netherlands	487	15	118	5	217	3	166	7		8		30	1,026	883	21	256	6	164	10	74	2	2		87	2	152	4	45	1,663	75	2,689
Norway	316	4	154	4	56	1	96	5		2		14	638	1,115	35	346	3	173	3	65	4	1		60	2	161	3	50	1,971	64	2,609
Portugal	25	4	17	3	1		17	3			1	11	71	77	11	26	4	28		3		14		11	2	103	8	25	287	36	358
Spain	229	23	72	6	235		135	15		10		44	725	375	35	53	9	71	5	56	8	57	29	35	3	146	9	98	891	142	1,616
Sweden	53	7	21	1	10		50	2		15		10	159	144	16	95	10	57	1	35	4	2		118		126	4	35	612	45	771
Switzerland							10			1			11	11		1		1		1		2		9		57	2	2	84	2	95
United Kingdom	2,286	87	384	13	1,905	77	387	21		19		198	5,179	2,726	117	1,374	71	1,925	78	624	33	6		87		482	16	315	7,539	513	12,718
Multicountry [1]			1		81		1			200	6	6	289																6		289
Total	13,523	554	2,237	107	4,364	136	2,510	143	3	963	7	947	24,547	19,209	774	4,974	265	5,341	222	1,652	123	226	29	1,315	30	9,159	161	1,604	43,480	2,551	68,027
Eastern Europe:																															
Bulgaria	1						1			4	1	1	7	2		3	1	6	4					6		11		5	33	6	40
Czechoslovakia								1		3		1	4			1		3	1					22	3	2	8	12	40	13	44
Hungary										1			1													3			3		4
Poland	54	8	1		1		29	3	4	120	5	16	225	99	11	84	11	25		6		8		76	3	57		25	380	41	380
Rumania	16	4	7	3			8	2		7	3	12	50	23		30	11			5				8	2	14	14	27	107	39	157
U.S.S.R.										63			63											1		5			6		69
Yugoslavia	14	7	10	2			36	8		38	8	25	123	110	19	70	25	15	4	14	3	6		142	4	171	24	79	607	104	730
Multicountry										25	4	4	29																4		29
Total [2]	85	19	18	5	1		74	14	4	261	21	59	502	234	30	188	48	49	9	25	3	14		255	12	263	46	148	1,176	207	1,678
Near East and South Asia:																															
Afghanistan	6				7		23	4		12		4	52	97	11	3		11				11		4	1	32	5	17	175	21	227
Bhutan																													2		2
Ceylon	19	2	4				64	4	8	2		14	103	195	13	21	2	64		6				29		82	7	22	419	36	522
Cyprus					4	1	8	1		2		2	16	105	13	1		37	2					58	2	33	3	20	254	22	270
Greece	136	3	58	2	332	9	95	7		23		21	665	839	23	116	5	117	1	9	2	10		82	7	198	3	41	1,412	62	2,077
India	431	37	225	14	160		361	19	9	136	3	82	1,395	1,774	96	264	15	345	13	113	3	12	9	361	4	382	42	182	3,433	264	4,828
Iran	20	2	10	3	67	1	102	7		14		13	226	173		73	3	284	14	4	1	4		124	10	140	11	39	841	52	1,067
Iraq	1		13		19		106			14			153	143		14				3				18		66			244		397
Israel	21	1	31		8		99	8		25		9	193	115	14	89	9	23	1	13	2	6		80	1	54	13	40	420	49	613
Jordan	4				3		13	2		6	1	3	29	118	4			4				1		51	3	51	2	9	234	12	263
Kuwait																								1		2			3		3
Lebanon	1		1		4		39	2		36		2	83	15	8	2		12		5		24		46	2	92	19	29	225	31	308
Nepal	2		6		3		7	2				2	20	75	16	10	1	41		5	3			5		12	8	28	176	30	196
Pakistan	19		17		25		201		16	36		16	314	834	7	49	1	130		13		8	6	106		202	1	15	1,357	31	1,671
Saudi Arabia							13			4			17	5				2						8		10	1	1	26	1	43
Southern Yemen										1			1	21	2			1						3		1		2	28	2	29
Syria					13		41			6			60	21				2		2		12		33		54			124		184
Turkey	41	3	13	3	113	4	129	10		35	2	22	353	520	45	123	7	93	4	16	2	10		75	4	123	16	78	1,038	100	1,391
United Arab Republic	58		38		6		179			25			306	573	2	112		73		28		4		69		148		2	1,009	2	1,315
Yemen					2								2	39	1									1		10		1	51	1	53
Multicountry										110	3	3	113																	3	113
Total	759	48	416	22	766	15	1,480	66	33	487	9	193	4,101	5,664	255	877	43	1,239	35	217	13	102	15	1,154	34	1,692	131	526	11,471	719	15,572
East Asia and Pacific:																															
Australia	318	15	176	4	124	8	200	17		10		44	872	526	32	332	32	192	15	90	6	9	2	21		154	13	100	1,424	144	2,296
Brunei																													1		1
Burma	18		20		50		74			9			171	238		42		97		3				25		116			521		692
Cambodia	1				42					7			50	83				12						5		35			135		185
China, Republic of	34	3	112		3		98	7		8		10	265	173	17	76	7	61	2	33	1	4	1	75	1	111	12	41	574	51	839
Hong Kong	6		8		2		24	1		5		1	46	35	3	7	1	20	3		1	7	2	49	3	40	7	20	178	21	224
Indonesia					33	3	9			10		3	55	250	12	3		69		5		11	2	120	2	271	29	45	774	48	829
Japan	136	8	171	5	117		277	19		208	12	44	953	2,723	131	1,148	6	368	9	122	4	12	2	103	1	914	81	234	5,624	278	6,577
Korea	8	1	1	1	4		57	6		35		8	113	365	19	51	4	63	5	22	2	13	1	200	3	232	22	56	1,002	64	1,115
Laos					25	6				7		6	38	25				66				3	2	19		34	5	7	154	13	192
Malaysia	9	1	3		4		49	5		22		6	93	162	40	16		115	5	5		8	2	137	4	209	21	72	724	78	817
Nauru																															
New Guinea			1		2								3	2										4		2			8		11
New Zealand	138	5	106	2	74	2	40	2		8		11	377	262	11	77	2	100	3	26		10	2	36		88	7	25	624	36	1,001

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—NUMBER OF EXCHANGES WITH EACH COUNTRY, 1949-69—Continued
[Arrivals only]

Area and country	U.S. grantees: Academic: University students 1949-68	1969	Research scholars 1949-68	1969	Teachers 1949-68	1969	International visitors: University lecturers 1949-68	1969	Educational travel 1959-68	1969	Short-term grantees 1949-68	1969	U.S. totals, cumulative 1969	1949-69	Foreign grantees: Academic: University students 1949-68	1969	Research scholars 1949-68	1969	Teachers 1949-68	1969	International visitors: University lecturers 1949-68	1969	Educational travel 1957-68	1969	Specialists 1949-68	1969	Leaders 1949-68	1969	Foreign totals, cumulative 1969	1949-68	U.S. and foreign total 1969	1949-69
East Asia and Pacific—Continued																																
Pacific Islands:																																
Br. Solomon Islands																											1		1	2	1	2
Fiji Islands											1		4		1				8	1					4		20	5	6	40	6	44
Micronesia																																
Mariana, Marshall																																
Carolina Islands					1								1						1						2		15			18		19
New Caledonia											1		1																			1
Tonga Islands					2								2														1			1		3
Western Samoa															8										3		6			17		17
The Philippines	79	3	37		10		162	5			18	1	9	315	965	28	50	1	50	4	15	2	21	2	116	1	172	20	58	1,447	67	1,762
Singapore	2	5			2		9	2			8		7	28	35	6	7		21		1		7	2	56	4	37	6	18	182	25	210
Thailand	16		13		41		96	3			38		3	207	501	37	5		54	11	2		18	2	125	3	220	55	108	1,033	111	1,240
Vietnam			1	1	19	8	42				19		9	90	97		8		21		1		6	2	36	2	66	34	38	273	47	363
Multicountry					1		4	1	9		169	15	16	199																	16	199
Total	765	41	649	13	559	27	1,141	68	9		583	28	177	3,883	6,451	336	1,823	53	1,319	58	325	16	129	25	1,136	24	2,744	317	829	14,756	1,006	18,639
Latin America:																																
Argentina	75	7	9		14		83	10	7		18		17	223	365	32	42	2	143	9	22	1	195	20	109	2	353	32	98	1,327	115	1,550
Barbados					2								2	2	2				5	1			1		8	2	4		3	23	3	25
Bolivia	24	2	1		8		14				5		2	54	127	14	20		197	13	2		427	12	18	1	156	23	63	1,010	65	1,064
Brazil	124	10	19	1	76		131	13	15		76	3	27	468	610	46	113	6	301	9	33		814	54	156	4	491	70	189	2,707	216	3,175
Chile	106	10	10		16		96	3	6		21	3	16	271	395	30	44	5	212	10	19	4	62	5	28	2	212	25	81	1,053	97	1,324
Colombia	70	8	4		171		135	17			24		25	429	328	33	23	3	220	19	16	1	348	10	53	1	161	20	87	1,236	112	1,665
Costa Rica	32				3		17	2			4		2	58	66		8		94	7	1		330	5	39	8	66	4	24	628	26	686
Cuba	8				6		13				6			33	57		2		46		1		5		7		40			158		191
Dominican Republic	11										13	1	1	25	63	6	3		42	13	1		120	9	14	12	90	23	63	396	64	421
Ecuador	43	4	1		10		61	9			26	1	14	155	154	9	12		201	22	4		357	20	37	1	147	16	68	980	82	1,135
El Salvador	2				2		14	2			6		2	26	39	1	2		82	11			343	20	23		59	15	47	595	49	621
Guatemala	71				1		24				10			106	69		3		286	13	4		556		101	9	157	21	43	1,219	43	1,325
Guiana (French) and Surinam											1			1	2				1				1		2	1	6	1	2	14	2	15
Guyana					6		2	1			2		1	11	45	3			13	1			4		35	3	31	7	14	142	15	153
Haiti	18				2		12				6			38	71			1	56	6	1		21		19		17	8	15	200	15	238
Honduras	8				7		16	1			6	1	2	39	58		3		112	11			153		13	4	59	11	26	424	28	463
Honduras, British									1		2		1	3	5	1			15	2			2		13	2	18	3	8	61	9	64
Jamaica	8	1	14		7		11	1			11		2	53	4		6		8	11	1		18		39	3	26	7	21	123	23	176
Mexico	90	4	1		5		176	13			78	2	19	369	321	13	35	10	526	39	16		1,043	20	80	5	140	13	100	2,261	119	2,630
Nicaragua	14				8		13				1			36	87	3	3		52	8	2		90	4	19		45	10	25	323	25	359
Panama	8						13	1			15		1	37	102		4		98	12	2		60	60	23		46	9	81	416	82	453
Paraguay	6		3		6		18	1			4		1	38	100	3	8	3	87	8		1	53	4	21	4	84	9	32	385	33	423
Peru	93	7	25		20		130	8	5	6	9		21	303	209	21	87	7	197	22	9		355	10	22	2	119	32	94	1,092	115	1,395
Trinidad and Tobago	3		1		1		14	4			1		4	24	29	2	2		5				15		21	2	25	3	7	104	11	128
Uruguay	25	2	6		6		57	11			14	1	14	122	115	9	34	4	136	10	3		338		45	1	100	11	35	806	49	928
Venezuela	75	5			1		22		9		41	6	11	159	67	7	8		162	22	3		373	29	48	1	238	23	82	981	93	1,140
West Indies:																																
British (including Bahamas)	1	1	5		25						8		1	40	25		4		24		2		16		29		19			119	1	159
French Antilles					3									3					5	1			29	3	2		17	4	8	61	8	64
Netherland Antilles											2			2					2						4	1			1	7	1	9
Multicountry							8		9	4	234	4	8	259																	8	259
Total	915	61	99	1	406		1,080	97	51	11	644	22	192	3,387	3,515	233	466	41	3,328	280	142	7	6,129	285	1,028	71	2,926	400	1,317	18,851	1,509	22,238
Multiarea					1		5				476	7	7	489																	7	489
Grand total	16,133	723	3,475	148	6,252	182	6,463	413	102	44	3,611	103	1,613	37,649	36,642	1,694	8,368	452	11,510	626	2,379	162	7,215	505	5,547	213	18,133	1,285	4,937	94,371	6,550	132,380

[1] Includes grants to both Western and Eastern Europe and Yugoslavia for the period 1949-64.
[2] In addition, the following exchanges were arranged under State Department sponsorship and through the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the U.S.S.R.:

"IUCTG" exchanges with Eastern Europe

Country	U.S. Grantees				Foreign grantees				
	Students	Research scholars	Teachers	U.S. total	Students	Research scholars	Teachers	Foreign total	U.S. and foreign totals
Bulgaria	2			2	4			4	4
Czechoslovakia	6			6	8			8	16
Hungary					2			2	2
U.S.S.R.	28	4	22	54	24	4	18	46	100
Total	36	4	22	62	38	4	18	60	
Grand total					74	8	40	122	122

TABLE 2.—FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION BY CATEGORY OF GRANTEE, JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969

[Arrivals only]

Fields of specialization	U.S. grantees							Foreign grantees								
	Academic				International visitors			Academic				International visitors				
	University students	Research scholars	Teachers	University lecturers	Educational travel	Short-term grantees	U.S. total	University students	Research scholars	Teachers	University lecturers	Educational travel	Specialists	Leaders	Foreign total	U.S. and foreign total
Humanities:																
Fine arts:																
Archeology	4						4		4						4	8
Architecture	12	3		2			17	38	1		4	4	1	5	53	70
Painting: sculpture	9	5				4	18		2		1				3	21
History of art, architecture	30	4				1	35	2	4		2			2	10	45
Music	58	6				9	73		2		4	1	8	11	26	99
History of music	20					1	21	19	1		1			2	23	44
Theater arts	7			3	4	5	19	10	1				3	21	35	54
History of theater arts	5			1			6				1				1	7
Other	7				1	3	11	7	1		2	9		24	43	54
Fine arts, total	152	18		6	5	23	204	76	16		15	14	12	65	198	402
Language and literature:																
African																
Classical	3	1	1	1			6	3	4	2	3				12	18
East Asian	6						6				5				5	11
Slavic, European	63	3	23	1			90	4	2	25	4				35	125
Near East and South Asian	7						7				1	1			2	9
Romance	117	3	2	2			124		4	21	33	1			59	183
U.S. and English	21	3	51	73		8	156	124	8	12	6	41		1	192	348
Other	16	2		1		2	21	28	2	1	5	2	4	3	45	66
Language and literature, total	233	12	77	78		10	410	159	20	61	57	45	4	4	350	760
Library science		1		1		2	4	12	2			8		5	27	31
Linguistics, philology	19	2		19		1	41	48	2						50	91
Philosophy	28	2		3			33	11	4		3	2		1	21	54
Religion	15	4		3			22	25	2		1				28	50
Humanities, other	3			1			4	3				2		1	6	18
Humanities, total	450	39	77	111	5	36	718	334	46	61	76	71	16	76	680	1,398
Social sciences:																
Anthropology	7	2		3			12	12							12	24
Business administration				7			7	117	2	1	2	25	6	18	171	178
Communications				5		2	7	10	1		1	16	54	256	338	345
Economics	13	3	1	23		6	46	116	11	1	11	53	2	39	233	279
Geography	2	1	8	2			13	13	2	8	3				26	39
History:																
African	1			1			2							1	1	3
East Asian	6	2					8				1	1		1	3	11
European	67			2			69		1	2	1				4	73
Latin American	6						6		1						1	7
Near East and South Asian	4	9				1	14									14
U.S. history and civilization	2			29		1	32	8		23	1	1		1	34	66
World			1				1		1	4					5	6
Other	6	11	5	5			27	18	3	4	3	4	1	2	35	62
History, total	92	22	6	37		2	159	26	6	33	6	6	1	5	83	242
Labor industrial relations						14	14		1				4	110	115	129
Law	21	6		7		1	35	72	17		8	69		54	220	255
Manufacturing industry		1					1	5					1	3	9	10
Political science	42	5		18		8	73	54	11		1	51	13	412	542	615
Psychology	4	2		17			23	28	11	2					41	64
Public administration	1	1		1			3	15	2			16		19	52	55
Social science						1	1			35					35	36
Social work and welfare	5			12		1	18	6					43	8	57	75
Women's organizations and activities						1	1							16	16	17
Youth organizations and activities												5	32	27	64	64
Sociology	6	11		11		2	30	45	4	1	6	8	6	21	91	121
Statistics				1			1	8						1	9	10
Urban housing and planning	2	1		1		8	12	10						25	35	47
Social sciences other	1	1					2	25						1	26	28
Social sciences total	196	56	15	145		46	458	562	68	81	38	249	162	1,015	2,175	2,633
Agriculture, food sciences:																
Agriculture	2	2		1	17		22	35	1		1	26	10	32	105	127
Food technology	1	1		1			3									3
Home economics, dietetics		1		1			2	4		1			2	1	8	10
Other								7							77	77
Agriculture, food sciences, Total	3	3	1	3	17		27	46	1	1	1	26	12	33	120	147
Medical sciences	1	4		13		1	19	79	77		7	3		10	176	195

TABLE 2.—FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION BY CATEGORY OF GRANTEE, JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969—Continued

[Arrivals only]

Fields of specialization	U.S. grantees							Foreign grantees								
	Academic				International visitors			Academic				International visitors				
	University students	Research scholars	Teachers	University lecturers	Educational travel	Short-term grantees	U.S. total	University students	Research scholars	Teachers	University lecturers	Educational travel	Specialists	Leaders	Foreign total	U.S. and foreign total
Natural and physical sciences:																
Chemistry	6	8	3	13			30	49	82	5	4			1	141	171
Earth sciences	2	5		3			10	16	6		1			3	26	36
Life sciences	8	11	2	26			47	46	96	11	5	1		2	161	208
General science, science history	1		2				3	2							2	5
Mathematics	11	6	9	15			41	66	17	21	12	1		2	119	160
Physics	3	9	1	11		1	25	64	26	5	6			1	102	127
Space sciences						1	1	1	2					3	6	7
Natural and physical sciences, other								10		1				1	12	12
Natural and physical sciences, total	31	39	17	68		2	157	254	229	43	28	2		13	569	726
Engineering	5	4		20			29	232	24	2	9	17		10	294	323
Education:																
Administration and supervision				2		1	3	6		67	1			10	84	87
Art and music education	2		8	2			12			10	1	1		2	14	26
General		2	1	12		1	16			34	1	27		80	142	158
Elementary and preschool	2		32	2			36		1	58				2	61	97
Secondary	2		4	1			7	6		99		2			107	114
Teacher training and methodology of teaching			1	2			3	1	1	8		2	1	7	20	23
English as a foreign language	2		16	25		3	46	27	1	120		9		1	158	204
Physical			3			3	6	8	2	4			12	1	27	33
Remedial										6		60	3	1	70	70
Science education			1	3			4	1		23		1	1		26	30
Vocational			6	1			7			8					8	15
Education, other	4			1		3	8	83		1		1	3	5	93	101
Education, total	12	2	72	51		11	148	132	5	438	3	103	20	109	810	938
Area studies	25	1		2	22	1	51	45	2			10			57	108
Transportation								2					1	10	13	13
Liberal arts								6				1			7	7
Sports						6	6						2	4	6	12
Observation of United States												23		4	27	27
Other								2						1	3	3
Grand total	723	148	182	413	44	103	1,613	1,694	452	626	162	505	213	1,285	4,937	6,550

TABLE 3.—DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTEES IN THE UNITED STATES 1952–66; 1967, 1968, AND 1969

[Arrivals only (except for 1969)]

	Arrivals						Arrivals, extensions, and renewals, 1969				Total arrivals, 1952–69	
	1952–66		1967		1968		From United States		To United States			
	From United States	To United States	From United States	To United States	From United States	To United States	Arrivals	Extensions and renewals	Arrivals	Extensions and renewals	From United States	To United States
Alabama	180	131	10	12	11	7	10		8	4	211	158
Alaska	17	6	2		2	1			3		21	10
Arizona	154	258	23	36	13	23	23		19	11	213	336
Arkansas	114	129	7	4	4	8	9	1	4	4	134	145
California	3,362	4,663	281	416	254	405	213	17	453	414	4,110	5,937
Colorado	386	918	31	77	27	66	23	3	41	69	467	1,102
Connecticut	797	1,240	59	58	42	44	51	3	60	59	949	1,402
Delaware	104	100	10	4	6	4	5	1	1	5	125	109
Florida	397	451	37	41	26	39	15	2	32	28	475	563
Georgia	254	365	24	34	20	30	12	1	25	30	310	454
Hawaii	120	42	17	9	11	11	9	2	4	9	157	66
Idaho	96	43	5	3	7	89	7	1	2	1	115	137
Illinois	1,518	3,414	122	201	94	199	98	6	234	256	1,832	4,048
Indiana	683	1,584	44	147	48	127	33	3	132	122	808	1,988
Iowa	436	690	26	49	29	34	25	1	59	58	516	832
Kansas	422	1,094	29	56	31	59	32	4	49	53	514	1,258
Kentucky	238	164	12	6	12	4	11		5	7	273	179
Louisiana	240	327	24	18	12	19	15		18	19	291	382
Maine	168	166	13	14	4	11	5		7	4	190	198
Maryland	563	636	39	34	32	28	46	1	30	59	680	728
Massachusetts	1,541	4,167	113	255	80	260	78	6	219	256	1,812	4,901
Michigan	1,234	2,656	74	193	68	137	57	4	129	165	1,433	3,106
Minnesota	774	1,232	59	55	30	70	38		62	73	901	1,419
Mississippi	128	43	7	3	9	3	5		4	6	149	53
Missouri	483	609	36	41	34	34	38	1	31	53	591	715
Montana	125	84	5	2	5	6	2		5	6	137	97
Nebraska	210	153	10	30	8	26	7		5	13	235	214
Nevada	48	10	4	1	3		4		2	1	59	13
New Hampshire	155	146	8	8	9	10	11	2	8	17	183	172
New Jersey	1,101	1,253	90	93	76	92	47	7	67	58	1,314	1,505
New Mexico	155	129	11	10	9	11	15		7	18	190	157
New York	4,443	6,406	311	434	232	421	214	25	378	491	52,00	7,639
North Carolina	485	670	32	55	19	28	28	1	35	63	564	788
North Dakota	94	40	3	7	7	6	6	1	5	5	110	58
Ohio	1,101	2,008	86	173	56	133	47	6	127	112	1,290	2,441
Oklahoma	255	281	14	44	9	8	11	2	10	14	289	343
Oregon	434	625	26	77	37	48	25	3	46	30	522	796
Pennsylvania	1,518	2,669	108	211	106	196	96	5	197	249	1,828	3,273
Rhode Island	198	319	13	24	14	16	13	1	17	31	238	376
South Carolina	158	136	9	8	10	7	12	1	3	6	189	154
South Dakota	115	56	6	2	9	2	3		4		133	64
Tennessee	302	436	21	23	11	11	14	3	16	23	348	486

	Arrivals						Arrivals, extensions, and renewals, 1969					
	1952–66		1967		1968		From United States		To United States		Total arrivals, 1952–69	
	From United States	To United States	From United States	To United States	From United States	To United States	Arrivals	Extensions and renewals	Arrivals	Extensions and renewals	From United States	To United States
Texas	724	1,456	77	144	59	111	51	3	109	84	911	1,820
Utah	181	246	10	7	13	22	9	3	8	10	213	283
Vermont	119	150	5	9	9	10	5	2	7	7	138	176
Virginia	476	372	31	35	25	30	30	2	18	31	562	455
Washington	576	1,104	44	57	32	59	30	3	54	54	682	1,274
West Virginia	122	81	6	7	8	3	6	1	2	7	142	93
Wisconsin	683	1,515	44	122	46	155	43	4	95	100	816	1,887
Wyoming	71	43	4	2	2	4	2		1	5	79	50
District of Columbia	489	829	38	103	36	108	17	2	81	74	580	1,121
Guam	3										3	
Puerto Rico	85	1,142	5	70	5	96	2		58	4	97	1,366
Virgin Islands	5						1			1	6	
Multi-state		25,005		1,884		1,712			1,914	4		30,515
Residing or assigned outside the United States	43	1	5	1	3		4	1	36	1	55	38
Total	28,883	72,491	2,130	5,409	1,764	5,043	1,613	135	4,937	3,284	34,390	87,880

TABLE 4.—TOTAL PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM, 1969

[Arrivals plus grant extensions and renewals]

Area	U.S. grantees			Foreign grantees			U.S. and foreign total participants
	Arrivals	Extension and renewal	Total U.S. participants	Arrivals	Extension and renewals	Total foreign participants	
Latin America and Caribbean	192	16	208	1,317	343	1,660	1,868
Western Europe	947	91	1,038	1,604	869	2,473	3,511
Eastern Europe	59	1	60	148	40	188	248
Africa	38	4	42	513	381	894	936
Near East-South Asia	193	11	204	526	961	1,487	1,691
East Asia and Pacific	177	12	189	829	690	1,519	1,708
Multiarea	7		7				7
Total, 1969	1,613	135	1,748	4,937	3,284	8,221	9,969
Total, 1968	1,764	182	1,946	5,043	3,317	8,360	10,306
Percent change fiscal year 1969 over fiscal year 1968	−8	−25	−10	−2	−1	−2	−3

TABLE 5.—WOMEN GRANTEES AS COMPARED TO TOTAL EXCHANGES, JULY 1, 1968 TO JUNE 30, 1969

[Arrivals only]

	Students and educational travel		Lecturers and research scholars		Teachers		Leaders and professionals		Total	
	Women	All	Women	All	Women	All	Women	All	Women	All
U.S. grantees:										
Latin America and Caribbean	42	72	9	98			4	22	55	192
Western Europe	217	554	11	250	61	136	1	7	290	947
Eastern Europe	9	19	2	19			4	21	15	59
Africa			1	25	2	4	1	9	4	38
Near East-South Asia	37	81	7	88	7	15		9	51	193
East Asia and Pacific	4	41	8	81	12	27		28	24	177
Multiarea							2	7	2	7
Total U.S.	309	767	38	561	82	182	12	103	441	1,613
Foreign grantees:										
Latin America and Caribbean	153	518	6	48	118	280	48	471	325	1,317
Western Europe	179	803	33	388	108	222	22	191	342	1,604
Eastern Europe	15	30	7	51	5	9	10	58	37	148
Africa	49	217		2		22	20	272	69	513
Near East-South Asia	43	270	5	56	9	35	17	165	74	526
East Asia and Pacific	72	361	5	69	7	58	18	341	102	829
Total foreign	511	2,199	56	614	247	626	135	1,498	949	4,937
Grand total	820	2,966	94	1,175	329	808	147	1,601	1,390	6,550

TABLE 6.—SOURCES OF FUNDS PROGRAMED, FISCAL YEARS 1968 AND 1969

Source of funds	1968	1969	Difference, increase (+) or decrease (−)
Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act Appropriation	$43,682,708	$31,389,503	−$12,293,205
Other funds available:			
International educational exchange activities (special foreign currency program appropriations)		1,033,328	+1,033,328
Reserve funds on hand, binational educational foundations and commissions	864,398	831,055	−33,334
Educational exchange funds, payment by Finland, World War I debt	$362,593	$391,320	+$28,727
Foreign government contributions to cost-sharing agreements	2,061,195	1,794,464	−266,731
Irish counterpart Funds	89,608	89,608	
Total, other funds	3,377,735	4,139,775	−761,990
Grand total	47,060,493	35,529,278	−11,531,215

TABLE 7.—COUNTRIES WHICH SHARE COSTS OF EXCHANGE[1]

Country	Cost-sharing agreement signed	Fiscal year 1969 contribution	Country	Cost-sharing agreement signed	Fiscal year 1969 contribution
Australia	Aug. 28, 1964	$229,600	Israel	Mar. 23, 1967	4,286
Austria	June 25, 1963	150,000	Italy		240,000
Belgium/Luxembourg		45,000	Netherlands		45,858
China (Taiwan)	Apr. 23, 1964	15,300	Norway	Mar. 16, 1964	28,000
Cyprus	Sept. 7, 1968	2,420	Spain		75,000
Denmark	Feb. 25, 1965	20,000	Sweden	June 28, 1963	10,638
France	May 7, 1965	225,225	United Kingdom	May 10, 1965	34,000
Germany	Nov. 20, 1962	668,000			
Iceland	Feb. 13, 1964	1,137	Total		1,794,464

[1] In addition, Ireland provided $89,608 in Irish counterpart funds under a special exchange agreement.

TABLE 8.—TOTAL FUNDS OBLIGATED, FISCAL YEARS 1965–69

Program activity	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	Percent change 1969 over 1968
Exchange of persons:						
Exchanges with 127 countries and territories	$39,322,512	$39,929,279	$35,134,048	$33,079,987	$23,183,251	
Assistance to high school (teen-age) exchanges	385,000	385,000	200,000	180,000	182,762	
Special programs for nongrant students	391,324	394,816	271,549	362,600	455,000	
Volunteers to America			73,000	99 936	37,708	
Total, exchange of persons	40,098,836	40,709,095	35,678,597	33,722,523	23,858,721	−29
Aid to American-sponsored schools abroad	3,173,000	3,176,636	2,899,931	2,052,937	1,599,942	−22
Cultural presentations	2,498,997	2,774,140	1,606,397	1,575,487	1,199,010	−24
Multilateral organizations activities	465,239	460,226	477,891	405,771	433,522	+7
Program services cost	6,797,300	7,152,312	7,146,572	6,804,143	6,160,583	−9
Administrative expense	2,357,796	2,491,435	2,491,225	2,499,632	2,277,500	−9
Grand total	55,391,168	56,763,844	50,300,613	47,060,493	35,529,278	−25

TABLE 9.—*Expenditures by country, under Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act (P.L. 87–256) During Fiscal Year 1969*

	Expenditures
Africa:	
Algeria	$70,935
Angola	236,694
Botswana	94,156
Burundi	46,973
Cameroon	53,361
Central African Republic	23,663
Chad	18,801
Congo–Kinshasa	61,837
Dahomey	44,572
Equitorial Guinea	35,168
Ethiopia	109,241
Gabon	6,290
Gambia	31,711
Ghana	157,614
Guinea	29,902
Ivory Coast	49,627
Kenya	113,379
Lesotho	83,796
Liberia	264,957
Libya	34,903
Malagasy Republic	42,379
Malawi	18,537
Mali	47,661
Mauritius	23,681
Morocco	112,582
Mozambique	252,011
Niger	44,481
Nigeria	156,360
Rwanda	33,112
Senegal	42,304
Sierra Leone	102,598
Somalia	61,046
South Africa	527,909
Southern Rhodesia	541,339
Sudan	35,168
Swaziland	100,440
Tanzania	63,888
Togo	41,348
Tunisia	82,211
Uganda	167,322
Upper Volta	35,143
Zambia	111,956
Regional	268,719
Cultural Presentations	315,429
Total	4,795,204
American Republics:	
Argentina	398,261
Barbados	23,546
Bolivia	266,997
Brazil	$779,848
British Honduras	29,911
Chile	380,908
Colombia	506,676
Costa Rica	58,915
Dominican Republic	113,827
Ecuador	292,321
El Salvador	79,531
Guatemala	162,591
Guyana	95,772
Haiti	38,108
Honduras	77,759
Jamaica	63,942
Martinique	18,784
Mexico	493,817
Nicaragua	68,485
Panama	102,175
Paraguay	102,491
Peru	377,879
Surinam	5,950
Trinidad	94,274
Uruguay	141,024
Venezuela	289,004
Regional	455,156
Cultural Presentations	244,359
Total	5,762,311
Western Europe:	
Austria	291,237
Belgium/Luxembourg	149,515
Canada	2,359
Denmark	113,110
Finland	400,424
France	689,462
Germany	1,472,439
Iceland	37,588
Ireland	157,108
Italy	614,092
Malta	5,241
Netherlands	144,094
Norway	131,400
Portugal	68,014
Spain	376,291
Sweden	97,180
United Kingdom	349,241
Regional	195,856
Cooperation with Private Institutions	102,500
Cultural Presentations	47,483
Total	5,444,634
Eastern Europe:	
Bulgaria	23,498
Czechoslovakia	68,805
	Expenditures
Poland	$176,073
Romania	195,245
U.S.S.R.	291,348
Yugoslavia	357,936
Regional	6,211
Cooperation with Private Institutions	66,916
Cultural Presentations	232,569
Total	1,418,601
East Asia:	
Australia	460,035
Burma	6,108
Cambodia	1,685
China (Taiwan)	240,740
Hong Kong	85,366
Indonesia	232,539
Japan	957,115
Korea	389,894
Laos	138,533
Malaysia	256,621
New Zealand	104,144
Philippines	260,932
Singapore	74,656
Suva, C. D.	6,101
Thailand	412,226
U.N. Trust Teritories	4,099
Viet-Nam	240,282
Regional	149,215
Cooperation with Private Institutions	400,000
Cultural Presentations	144,891
Total	4,565,182
Near East & South Asia:	
Afghanistan	186,881
Ceylon	272,937
Cyprus	99,386
Greece	411,030
India	940,964
Iran	319,715
Israel	106,048
Jordan	68,610
Lebanon	110,131
Nepal	158,367
Pakistan	181,136
Saudi Arabia	10,204
Southern Yemen	23,367
Turkey	469,093
United Arab Republic	44,431
Regional	108,248
Cooperation with Private Institutions	97,500

Cultural Presentations	$182,038
Total	3,790,086
Grand total	25,776,018

PERFORMING ARTS GROUPS AND ATHLETIC TEAMS SENT ABROAD IN FISCAL YEAR 1969

Professional groups (17)

Alvin Ailey American Dance Theatre, Europe.
Alwin Nikolais Dance Company, Europe and Near East.
Beers Family (folk ballad), Latin America.
Buddy Guy Band (blues), Africa.
Charlie Byrd Quintet (classical, popular), Africa.
First Chamber Dance Quartet, Near East, Far East.
Glen Tetley Dance Company, Europe.
Jazz Dance Theatre, Africa.
Junior Wells Rhythm & Blues Band, Far East.
Martha Graham Dance Company, Mexico.
Merce Cunningham Dance Company, Latin America.
New York Philharmonic, Europe, Near East.
New York Woodwind Quintet, Latin America.
Oliver Nelson Septet (jazz), Africa.
Paul Taylor Dance Company, Latin America.
Schola Cantorum, Europe.
Smithsonian Olympic Folk Music and Dance Festival, Mexico.

Academic groups (6)

Duquesne University Folk Ensemble, Eastern Europe.
Millikin University Jazz Band, Near East.
Southern Methodist University Jazz Trio, Latin America.
University of Illinois Jazz Band, Europe.
University of Minnesota Concert Band, Soviet Union.
West Virginia University Percussion Ensemble, Latin America.

Individual artists (3)

Andre Watts (Pianist), Far East.
Betty Allen (Soprano), Latin America.
Jimmy Driftwood (Folk Singer), Far East.

Athletic teams (7)

Armed Forces Basketball Team, Latin America.
AAU Gymnastics Team, Latin America.
College All-Star Baseball Team, Mexico.
Davis Cup Tennis Team, Far East.
Seattle Gymnastics Team, Far East.
Track and Field Team (AAU), Far East.
Track and Field Team (AAU), Africa.

ADVISORY GROUPS AND COMMISSIONS

In carrying out the exchange program, the Department of State in the fiscal year 1969, as in previous years, had the benefit of the cooperation and counsel of especially appointed boards and advisory commissions:

The Board of Foreign Scholarship supervises the academic exchange program and selects all academic grantees. The Board's chairman is James R. Roach, professor of government, University of Texas, who succeeded John Hope Franklin, chairman of the Department of History at the University of Chicago, in February 1969.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs recommends to the President broad policies on the conduct of international educational and cultural programs. Its chairman is Homer D. Babbidge, president of the University of Connecticut.

The Advisory Committee on the Arts advises the Department of State on exchange programs in the arts. Its chairman in 1969 was Roy E. Larsen, vice chairman of Time, Inc., first elected in 1963.

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO serves as an advisor to the State Department on UNESCO's program and biennial budget and as a link between UNESCO and the American people. Its chairman during 1969 was Alvin C. Eurich, president of the Academy for Educational Development of New York, who was elected in 1967.

The Government Advisory Committee on International Book and Library Programs assists the Department in a continuing review of U.S. Government book and library activities abroad. Its chairman during 1969 was W. Bradford Wiley, president of the publishing firm of John Wiley and Sons, who was appointed in 1966.

The Advisory Panel on International Athletics assists in the planning and selection of exchange programs involving athletes and coaches.

The National Review Board for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West (East-West Center), which reviews the programs and operations of the Center, had as its chairman Governor in 1969 John A. Burns of Hawaii, first appointed in 1965.

STATEMENT OF THE POLICEMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WITH REGARD TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the District of Columbia crime legislation now in conference, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following two statements of the Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia:

WHO'S NEXT? BECAUSE OF PRETRIAL DETENTION

Too many policemen have lost their lives because of the numerous defendants who are out on bail and are committing crimes while awaiting trial. These individuals are a danger to the community and should be detained.

The case of Officer Ronald Watson, who was critically wounded in last Thursday's shoot-out, offers a perfect example of the dire need for the pretrial detention provision in the pending D.C. Crime Bill. The suspect who shot Officer Watson three times and was then himself killed was out on bond for two previous armed robbery charges and for assaulting a police officer. In addition, he had been convicted twice previously on assault charges, once for assault of a police officer.

The Bail Reform Act of 1966, as it is interpreted by the D.C. Court of Appeals, makes it impossible for a Judge to detain a dangerous defendant prior to trial. Consequently, the Judge must set bail and the defendant is allowed to roam the streets and continue to commit criminal offenses until his trial date. The pretrial detention provision in the D.C. crime bill would allow the Judge to consider the defendant's dangerousness to the community as well as the probability of his showing up for trial before setting bond or detaining the individual.

It is unfair to make police officers arrest criminals over and over again only to have them turned loose to commit additional crimes and in many instances, shoot police officers.

WHO'S NEXT? BECAUSE OF PRETRIAL DETENTION

Carl W. Beatty, President of the Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia, representing over 5300 police officers from the Metropolitan Police Department, Executive Protective Service (formerly known as the White House Police), and the United States Park Police, today urged immediate Congressional action on the pending crime legislation for the District of Columbia.

Speaking with reference to the pretrial detention provision of the bill, Beatty said, "Too many policemen have lost their lives because of the numerous defendants who are out on bail and are committing crimes while awaiting trial. These individuals are a danger to the community and should be detained." "The case of Officer Ronald Watson, who was critically wounded in last Thursday's shoot-out, the case of the two F.B.I. agents killed last year and Officer Stocker several years ago, offers perfect examples of the dire need for the pretrial detention provision in the crime bill. The suspect who shot Officer Watson three times and was then himself killed was out on bond for two previous armed robbery charges. In addition, he had been convicted twice previously on assault charges, once for assault of a police officer," the President of the Policemen's Association said.

"The Bail Reform Act of 1966 as it is interpreted by the D.C. Court of Appeals makes it impossible for a Judge to detain a dangerous defendant prior to trial. Consequently, the Judge must set bail and the defendant is allowed to roam the streets and continue to commit criminal offenses until his trial date. The pretrial detention provision in the D.C. crime bill would allow the Judge to consider the defendant's dangerousness to the community as well as the probability of his showing up for trial before setting bond or detaining the individual," Beatty said.

BOSTON DANIELS, KANSAS CITY, KANS., CHIEF OF POLICE

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the many friends and associates of Boston Daniels in congratulating him upon his appointment as chief of police of Kansas City, Kans. I have known Chief Daniels for many years. I have worked with him in youth activities and Boy Scouts and have come to admire and respect him as an inspiring leader and a most dedicated and capable administrator. Boston Daniels joined the Kansas City, Kans., police department as a patrolman in 1945 and was promoted to detective 5 years later. He became a major in 1967. In that position he has headed all of the department's investigative operations. With his appointment as chief of police he becomes the first Negro to hold that position in a city the size of Kansas City, Kans.—population 170,000.

Station WDAF, Kansas City, summed up our pleasure concerning Boston Daniels' appointment in the following words:

As a detective major, Boston Daniels has been one of the metropolitan area's top crime fighters and is also a man who had done tremendous work in promoting a greater understanding between minority groups and the police department.

WDAF feels that its to his credit to be the first Negro chief of police in the metropolitan area, and we know with the Kansas City, Kans., police department his leadership can do nothing but strengthen the police department operations.

And, to my colleagues here in the House, I would like to commend Chief Daniels' own words when he says:

Today's problem is communications. Find out what is bothering people, then do something about it.

A VERSATILE AND HIGHLY DEDICATED MAN

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of the House, now approaching his centenary—August 15—has had a long and most useful career, and has manifested great versatility. He has earned the designations of publicist, statesman, executive, conservationist, effective supporter of efforts in behalf of the study of tropical disease, wise and successful advocate of just claims of the "under dog," a builder of the Panama Canal, as member of the Isthmian Canal Commission—1910–11–12–13—and Civil Governor of the Canal Zone, and so forth. Moreover he has fine literary ability, and is possessed of a rich talent of poetic character which has enabled him to write a considerable body of most excellent poetry—some of which has found publicity in newspapers and magazines in the United States and Panama. He has never had time to screen and publish his poems in volume form.

I refer to Maurice Hudson Thatcher of Kentucky, Louisville district, now domiciled in the city of Washington, and yet interested in the Panama Canal and its employees, the Isthmus of Panama, the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama City, for whose creation, in Congress in 1928, he sponsored and obtained the Enabling Act; and since about 1939 he has gratuitously served the supervisory body—the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine—as vice president and general counsel; and now as honorary president and general counsel. This laboratory has grown to be—as is generally believed—the outstanding institution of the world in research studies touching the cause and prevention of tropical disease, both human and veterinary.

From time to time there have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD eulogies of this devoted and dedicated man, with more detailed account of his achievements.

Some recent poems from Mr. Thatcher's pen are subjoined under leave accorded, which are, as I believe, of a very high order and most thoughtful; and I am glad to share them with other readers of the RECORD.

The poems follow:

CHRISTMAS 1969

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

Now comes again that season of the year
When custom requires that families and friends
Exchanges make of gifts and timely cheer
And sentiment; and while are made amends
By some for errors past; and there is the hope
For mutual health and strength in times ahead.
These are the days when kindness, in broadened scope,
Finds ampler play, and by holy zeal is led.
There's nought for me to say that is not old,
And nothing to suggest that is not new—
Except what fearless science may unfold
To deal to moral lapse the stroke that's due.
If that I write seems like what's gone before,
Some stress I'll add from friendship's boundless store.
May Heaven's richest blessing attend you!

DECORATION

Decoration Day! and the Living place
On Tomb, Grave, and Shaft the Blooms that deck and grace—
In Memory of the Dead, and in Tribute to
The Sacrifices which Time cannot efface.
May 30, 1970

FERRY BELLS

On either shore of a Stream that found the Sea,
Once stood a Bell. What 'er the hour might be,
The Keeper was aroused, and ferried o'er,
The Traveler, and earned a modest fee.

How earnest were the pleadings of the Bells!
In deepest night how lonely seemed the Knells!
But Progress has replaced these Monitors—
A Traffic Bridge is there. Alas, the Bells!

Each of us westward moves to River Death:
When is exhaled the last, convulsive Breath,
Will there be One to take the orphaned Soul
Across to Realms of Bliss, devoid of death?

The Pure-in-Heart strive to be Wise and Just;
Belief in Sequent Good sustains their Trust;
The Law of Compensation proves its worth—
Else, Man's Mission fails, and Soul reverts to Dust.

Our Faith must be that the Eternal Plan
Was wrought to serve the Betterment of Man
(And those like him, perhaps, on other Orbs)—
But not fully revealed since Life began.

Now, Faith is Reasoned Hope, food for the Soul,
The Key to High Adventure and Vital Goal.
Toil ye in Faith—at length there may be found
Some Earned Reward, and your Name upon the Scroll!

AGE, YOUTH, AND TIME

Why should men age, altho they must grow old?
Why doth not Time deal gently with his own?
And why should rosy Youth his bloom withhold
From those who unto ancientry have grown?
Tell me, I pray, why Time should leave his mark—
His stamp, indelible, on face and form?
And, for ripe years, tax me with tokens dark,
Wrought from Life's long and all-relentless storm?
Were I a tree I'd bear internal rings
To prove mine age—but they'd be hid from sight:
But, being man, my span most surely brings
Inward and outward witness of my plight.
Bid me grow old—Time's flight no strength can stay:
But keep me youthful till I've passed away.

CABINET TASK FORCE ON OIL IMPORT CONTROL

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express concern over the inaction by the President upon the release of the report by the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control. The mandatory oil import program is 10 years old and is not only outdated, but is unnecessary.

I would like to propose a three-point revision of the program concurrent with the recommendations of the task force. I feel that the independent deepwater terminal operators should be allotted a greater deepwater supply. I had asked on May 13 for an amendment to Presidential proclamation 3279, as amended, to provide for allocation of 150,000 barrels per day of No. 2 fuel oil into the east coast; and to this date only 40,000 barrels per day have been granted. This is hardly enough to affect prices for the consumer. I also wish to see a permanent open exemption for Canadian oil, which was found to be the most secure of any foreign oil source by the task force. Presently, Canada is under the same restrictive quota as other foreign countries.

I also feel that there should be a reduction of all oil import quotas with an eye toward their eventual abolition. Our national security cannot be at stake when there are 270 billion barrels of domestic oil which are untouched in the United States. According to the task force, which has estimated that we will consume 50 billion barrels in the next 10 years, there is more than enough oil to meet our needs for the indefinite future. It makes no sense to argue that the best way to assure open supply lines in times of emergency is to dry them up in times of peace.

The term "national security" is no more than a charade that is designed to mask the continuation of a program which serves only to obstruct competition and guarantee unjustifiably high-oil prices. Oil reform may not rank at the top of the scale of national priorities, but it is an important issue in terms of both consumer needs and the war against inflation.

Perhaps the most important aspect of this problem is that it raises a serious question about the responsiveness of Government. All our citizens are being manipulated by one of the Nation's most privileged and powerful private interest groups and are being silenced by a vocal minority.

The low cost of imported oil will serve to both force the domestic market to lower its prices, and insure the utmost efficiency in all operations.

There is no reason why in a country which thrives on competition, competition is scorned as a security risk on the oil market. Free trade has been a principle which has encouraged international unity and I see no reason to continue to restrict free trade of oil imports.

The research done by the task force should not be ignored. The inaction of the President regarding the recommendations is inexcusable since the group was set up to study the problem and make recommendations based upon their findings. I urge that the President take positive action on the proposals of the task force and my recommendations included herewith.

ROGERS MORTON GOP GOALTENDER

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Representative ROGERS C. B. MORTON is not only one of the most outstanding Members of the House of Representatives; he is also one of the best liked. Recently ROGERS was the subject of an excellent article by Lloyd Schwartz in Women's Wear Daily. I believe my colleagues would enjoy reading this article and so, with the House's permission, I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

ROGERS MORTON GOP GOALTENDER

(By Lloyd Schwartz)

WASHINGTON.—Republican National Chairman Rogers C. B. Morton is an affable, silver-haired, 6-foot-7 Marylander-out-of-Kentucky who wears four hats: He is masterminding things political for Richard Nixon; he spends half his time as a member of Congress (where he serves on the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee); he has a 10-gallon cowboy hat on his desk—and nearby, within easy office reach, he has a construction worker's hard-hat neatly lettered: Morton.

Chairman Morton, in an interview with WWD, is clearly the man in control as he articulates Republican strategy and points to the domestic and international "mess" Mr. Nixon inherited from Democratic misrule.

"What we've accomplished in this very short time is really just short of a miracle," Morton declares. "The Nixon record is remarkable in terms of turning the war around in Southeast Asia, in terms of articulating a new foreign policy that is up with the times and really is more in keeping with American interests as these exist around the world and in terms of what we found on the domestic scene when we took over. No Republican candidate, either for local, State or Federal office, has any concern or any apology to make about the Nixon record."

Morton, whose older brother Thruston, an ex-GOP chairman and ex-Kentucky Senator, is being urged to run for Governor of Kentucky, is confident that Republican tenure nationally is to be extended, that a new era has opened.

Despite what he considers some "rather shabby gerry-mandering" by Democratic State Legislatures, with the full impact due in the 1972 elections, Morton sees the GOP holding its own at the very least in the House in November and winning control of the Senate. He thinks the Republicans will pick up three more State Houses, and wind up with 35 Governors—a commanding position.

Looking beyond to 1972, the GOP boss fully expects, and hopes that Nixon will run for a second term and be reelected. What is Nixon bringing to the Presidency that is peculiarly Nixon's? "He is bringing to Government a new concept of management of higher order," Morton reflects. "We are dedicated to the proposition of giving the taxpayers a better return on their investment—better Government for what they're putting into it. And this is coming about even faster than I thought it could."

Morton goes beyond this and predicts that Nixon will be known in history for the reform and redesign of Government structure that will make the bureaucratic monster more workable—and more responsive to the institutions that have been created.

The GOP chairman was born with a silver spoon and is an entirely different type from Larry O'Brien, his Democratic counterpart. Where O'Brien slashes away and relishes the political infighting, Morton offers a "lower profile," somewhat less rhetoric and the coolness bred of a Yale education, success, affluence and confidence in holding the reins of national power.

The "B" in Morton's name is for "Ballard." His family made its fortune with Ballard & Ballard Milling Co., now a subsidiary of Pillsbury Co. (Morton is a Pillsbury director). Years ago, young Morton sold Ballard flour in the Southeast. And he still reflects that he could always tell how well the company was doing by dropping in on the bayou. If the girls had "Ballard" initialed on their panties, Morton knew things were going well. If another company name had the honor, there was trouble.

Trapping Rogers Morton isn't easy. He fends off a question about the Kevin Phillips Doctrine (about a new stable majority the GOP has pieced together from the middle class, blue collar workers, and conservative South) and denies the O'Brien charge that the GOP has become a regional party. Nor does Morton concede that the party is "writing off" urban America, or assigning it second class status.

Morton doesn't agree that the GOP has any "Southern Strategy," and he reacts sharply to a Democratic suggestion that it is in operation: "This business of Southern strategy is political. It's something that's being hung on us. It's a bum rap. Obviously, we want to develop a two-party democracy in the South. The South deserves this and should have it. It will be better for their own local government and their representation in the Federal Government. But we consider our course pragmatic and practical, not just for the South but for the entire country."

Morton emphasizes that more schools have been desegregated "and gotten on the track where education is the prime emphasis" during this administration than in any one year before. He feels the desegregation requirement, laid down by the Supreme Court, is being enforced to the letter, but with care not to sacrifice educational values contained in the school system.

Like Nixon, Rogers Morton is not defensive about Vietnam and Cambodia. A year ago he suggested on TV that if the war were not over by March 1970, the GOP could be in for trouble in the '70 elections. Morton feels he should not have said "over": "I should have said that if the war hadn't turned around and that we were on the road to deescalation, to reduction in American involvement. And, of course, this has come to pass. And I think the President comes off as a great hero in this.

"He's the first person that's come along that's turned it around. It had been escalated from 25,000 men only a few years ago during the Kennedy Administration up to way over half a million men in the Johnson Administration. And now we're on the road back, and the President has done this very deliberately, very calmly, and with great skill."

Morton is upset about the Senate's Cooper-Church Amendment: "Suddenly, there's a sort of scream that Congress should begin to take over some of the President's constitutional powers. It would be in the worst possible interest of the people if the President isn't free to act, if we don't have the capability of management of our forces, wherever they are. The Amendment reflects a sort of turning away from the responsibility we have placed in the presidency—and I happen to believe this President is exercising that responsibility in the highest order."

Morton has just heard from a team of young GOP'ers who toured many college campuses to measure the extent and significance of dissent over Nixon policies. He's matched this with his own travel observations and found that while the disenchanted are making the noise and hogging the headlines, "the hard, big base, the majority of youth, is very much a part of the program Nixon has outlined for deescalating this war."

As the GOP chief views it: "We have to be awful careful to make sure that we get the volume tuned down so we can really understand the music. For instance, the Cambodian raid was very successful, a necessary military operation to crank down the war. People are beginning to understand that. The first flurry on it was in loud opposition. Now that they understand it and see what actually resulted from it, the young people are developing a much greater understanding."

Morton agrees that the "bread basket issue" (prices, inflation, unemployment, interest rates) will figure importantly in how the election turns out this year. But he is utterly convinced the GOP will prevail with its side of the story: The economy was in a "skyrocket burning situation when Nixon took office."

Says Morton: "The Democrats can't hang the mantle of inflation on us. This thing got into high gear before we got on board. The President is doing everything he can not only to cool it off, but to stabilize the values in the economy. I don't believe the people's memory is that short."

Though the President has now adopted a form of "incomes policy" to keep watch over price and wage increases in the context of inflation and the national interest, the Republican chairman does not believe price and wage controls are coming, "though a good deal of planning and thought have been given to it in case we do." Morton says flatly that direct controls, as used in the past, invariably have had "a very demoralizing effect."

SALUTE TO ITALIAN-AMERICANS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today is Italian-American Unity Day, a good time to reflect on the contributions of a great civilization to our young American culture. As former Columbia University President Nicholas Murray Butler has said:

You can subtract Italian culture from civilization only by destroying that civilization.

In cooking, the arts, in statesmanship, in architecture, music, and science, the Italian people have given the world riches beyond measure. Warmth, creativity, loyalty, and deep devotion to family life are Italian virtues that have inestimably enriched the American melting pot. Those who today fly the red, white, and green tricolor in front of their homes are celebrating their membership in a noble culture, one to which all civilized people owe a debt of thanks.

LAW: BRIDGE TO JUSTICE

HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given on Law Day by the Honorable Bryce Harlow at Oklahoma City University:

LAW: BRIDGE TO JUSTICE

(By Hon. Bryce N. Harlow)

My presence here on this special occasion is a bit singular in two respects. First, my wife and I are native products. To us this City is still home. Second—and I say this not triumphantly but lugubriously—a lawyer is precisely what I am not.

In my thirty-two rollicking years back East in America's political Valhalla, I have been called almost everything ranging all the way from stupid and irresponsible to incompetent—but not yet have I had to live with being called a lawyer. Nonetheless, I must assume that almost everyone else here *is* a lawyer, or a law student, or a member of a law faculty, or a lady ensnared in her husband's legal toils. Moreover, this event that joins us tonight is legally noteworthy—Law Day-1970. So there too—your having you lawyers lectured on this Law Day by a non-lawyer has at least some element of singularity. I might say, however, that, while I have not been called a lawyer, I *have* been known for some years as the lawyer's best friend. For years, in an out of the Congress, I have helped to write or to amend our federal laws. To this day, many of the barristers who are making a go of it, thanks to their retainers to interpret the Harlow free-style prose that today encumbers the statutes of the United States.

Well, odd as this all may be, Betty and I are, as a good southern strategist would be expected to say—we're "powerful pleased" that you asked us here. Trite I know it sounds, but our fondest recollections are of our salad days here with our families in Soonerland. We revel in this opportunity you have given us to wend our way home.

Now, to be blunt about it, my lack of law doesn't daunt me one bit, even in these circumstances. After all, an education in Oklahoma City public schools, O.C.U., O.U., or O.S.U., outfits anyone for any situation. Anyway, back in Washington, the less a speaker knows his subject, the more authoritative he is, so in that sense I feel admirably suited to the occasion.

In any case, my not being legally trained just might prove to be an asset this evening, in that my detachment from your consuming legal passions may afford a perspective that one cannot have as one of you. Conceivably, and this I suggest uncertainly but hopefully, I can offer something useful here by moving my thoughts a little closer to the law than I normally do, while at the same time extruding your thoughts just a bit beyond your customary legal preoccupations.

So for better or worse, in that kind of a mind-stretching exercise, let's concern ourselves now with these two themes: (1) The proper role of a good lawyer in our society today; and, (2) The role of a good lawyer in advancing your Law Day theme: "Law: Bridge to Justice."

Now, in suggesting the kind of lawyer I believe our society needs in these times, I necessarily must draw from personal experience. That means drawing from years of shoulder-to-shoulder laboring with lawyers in the federal employ and with others whose work is with the government. So in developing my view of the model lawyer, I hope you will indluge a couple of personal references.

The first concerns one who achieved eminence in your profession—the late Judge Arthur T. Vanderbilt. I am sure many here have known him, or at least know of him. He was Chief Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, President of the American Bar Association, and Dean of the New York University School of Law. While I did not know the Judge personally, I well recall how greatly he was admired by my former boss, President Eisenhower.

Primarily I remember Judge Vanderbilt because I once was interested in, and then—as a non-professional—became quite impressed with, his view of what makes a good lawyer. He believed that it was a sheer waste of a young man's time to go to law school unless he was very sure he wanted to practice law. He also believed that a law school graduate who then concentrated only on technical proficiency in the law simply could not be an effective lawyer. Those statements seem contradictory. At first they seemed so to me. But the Judge's later explanation persuaded me, and perhaps it will you.

Judge Vanderbilt said a good lawyer has to be far more than a lawyer; he should be a host of things: a wise counsellor, a good advocate, active in his professional association, active in community activities, active in government. To be sure, the Judge would not countenance a sloppy legal craftsman. Neither, however, could he abide a skilled craftsman who allowed himself to become narrow and introverted. His idea was that really "good lawyers" would establish their professional reputations, then move in and out of government, politics, civic activities and professional groups.

To round out this thought, I shift to another personal reference. The previous political transient in the White House office which, thanks to the voting public, I now occupy rent-free, was Joseph Califano, a lawyer on the White House staff of President Lyndon Johnson. Mr. Califano is still comparatively young, not yet forty, I believe, but during the autumn season of the Johnson Presidency, he was the President's top assistant for the nation's domestic affairs. For President Johnson, he was a very good lawyer, and so he is now for other clients, including, I might add, the Democratic National Committee.

Now, why do I say Mr. Califano was a good lawyer? In his White House days, he did very little of what is conventionally regarded as the "practice of law." Joe had his own explanation, an intriguing definition of what effective practice of law is or ought to be. He described it as two things: first, the art of perceiving the relevant; and, second, the know-how of doing something useful with it.

The test of a good lawyer, said Joe, is how surely and swiftly he is able to sort through an avalanche of information, facts, evidence, opinions, telephone calls and personalities to isolate the salient facts, and then frame the issue so a decision-maker can act quickly and wisely. My predecessor believed his art is practiced much the same whether in a law firm in Washington or elsewhere, or only thirty feet away from the nation's Chief Executive at the White House.

My observations in government over a third of a century lead me to agree with Judge Vanderbilt and Joe Califano on what a good lawyer in these times needs to be. As I contemplate my own experiences, it seems to me that the most useful and most highly respected lawyers have been those who ranged beyond their professional constituents—men and women who, first, were broad-gauged in activities and interests rather than preoccupied with the law and their clients; and, second, were especially competent (a) in ferreting out and (b) in applying the true essence of a problem, a situation, or a group of situations.

This commentary relates especially to my ten years in the White House. It is there, at the apex of our system, that one encounters the greatest flow of information, facts, opinions, personalities, telephone calls, and ideas. The input there is unending, crushingly voluminous, kaleidoscopic, and mercilessly urgent. Day in and day out it borders on the unmanageable. And so it is that every President must rely upon a small number of close associates who have the ability to sort through the billowing mass of information to determine that this item is worthy of the President's attention while that other item is not, and then to present the worthy item quickly to the President in the clearest, most usable way.

I don't mean to say that some issues reaching the White House are significant while others are not. Very little penetrates that pre-eminent place in our government that is unimportant. The problem there is not to separate the wheat from the chaff, but far more troublesome—to glean the wheat from the wheat. The problem for every White House group is an intensely pragmatic one—simply that a President of the United States is physically unable to deal personally with the Niagara of information and problems that engulf his office, or even with very many of them. So there is no person more valuable to a President—and, in some ways, to the country—than a gifted Presidential assistant who can astutely and rapidly sort, sift and advocate.

Defensively maybe, let me say that such people who hover closely about our Presidents do not have to be lawyers, and the assignments of some require other skills—as, for example, the President's science adviser and his press secretary. But I must admit that the prime movers in every White House are often lawyers, and more often than not, the best ones are lawyers. (You can understand that it rather pains me to make that point!)

Well, the more attentive among you may now be privately grumbling, "I hope, Harlow, that you're not suggesting that what's good for lawyers in and around government has to be good for every other lawyer in the country." No, that's not precisely correct. But what I do suggest is rather close to that, with enough reservations to cover gaps in my experience. I rather believe that the tight-minded, analytical, broad-gauged type of White House lawyer would be not certainly, but very probably, among the most respected and successful lawyers in Oklahoma City, and vice versa.

So, to conclude this phase of our discussion, I come up with a suggested type of lawyer, not a categorical finding that every good lawyer must do specifically this or that. That's not to say I am unfamiliar with the various thises and thats of this era. As a nation we do confront monumental problems—of narcotics, polluted water and air, quality education, race relations, poverty, hunger and massive international and domestic economic conundrums. The social consciences of Americans are, to our collective credit, more aroused than ever before. There are myriads of critically important things, many of them passionately human, crying out for attention in this richest of nations. A lawyer who strives or aspires to be constructively involved in private affairs, community affairs and governmental affairs simply cannot—and, I believe, should not—sidestep these transcendent concerns of our day. And my experience tells me that your disciplined minds are an indispensible resource in the national endeavor to make this land and this troubled world better places in which to live.

So there you have at least one man's concept of the important role that today beckons the good lawyer. And, now, let's relate that to your theme: "Law: Bridge to Justice." In its simplest terms, that role, as I see it, is for the "good lawyer" to work ardently

and untiringly to modernize, but also to explain and defend, our government of laws as a means for achieving a just society.

It is, surely, no news to you that many of our most cherished institutions are in a state of siege today. None are more severely challenged and none more prized than our government of laws and our system of justice. I offer five examples to pinpoint what I mean:

(1) Criminal defendants and even their advocates disrupt courtroom proceedings, making impossible the continuance of trials under our standards of fairness;

(2) Private citizens and even some highly placed elected officials advocate deliberate defiance of laws with which they disagree;

(3) Aggrieved citizens, not uncommonly under the leadership of professional agitators, turn to street demonstrations and marches and acts of crudity or violence in an effort to force official compliance with their complaints because they are impatient with or disbelieve in seeking legal redress;

(4) From coast to coast victims of crime multiply, giving rise to the most serious questions about the fairness and efficacy of our system of criminal justice;

(5) More and more persons become disillusioned with the Supreme Court, the final arbiter of our most important public and private controversies, and the pace quickens to denigrate individual members of the Court.

You, yourselves, can cite many other examples.

Well, my friends, all of us know that changes are continuously needed in our laws and in the administration of justice. But that is not new. Virtually every aspect of our system, even including our basic charter—the Constitution itself—was designed to respond to, even to encourage, constructive change. Yet, I submit that the propagation of a full understanding of our institutions of law and justice, together with a cogent and aggressive defense of those institutions, are at least as necessary in this time of testing as are change.

This I believe because I have become concerned lest too much of the criticism we are hearing and that some of us are prone to utter bears the potential of irreparable injury to this greatest free system in all human history. I do not want that concern misunderstood. Freely voiced criticism is a goad for progress in our society; it is not criticism, therefore, but a kind of criticism which I call into question. I refer to criticism that is intellectually insupportable, intellectually shallow, sometimes intellectually dishonest. I refer to cirticism which reflects a weak appreciation of the institutions being attacked and a poor understanding of their importance to our society.

I feel also obliged to say that one reason why more rational explanation and defense are essential today is because I detect a default on the part of those best equipped to comprehend these institutions. Such counter-argument as there has been in recent times too often fails to measure up either to the decibels or the cogency of the criticisms which I have just characterized.

In this context, your profession's Law Day is, of course, highly valuable, for it serves on at least one occasion each year to remind the American people of the sentinels of their freedom—their government of laws, their systems of justice—and to promote citizen awareness. The sponsorship of this day by your profession is particularly appropriate because you and your colleagues across the land are schooled for the task. You are intellectually prepared for it; you are mentally disciplined for it. The law and justice are—certainly they should be—your passionate concern. And so, I deeply feel it is, in major measure, up to you to shoulder the burden of keeping the rest of us on the right course.

Perhaps I might dare suggest a direction for your efforts, which you, in your wisdom, could refine, correct, and perhaps advocate.

As this 1970 Law Day theme suggests, one reason we prize our government of laws is because, as far as human history can teach us, it is one sure bridge to justice, and in our view the best one. In our effort to do that most difficult thing—assure order in a free society—we have voluntarily subjected ourselves to a complex of rules that establish our total society's authority over each one of us. Merely the fact that these rules exist inhibits licentious or arrogant conduct and encourages conciliation of differences. Their very existence is the individual's armor against unwarranted interference by other individuals or the state. And when these rules of conduct are violated, when disputes cannot be settled privately, when someone wrongs another, the law is there as our safeguard to enforce society's rules.

This legal process does not exist for itself, however, nor is order alone its end. It has been evolved through long and painful human experience to assure justice, and it should be administered with justice. In verbal shorthand, we would say that our society has fashioned a body of law to enable us to have order, yes—but order with justice.

I am not sufficiently philosophical to attempt here a definitive expression of what justice is or ought to be. When Plato tried it, you recall, he could not stop short of building a commonwealth. But I suppose we could say that justice is, in very general terms, a concept which comprises the sum of all of the citizen's relations with the state at large. Its meaning here in America depends upon the purposes that our people collectively aspire to, and the purposes the state, with the consent of its citizens, sets out to realize.

Ordinarily, it is not evident to the general public, but most of our great national debates are over the guiding purposes of a just society. In Washington we are forever debating such concepts as freedom, liberty and fairness in an attempt to define them as legally enforceable principles and to adjust them when they seem to conflict.

Without pursuing this further, it does seem clear that when we talk of law and justice, we are concerning ourselves with very basic concepts that go to the organizational roots of our society. We must realize—and induce others to realize—that changes in our laws, and changes in our system of justice, must be very prudently accomplished, for they affect in the most fundamental way the kind of society which we enjoy today and want for our children tomorrow.

I suppose most of that sounds very abstruse and too academic to be very meaningful in our day-to-day lives. But that is not true at all. Let me bring it home.

What all this means is, for example, that disruption of a single courtroom proceeding does not merely bring one trial to a spectacular halt; it threatens our entire system for the administration of criminal justice.

Resorting to street marches and demonstrations when legal remedies are available does far more than create an inconvenience and disrupt a community; it brands as unworkable an elaborate system evolved over many centuries to encourage the peaceable adjustment of grievances.

Intentional defiance of law by an individual or by a governmental entity or officer cannot be measured in isolation; what it does is to invite anarchy and breed a dangerous disposition to jettison an entire government of laws.

Failure to enforce the criminal laws firmly and fairly goes beyond indulgence of individual misbehavior; it erodes the rightful expectation of every member of our society to be safe from the criminal acts of others.

A single unfair trial not only prejudices the rights of one accused; it also labels as unfair an entire system of justice and threatens everyone who someday might be the accused in a criminal proceeding.

A deepening disrespect for the Supreme Court of the United States not only denigrates a decision or a Justice; it undermines the ability of this great institution to perform its crucial function in resolving our nation's most persistent controversies.

Somewhat to my surprise, therefore, my role here has turned out to be like that of the lay preacher who on the Sabbath commends his congregation for their religious fidelity, then chides them all for misbehaving from Monday through Saturday. Similarly I salute you for setting aside one day each year to engender in our beloved America an understanding of the basic institutions of which you are our most learned exponents. But as a layman, I most sincerely exhort you, as individuals and as a profession, to persist in your evangelism on all the days of the year.

Every one of us profoundly cares about our government of laws, and we revere and support our system of justice. But we benighted non-lawyers are eager for you to assume a larger, a broader-gauged, a more aggressive leadership role in community affairs, in government, in politics. That way you can inculcate in yourselves, in the rest of us, and in those to follow that indispensable appreciation of why, for this America—for this island of liberty in a world of fear and torment—law is indeed our bridge to justice.

A RESOLUTION FROM THE INDIANA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I enclose for the attention and information of my colleagues the following resolution from the Indiana Legislative Council, whose chairman is the speaker of the house of representatives in the Indiana General Assembly:

RESOLUTION OF INDIANA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Whereas, There is an acute need for additional revenue on the part of Indiana state and local governments to pay for additional services; and

Whereas, The tax base which grows rapidly with the economy is the federal income tax; and

Whereas, The federal government is presently anticipating providing funds to state and local governments through various aid programs, many of which use the federal income tax as a basic source of revenue; and

Whereas, The management of programs by state and local governments is most efficient when the funds are not ear-marked for specific purposes; Now, Therefore;

Be it resolved by the Indiana Legislative Council:

Section 1. That the Indiana Legislative Council supports the concept of continuing to use the federal income tax base for funding of state and local programs, with the proviso that additional moneys be transferred through a revenue sharing program, in order that efficient management of programs involving federal, state and local funds can be enhanced.

Sec. 2. The Indiana Legislative Council supports the most unrestricted concept of revenue sharing which it is possible for Congress to develop at this time, that is, reversion of a certain percentage of federal income tax collections to the state from which the collections are made, with complete discretion left to the state government about the use of funds.

Sec. 3. The executive director of the Indiana Legislative Council is instructed to provide copies of this resolution to all members of the United States Congress representing the State of Indiana; to all members of the Indiana General Assembly; to the officers of the Council of State Government; to the officers of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the United States Treasury Department, and to the President of the United States.

Adopted this 10th day of June, 1970.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' NEWSLETTER

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the following guest editorial, written by a constituent, Mr. Harry H. Zucker, VA Local 1151, AFGE, was published in the Second Speaks, the house organ of the American Federation of Government Employees of the Second District. I think that it represents the type of thinking that should be circulated among the Members of the Congress and of the executive branch:

GUEST EDITORIAL BY BROTHER HARRY ZUCKER, VA LOCAL 1151

Labor Secretary George P. Shultz breathed a spirit of freshness into an archaic, stilted, mouldy and tired unilateral government policy when he stated that "the Government will have to accept a managerial role and be subject to binding arbitration * * * in labor relations with its employees."

In the earlier days of this century when the Government still recognized and accepted noblesse oblige and adopted enlightened and progressive personnel policies for other employers to follow, there was no need for confrontation between the Government and its employees. However, when the Government repeatedly faltered in its role and assumed the hard and fast policies of the market place, it could no longer, in good conscience, claim immunity from the reverse swing of the pendulum on the basis of sovereignty.

To phrase the issue simply, in essence, when one looks, sounds and acts like an employer, he must be an employer and no unilateral assertion to the contrary will convince the employees that the regular employee-employer rules ought not to prevail. To use sovereignty as the excuse to avoid collective bargaining is now considered a red herring issue and totally inapplicable. Sovereignty in government employee-employer relations has been a dead issue for about fifty years since the British Government entered this area willingly. But even if it were not a dead issue, there is no provision of law which would preclude the Federal Government from sitting down with its employees and bargaining collectively in good faith.

Circa World War I, the British Government recognized the benefits to be realized from satisfied public employees. It did not invoke the sovereignty rule but, in spite of it, organized the Whitley Council System, a tripartite organization for collective bargaining with representation on the part of the employee unions, government management and chaired by an impartial public representative. These councils were and are authorized to deal with almost any issue ranging from pay, hours, position classification down to the resolution of group grievances. A majority vote of two prevails. After the vote, the resolved issue is certified to the Cabinet and it becomes law as a matter of routine. If either the Government or the staff representative is wholly or partially dissatisfied with the outcome at the Whitley Council level, appellate rights are available to a special tribunal.

Why is it so difficult for the Congress and the Executive Department to face realities and give up a power which is tedious, time consuming and often administered in an inferior and inequitable manner? Why can a system, such as that of the Whitley Councils, work in England and not work in this country?

THE CONGOLESE NATIONAL DAY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1970, the Democratic Republic of the Congo will celebrate the 10th anniversary of its independence. This is a particularly important occasion not only for the Congo but for all of Africa because it marks the close of a period during which the Congo has made one of the most impressive economic and political recoveries recorded in the developing world.

In the early years after achieving independence in 1960, the Congo suffered one of the most prolonged and acute series of internal disorders and resulting economic disruptions any country has ever had to face. However beginning in the mid-sixties and accelerating after 1967, the Congo under President Joseph Mobutu was gradually able to restore internal tranquillity and embark on a remarkable economic recovery spurred by a successful monetary reform program.

Today the Congo is enjoying a period of unbroken internal tranquillity that dates from 1967 and President Mobutu is providing the country with the greatest measure of political stability that it has known since independence. Presidential and legislative elections are scheduled for December of the year. The economic picture is perhaps even more favorable with both mineral and agricultural exports having increased sharply in recent years, foreign exchange reserves standing at over $200 million, and the Congolese currency remaining stable. Also the Congolese Government has moved to create a favorable climate for foreign investment with publication of a liberal investment code and settlement of the outstanding disputes with foreign firms.

The Congo is by virtue of its size, central location, and great natural resources one of the most important African countries. Today it is also a nation which has overcome serious political and economic problems to emerge as one of the most stable and economically vital nations in Africa. This remarkable recovery clearly demonstrates the progress which can be made by African countries against the very serious problems of under development. Outside support and assistance was important in the Congo's recovery, and I am proud to note that the United States played a significant role in this regard. However in the final analysis, it was the ability and determination of the Congolese people which brought about this recovery and it is an achievement in which all Africa can take pride.

I am happy to note that President Mobutu will be making an official visit to the United States in August thereby giving us an occasion to appropriately recognize the Congo's remarkable achievements and to reaffirm the traditional friendship between the Congo and the United States.

POSTAL REFORM?

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, from those concerned about our postal system I have had a good amount of interest in my views on that legislation of last week. The word "reform" today carries magic, but not all so-called reform is true reform.

It is generally agreed that our private, free enterprise system, in its purest form, has difficulty in providing certain essential public services as is indicated by the bankruptcy action taken this week by the Penn Central Railway, as well as in the admitted inability of private builders to meet the low-cost housing need without government subsidy. As a Nation, we must not only provide, but improve mail delivery for all our citizens. Our Government cannot evade this obligation, nor should it try to remove the issue from the political arena in order to protect itself from possible public outcry.

Taking politics out of the Post Office has a noble sound, but it is neither the objective nor would it be the result of the present plan, as approved by the House and now under study in the Senate.

In the first place, you do not remove politics from the Post Office simply because you substitute a presidentially appointed commission for a publicly elected Congress as its overseer. Insofar as postal appointments or postal jobs would be concerned, the entire system threatens now to become a part of the spoils of partisan presidential politics, with a complete shakeup possible every 4 years.

In the second place, the new proposal fails to either meet head on or to solve the essential problem: the question of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail rates. Here is where politics is an essential part of the problem, since these users contribute most to the postal glut and less to postal revenues and yet swing the biggest stick in party politics at all levels from the Presidency on down.

Until we face up to this basic problem and apply a hardheaded, nonpolitical cost versus income solution to it, we will always have an expensive postal service no matter who runs it.

Under the President's proposal, the commercial rates remain a political football to be kicked around in Congress and the individual who wants to mail a business or social letter is at the mercy of the

new commission. The final decision on all rates remains up to the Congress through its veto power. And do not think that if the commission does decide to make bulk mail pay its own pay, Congress will not be pressured and will not be right back in the middle of the fray as much as ever before.

Under the new plan, the commission would have complete discretion to curtail or eliminate any of the following to meet its announced overall break-even policy: a rural route, suburban post office, or a weekday delivery. Some restriction was put into the bill to try to save small post offices; however, there are loopholes that could be circumvented by the commission even on this matter.

I do not like the new plan and did not vote for it. These are not my only reasons.

I also fear for the future job security of the individual postal employee whose deserved pay raise was used as bait to secure the votes of union leaders and Members of Congress, who should know better. It was a cheap political trick. Furthermore, the bill contemplates regional salary scales rather than remuneration based upon work done and years of service. This would mean that a letter carrier or a postal clerk in Dallas would receive less pay for the same work than someone employed in New York City or Chicago.

The heart of this whole matter is that as far back in our history as the founding of this Nation, the postal system was established as a public service and a responsibility of the central government. It was intended by the Founding Fathers to be a means of national communication and a public service to our citizens. The maintenance of this obligation of our Government cannot be expected to be self-supporting anymore than we expect the Public Health Service or the agencies that control the safety of the airways to pay their own way.

The question is now with the Senate and I am hopeful that the public will let its desires and its fears be known in order that the necessary safeguards can be built into this important legislative decision.

FORMER CONGRESSIONAL PAGE: STUDENT "UP TIGHT" ON STRIKE

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a newspaper story which should be of interest to everyone in this Chamber. It concerns John R. Zagame, Jr., who served as a House of Representatives page boy from July 1967 until August 1969.

This patriotic young American has just finished his freshman year at Syracuse University in Syracuse, N.Y.

The Washington correspondent for the Syracuse newspapers, Mr. Joseph V. Ganley, recently interviewed the former page, and his story appeared in the Syracuse Herald American-Post Standard of Sunday, June 21, 1970. I believe that Mr. Ganley, a conscientious and dedicated newspaperman, has written an excellent story about the views of John Zagame.

Because I feel that John represents what is "right" with American college students, I am calling this story, which describes his views so well, to your attention.

Mr. Ganley's story follows:

STUDENT "UP TIGHT" ON STRIKE

(By Joseph V. Ganley)

A former Congressional page, son of an Oswego onion farmer, is "up tight" about the student strike six weeks ago at Syracuse University.

John Zagame, 19, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Zagame, who own and operate a 100-acre farm, recently completed his freshman year at S.U.

On a visit to the Capitol, he told an interviewer that he regarded the actions of dissenters during the strike as the "tyranny of spoiled brats."

He declared that most of the "liberal" students who participated in the anti-Nixon, anti-Cambodia demonstrations didn't know what they were opposing and refused to permit persons with other viewpoints to be heard.

Why does the opinion of one student deserve a forum?

Because Zagame contends that the conservative viewpoint cannot be heard on the S.U. campus and is rejected by the Daily Orange, campus newspaper. He complains that the campus dissenters didn't present both sides of the issues.

John was a page boy in the House of Representatives from July 1967 to August 1969.

"I had an opportunity to hear both sides of any issue before the House, so I got into the habit of looking at both sides," he said.

In the Syracuse strike, he supported the "establishment." He said he "believes in and supports President Nixon's program for peace" and endorsed Nixon's reasons for the Cambodian incursion.

"The aim was to save American lives and to allow the Vietnam government to take over the fighting," he said. "And remember that each bullet captured means one that won't hurt an American."

However, Zagame declared he was "no right-wing nut" but was willing to listen to the dissenters' viewpoint.

"I just don't agree with them," he said. "But they reject my point of view without hearing it."

A history major, Zagame contends that the students he listened to and observed at S.U. appeared "lost" as to what they were striking about. Most, he said, when told to contact their congressman "Didn't even know who he is and had to go to maps to find their own congressional districts.

"It makes me wonder," he said, "just how sharp and how aware they are. Particularly the leaders, many of whom just reject the American system for an anarchistic approach."

He felt that the protestors "have no sense of past history, especially the most recent history beginning with World War II and events leading to Munich, the Nazi build-up . . . and they know little about the depression of the 1930's and the hardships their parents went through to get money to educate them.

"They make value judgments which are irrational concerning the establishment without knowing the facts," he said. An example, he said, was the burning of a branch of the Bank of America that had granted $1.6 million worth of low interest student loans.

The youth doesn't plan to give up the fight for his convictions. This summer he plans to work for the election of Rep. Robert C. McEwen, Ogdensburg Republican, as coordinator of students activities at about a dozen colleges in McEwen's six-county Northern New York 31st District. He'll also be helping on his father's farm.

Zagame said there wasn't much he and other conservatives could do during the campus strike because "there were so few of us and so many of them.

"We were bombarded with liberal ideology, but had no chance to respond," he complained. "The so-called liberals demanded the right to be heard but denied free speech to the opposing viewpoint. They characterized (Vice President Spiro T.) Agnew as repressive, yet shout obscenities at anyone who takes issue with them."

Zagame complained that he and his friends wrote to the Daily Orange but their letters were ignored. This, he contends, goes to the heart of complaints about a "biased press."

"We have got to get at the truth—to tell it like it is. The trouble is, politics always creeps into the issues," he said.

Zagame may head for a political career himself. He became interested in the Washington scene at an early age. "When I was 10 or 11 years old making a tour of the capitol with relatives, I got the idea I wanted to be a page," he said.

MEDEX: A PROGRAM TO ENCOURAGE THE PRACTICE OF MEDICINE IN RURAL AREAS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the June 12 issue of Life magazine contained an article on a program called MEDEX. This program is successfully pointing the way toward meeting the manpower shortage in rural areas in the medical profession.

I am sure that my colleagues who missed reading the article in Life magazine will find it of great interest and hopefully will want to assist in broadening the program so as to encourage medical care in their own rural areas where physicians have not found it attractive to practice medicine. I include the article by Richard A. Smith, M.D., in the RECORD.

MEDEX

(By Richard A. Smith, M.D.)

The state of Washington, like many other states in this nation, is faced with a severe manpower shortage in the medical profession. Much of the shortage can be explained by distribution patterns; that is, there are certain population segments in the state which have difficulty obtaining adequate medical care when and where they need it. In some areas, this difficulty is due primarily to a lack of physician manpower. According to the Washington State Medical Education and Research Foundation, this fact is true especially in the rural parts of the state where the physician-patient ratio is constantly decreasing due to the urban migration of physicians and replacement failures. In addition, the age of general practitioners in these rural areas is steadily increasing.[1] Thus efforts are needed to be directed to increasing the capacity of practitioners already in the areas, as well as

[1] Kinney R.: *Data Bank of Washington State Physicians, 1968.* Seattle, Washington State Medical Education and Research Foundation, 1968.

making general practice more attractive to physicians seeking new work settings.

There are many programs in the country, operational or in the planning stages, which are designed to train subprofessionals whose place on the health professional ladder is not clearly defined. Many of these subprofessionals perform a role of relieving the physician or his nurse of much of the uncomplicated parts of medical practice. However, the majority of highly technical procedures involved in primary contact care still remains the sole responsibility of the practicing physician. Thus, there remains the need to relieve physicians of more of the time-consuming procedures, that is, to help physicians become more efficient by extending the capabilities.

The defense system has developed ways of rapidly training medical personnel to meet its specific needs which are similar to those of the civilian medical care system. Thousands of medical corpsmen leave the military services annually who have had extensive training and experience in the provision of primary medical care within a military framework.[2] Of the 30,000 discharged annually from the military with some medical training, more than 6,000 of them leave the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard where they have been providing primary medical care. They return to a civilian setting which is unable to utilize their extensive training and proved talents. Some with specialized training take allied health jobs; the majority find that there is no way that they, as civilians, can use the 75 hours of didactic and laboratory training they received in human anatomy and physiology, the hundreds of hours of medicine, surgery, pharmacology, orthopedics, training in taking histories and performing physical examinations, etc. Some, such as Special Forces and Navy "B" Corpsmen, receive 1,400 hours of formal medical training, which may include nine weeks of a supervised "clerkship." Army corpsmen of the 91C series may have up to 2,000 hours of such formal training.

Most of these men have had 3 to 20 years of experience, including independent duty on the battlefield, aboard ship, or other isolated stations. Many have some college background (Special Forces "medics" average 1½ years of college). After at least 2 and up to 20 years in uniform, these men have certain skills and knowledge in the provision of primary care. Once discharged, however, the investment of public funds in medical capabilities and potential care are lost, as they work as detail men, insurance agents, burglar-alarm salesmen, or truck drivers. The majority of this vast manpower pool is unavailable to the present medical care delivery system because, up to this point, we have not devised a civilian framework in which their skills can be put to use. It is from this pool that personnel for MEDEX has been drawn.

This program is designed to utilize the products of the military system which have heretofore not been adequately adapted to the civilian health setting. The purpose of the MEDEX (*médecin extension*=physician's extension) Project is to develop an extension of the physician—another pair of skilled hands under his supervision and available to help him 24 hours a day, a person trained by and for a specific physician. MEDEX is a model of non-physicians extending primary medical care transferable to rural, suburban, or urban settings. It is anticipated that this model will demonstrate that former military corpsmen with additional practical training can perform many tasks, presently performed by civilian physicians, which do not require the extensive and sophisticated education obtained in medical schools. There are a few physicians who presently employ men in analogous practice settings.

In the initial phase (preparatory phase) of the project, a number of general practitioners in rural Washington were visited. Prior to the visits, these men had been identified as practitioners who were overworked by an increasing patient loan burden, unable to find time to take continuing education courses, unable to spend more than three or four days each year away from their communities for leisure activities with their families, or planning to leave their practices for a less demanding scene in "urbania."

Most of these physicians have had military service and were able to list a number of tasks which the Medex (the former military corpsmen to be trained for this project) could perform for them in their practices. Their experience with military corpsmen, in conjunction with their obvious need for help, produced a combination which made MEDEX appropriate in their communities.

Discussions were held with the Washington State Medical Association and the medical faculty at the University of Washington. In addition, meetings with members of the nursing profession in the state pointed up some of the potential problem areas, resulting in productive input into the design of the project. It was decided that the MEDEX demonstration program should be a joint effort of the Washington State Medical Association through its research arm (the Washington State Medical Education and Research Foundation) and the School of Medicine at the University of Washington. It is apparent that the complementary capabilities of these two organizations are integral to the MEDEX concept.

Visits were made to a number of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard installations to inform groups of corpsmen about the proposed project and to elicit applications. Funding was obtained from the National Center for Health Services Research and Development (Health Services and Mental Health Administration) of the Public Health Service (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). A core staff was assembled, and development of an intensive task-oriented curriculum was initiated in May 1969.

Initial screening of the 80 applicants on the basis of former training and experience, geographic desires for relocation, references from physicians, and dates of discharge produced 26 corpsmen-applicants to be interviewed for the 15 positions chosen for this demonstration project. Fourteen physicians, who indicated they would be willing to train 15 Medex in a 12-month preceptorship in their offices and subsequently to hire them, volunteered to participate in the program. On the last two weekends of May, the corpsmen were brought to Seattle in two groups to meet with the staff and the physician-preceptors (half of them were present each weekend) for intensive interviewing and selection conferences. Hour-long interviews with potential preceptors and MEDEX staff were followed by subjective testing and seminars. On June 3, 1969, 15 corpsmen were selected as the first Medex.

Criteria for selection include the following: applicant's knowledge of his limitations, judgment under varying circumstances, interpersonal relationships, medical task proficiency and knowledge, and satisfaction with the projected role of Medex. The Medex trainees selected varied in age from 22 to 55 years and educationally from holding a high school diploma to a bachelor's degree.

The second phase (university training phase) began on June 30. During the first week of this period and on three subsequent weekends, each Medex trainee visited a total of at least five potential preceptors in their practice settings to facilitate the process of matching Medex to physicians, which occurred four weeks later.

During the first three months of training, emphasis was placed upon pediatrics, geriatrics (chronic diseases), histories and physical examinations, and psychiatry. Much of the training was in these areas in which the preceptors and staff believed the Medex should have competence and in which the Medex themselves thought they had the least amount of experience. Heavy emphasis was placed upon the psychologic adaptation the trainees would undergo in their transition from military medicine to the civilian practice setting. The selection process and curriculum development were greatly enhanced by the presence on our staff of a former Special Forces medic (who, prior to his Vietnam experience, had received a BA degree in English literature and had served as a Peace Corps volunteer in community development in Colombia) and a community psychiatrist (whose ten-year military experience was that of a meteorologist in the Air Force). Additional professional input resulted from the presence on our staff of an educator with broad planning and operational experience.

The MEDEX faculty was composed of faculty members of the School of Medicine as well as physicians in private practice in Seattle and elsewhere in the state. A description of the curriculum will be available at a later date.

The preceptor phase began in the middle of September 1969, after the three-month university session was completed. Twelve Medex are in rural Washington; two are in an urban setting, and one is with a suburban general practitioner. During the 12 months following the university phase, the Medex will be performing tasks (many of which he performed in the military) under the immediate supervision of his preceptor, thereby increasing the physician's capacities. For the first months of his preceptorship, the Medex will assist and extend the physician by learning and applying primary medical care skills under his close supervision. When the physician has developed enough confidence in the individual, he could be used in a variety of ways—all activities geared toward extending the physician's capabilities. Tasks that this new professional could perform include screening patients to be seen by the physician, history taking, performing parts of physical examinations, the application and removal of casts, assisting at surgery, suturing minor lacerations, taking roentgenograms and performing laboratory tests during nonoffice hours, assuming certain administrative responsibilities, and being available to provide the physician with assistance any day of the week, any hour of the night. The full extent of the Medex's task capabilities are as yet undefined. Consideration will be given to future requirements for skills in other areas as needs develop.

A certificate was awarded each Medex upon the completion of the three-month university training phase, and an additional certificate will be awarded upon completion of the preceptor training phase.

Special attention has been paid to the selection of the corpsmen, the matching of Medex and preceptors, psychologic adaptation to the civilian medical scene, and the development of the Medex's self-image, identity, and status. Based upon our experience with this program thus far, the MEDEX staff feels that any large-scale attempts to utilize former military corpsmen in civilian settings should pay particular attention to these areas.

In addition to the in-practice training the Medex receive during the 12-month precep-

[2] *Allied Health Personnel*, Ad Hoc Committee on Allied Health Personnel. Washington, D.C., National Academy of Sciences, 1969, pp. 8–10.

torship, the design of the program includes ten three-day-weekend continuing education seminars. These seminars will occur in varying locations around the state and will be geared toward filling gaps in knowledge identified as the program progresses. Instructors at these seminars will be preceptors in the program and other private practitioners. Unlike the university training phase, the medical school faculty will play a relatively minor role in this third phase.

Three tools are being used in the evaluation of MEDEX. Engineers from the Department of Industrial Engineers at the University of Washington completed the pre-Medex, Time-Motion-Task Study in each of the preceptor's offices during July 1969. An outside consulting group completed its pre-Medex Outside Evaluation Study in each of the offices in August 1969. The former is an objective study of how medical care is provided in the preceptor's community; the latter is a subjective study of what medical care is provided. The second part of each of these studies (post-Medex) will take place in the summer of 1970. After the Medex have been in their preceptorship for approximately nine months, a retrospective survey will be conducted in each of the communities involved. Selected populations will be questioned regarding the impact of this innovation on the delivery of medical care in the communities involved.

COMMMENT

The conditions which produced the setting for MEDEX in Washington state are not totally unique. The state medical association's pioneering spirit to provide leadership and its expressed concern for its members were two important factors leading to the selection of this time and place for the demonstration program. Another important element was the very obvious need for help in rural Washington where dedicated general practitioners are growing increasingly concerned about their ability to maintain the quality and quantity of care for their patients. Of major importance, also, is a medical school evolving to meet the needs of the community it serves.

There will be other efforts to use corpsmen in civilian medicine. This program undoubtedly is not the only way to utilize this manpower pool. Conditions in other states will not be exactly the same and other pathways may be identified. However, in MEDEX we have attempted to design a program which is realistic and practical in this part of the Northwest. As this program continues, it will probably produce additional information which will be of assistance to other groups with an interest in improving the delivery of primary medical care in their areas. Subsequent writings will attempt to communicate such information.

Domestic implications of MEDEX should be obvious. Not so apparent, however, are the international developments that could result from American utilization of this available manpower pool. Although we are becoming more aware of our own health manpower needs, the worldwide perspective is one of acute crisis, with no relief visible on the horizon. The changes MEDEX or MEDEX-type programs might possibly effect in this country potentially could open numerous possibilities in other nations which spend considerable sums to maintain sizable defense systems.

Finally, MEDEX is not a radical innovation in health manpower, nor is it a new training program being developed within a university. It is a joint project of potential uses of the MEDEX personnel and the developers-trainers-evaluators of the MEDEX program. It is an overdue effort resulting from a global perspective to pull together existing resources to meet a growing need in community health.

(NOTE.—This investigation is supported by Public Health Service contract HSM–110–69–183 from the National Center for Health Services Research and Development, Health Services and Mental Health Administration.

(This demonstration program is jointly sponsored by the School of Medicine, University of Washington, and the Washington State Medical Education and Research Foundation (Washington State Medical Association).)

NIXON IS MEETING THE TEST IN ALLEVIATING INFLATION

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's leadership is being tested again in the struggle to alleviate inflation, and most observers feel that he is meeting the test well. While there are demands from some that the Government set guidelines for wages and prices, the President has wisely recognized that the responsibility can best be met by business and labor leaders themselves, acting in their own best interests.

A recent editorial from the Christian Science Monitor supports the President's decision to turn to private enterprise for help, using "persuasion" when necessary, but rejecting the rigid course of wage-price guidelines. I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 18, 1970]

NIXON RENOUNCES INFLATION "BIG STICK": PRIVATE ENTERPRISE GETS THE JOB

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The private enterprise system now has its big chance. The President believes that business and labor will fight inflation in their own best interest, if given the responsibility. Mr. Nixon has tossed them the ball.

In his address to the nation this week he renounced using the big stick which the Democratic opposition wants him to use. His administration will not set guidelines for wages and prices, and try to beat employers and workers into line.

Instead, Mr. Nixon has invited the business community to develop its own leadership in the fight against inflation. The obvious hope at the White House is that the President's new National Commission on Productivity will take over the job. He wants businessmen and labor leaders to persuade their fellows, showing them how much rise in wages and prices is in the national interest and therefore in their own interest.

This was the key decision. But the President saw fit to surround it with a sizable number of supporting actions by government.

"INFLATION ALERTS" TO COME

His Council of Economic Advisers will furnish the new national commission with statistical and other information on how the battle against inflation is going. It will sound "a periodic inflation alert"—calling attention to danger points in the wage-price picture. The Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Nixon assured the business community, will deal with the liquidity crisis—the shortage of money and credit and spending.

Government spending and purchasing will be reviewed once again, to make sure it helps rather than hinders the battle. Congress is asked by the President to pass a series of bills easing the temporary strains of unemployment and high interest rates.

The central questions in Washington today are two. One is in the short run: whether the President's measures show enough zip and initiative to start the economy up again, and avoid deepening recession. The other is in the long run: whether in so doing, and in rejecting the hard measures that his critics demand, the President can avoid another upward spiral of wages and prices.

It is considered possible by the President's advisers here that his show of leadership will provide a psychological lift—when taken together with the fiscal and monetary measures of the government—to deal with the immediate problems and get the country over the present in-between stage when business is sagging seriously and prices still going up.

Mr. Nixon tersely defined the immediate problems in a sentence which fairly reeled under the weight of its contents: "Unemployment has increased; the price index continues to rise; profits have gone down; the stock market has declined; interest rates are too high." He might have added that congressional elections are coming up in November and it is a staple of politics that bad business is bad for the incumbent administration.

The President's advisers hope that his address will produce an upturn to counter the dangerous sag in the economy which has proved worse and more obstinate than they expected.

In the longer run, it is apparent that Richard M. Nixon is characteristically fighting inflation with his own political and economic philosophy. He firmly believes in the least possible interference with the free enterprise system.

PERSUASION PREFERRED

When interference cannot be avoided, as at present, he tries to persuade rather than lowering the boom. He seeks to inspire voluntary action, in the countless private dealings by influential elements in the economy, to put their long-term interest in stability ahead of their short-term competitive interest in riding upward with inflation.

He is gambling on enough of this common sense working so that he can get the economy out of its downward spiral and yet avoid an upward spiral which could get out of control again. He is taking his chances with the bulk of past experience in this problem where enough businesses have usually been self-centered and hard-nosed enough to thwart the public interest.

Said the President: "I believe there is a new social responsibility growing in our economic system, on the part of unions and corporations. Now is the time for that social concern to take the form of specific action on the wage-price front."

If it doesn't?

IMPORTANCE STRESSED

"There is no more important goal than to curb inflation without permitting severe disruption," Mr. Nixon said. "This is an activist administration, and should new developments call for new action in the future, I shall take the action needed to attain that goal."

He made this cryptic remark in the face of the obvious and mounting concern of a number of liberal Democratic spokesmen in Congress and of some economists that the Nixon measures were inadequate to stem either the downthrust of the moment or the yeast in the price system later on. The decision between the two theories will be made by the economy itself, voting with its indices of wages and prices.

THE PROSPECT OF TERROR IN POSTWAR SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, for anyone who naively states, or believes statements, that the Communists would not engage in a "bloodbath" should they gain control in Vietnam, I recommend reading of a story by Peter T. Chew from the National Observer.

This story discusses the facts related by Douglas Pike—who Mr. Chew calls "this country's top expert on the Vietcong"—in a monograph entitled "The Vietcong Strategy of Terror." Just the few incidents of terror Mr. Chew has chosen are chilling evidence that revenge and repression are still the Communists' methods of making "peace" in a country they have occupied.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

HUE MASSACRE HOLDS A LESSON: THE PROSPECT OF TERROR IN POSTWAR SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Peter Chew)

Early last year, a South Vietnamese peasant who was walking through the grass-tufted sand-dune country outside the city of Hue tripped over a coil of rusty wire thrusting up from the sand. The peasant reached down angrily and gave the wire a sharp tug—and out of the sand flew a skull and the bones of a hand and forearm wrapped in the other end of the wire.

Thus another "find" had been made in the search for missing victims of the massacre of Hue, which was carried out by the Communists during their 24-day occupation of the city in the February 1968 Tet offensive.

The "Sand Dunes Find" yielded 809 bodies. These victims had been lined up beside shallow trenches in the sand, bound together with wire in "bundles" of 10 to 20 persons, including many women and small children. Then they were cut down by submachine guns fired by local civilian Communist cadres who had surfaced once the city had fallen securely into the hands of 12,000 North Vietnamese troops.

To date, the bodies of nearly 6,000 South Vietnamese civilians have been unearthed in Thua Thien Province, which surrounds Hue, the cultural capital of Vietnam. Many of the victims had been tortured and buried alive.

Details of the Sand Dunes Find and the massacre of Hue are related by Douglas Pike, this country's top expert on the Viet Cong, in a 125-page monograph entitled *The Viet Cong Strategy of Terror,* recently published by the U.S. mission in Saigon. Mr. Pike's writings, because of his scholarship and reputation for searing objectivity, have earned the respect of hawk and dove alike. He is an official of the United States Information Agency, and his work is signed and is published with the disclaimer that his opinions do "not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Government."

"NIGHT OF THE LONG KNIVES"

In this crisp, chilling document, Mr. Pike provides a convincing rejoinder to those editorialists and politicians in this country who airily dismiss as propaganda President Nixon's warning that a Communist takeover in South Vietnam after our departure would result in a blood-bath. The massacre at Hue, says Mr. Pike, proved to be a premature curtain-raiser for what can be expected if the Communists prevail. Mr. Pike's most dramatic conclusion: As many as 3,000,000 South Vietnamese "enemies of the revolution" may be slaughtered in a "night of the long knives."

Mr. Pike, who spent eight years in South Vietnam, says that data gleaned from Communist defectors, captives, and surviving eyewitnesses in Hue provide overwhelming evidence that the slaughter of civilians there during Tet represented a calculated elimination of anti-Communists, and that the killing was not carried out in the heat of battle by troops whose adrenalin was pumping fast. The killing was done not by North Vietnamese troops but by more than 150 local Communist assassination squads.

"Despite contrary appearances," writes Mr. Pike, "virtually no Communist killing was due to rage, frustration, or panic during the Communist withdrawal at the end. To trace back any single killing is to discover that almost without exception it was a decision rational and justifiable in the Communist mind. In fact, most of the killings were, from the Communist calculation, imperative."

As reconstructed by Mr. Pike and other U.S. and South Vietnamese investigators, the killing in Hue was carried out in three phases.

SEIZURE, THEN WITHDRAWAL

We now know that the enemy's original plan called for 16 battalions of the People's Army of Vietnam (PAVN) to seize and hold the city of Hue for one week, then withdraw. The killing that went on during this first phase was of the routine Communist kind, the sort of thing they do every day in the hamlets, villages, and towns throughout the country.

"Cadres with lists of names and addresses on clipboards appeared and called into kangaroo court various 'enemies of the revolution,'" says Mr. Pike. "Their trials were public, usually in the courtyard of a temporary Communist headquarters. The trials last about 10 minutes each and there are no known not-guilty verdicts."

The battle of Hue went so well for the Communists the first week they convinced themselves that they could hold the city indefinitely as an enclave. Withdrawal plans were canceled. The Phase Two killings now began.

Among the Communists' acts at this point, says Mr. Pike, "was to extend the death order and launch what in effect was a period of social reconstruction, Communist style. Orders went out, apparently from the provincial level of the party, to round up what one prisoner termed 'social negatives'; that is, those individuals or members of groups who represented potential danger or liability in the new social order. This was quite impersonal, not a blacklist of names but a blacklist of titles and positions held in the old society, directed not against people as such but against 'social units.'

"In consonance with this, killing in some instances was done by family unit. In one well-documented case during this period, a squad with a death order entered the home of a prominent community leader and shot him, his wife, his married son and daughter-in-law, his young unmarried daughter, a male and female servant and their baby. The family cat was strangled; the family dog was clubbed to death; the goldfish scooped out of the fishbowl and tossed on the floor. When the Communists left, no life remained in the house. A 'social unit' had been eliminated."

Special attention during Phase Two was paid to the elimination of Hue's considerable intellectual community. "Surviving Hue intellectuals explain this in terms of a long-standing Communist hatred of Hue intellectuals who were antiCommunist in the worst and most insulting manner: They refused to take communism seriously. . . . The intellectuals in the university, for example, in a year's course in political thought dispense with Marxism-Leninism in a half-hour lecture, painting it as a set of shallow barbarian political slogans with none of the depth and time tested reality of Confucian learning, nor any of the splendor and soaring humanism of Buddhist thought."

The Phrase Three killings began once it became obvious that the North Vietnamese could not hold the city more than a few more days under the determined assault by U.S. and South Vietnamese troops.

Probably the entire Communist civilian underground had, by this time, revealed itself during the Phase Two killings. The cadres thus exposed could not go underground again as long as there were individuals around who remembered them.

"Probably the largest number of killings came during this period and for this reason," concludes Mr. Pike.

Ever since my return from a reporting stint in South Vietnam last year, I have been mystified by the lack of interest on the part of the American press in this incredible story. "We just can't 'sell' the Hue story," a U.S. Army public-information officer said to me one day in Saigon. Mr. Pike is equally mystified and upset. For the first time in his writings, Mr. Pike in *The Viet Cong Strategy of Terror* permits himself the luxury of emotion.

PROVOKED NO OUTCRY

"Apparently it [the massacre at Hue] made no impact on the world's mind or conscience. For there was no agonized outcry. No demonstrations at North Vietnamese embassies around the world. Lord Russell did not send his 'war crimes tribunal' to Hue to take evidence and indict. In a tone beyond bitterness, the people there will tell you that the world does not know what happened in Hue, or if it does, does not care."

Finally, Mr. Pike has this to say:

"The meaning of the Hue Massacre seems clear. If the Communists win decisively in South Vietnam (and the key word is decisively) what is the prospect?

"First, all foreigners will be cleared out of the South, especially the hundreds of foreign newsmen who are in and out of Saigon. A curtain of ignorance would descend. Then would begin a night of long knives.

"There would be a new order to build. The war was long and so are memories of old scores to be settled. All political opposition, actual or potential, would be systematically eliminated. . . . The pattern would be the same: Eliminate not the individual—for who cares about the individual?—but the latent danger to the dream, the representatives of the blocs, the symbol of force, that might someday, even inside the regime, dilute the system.

"Beyond this would come Communist justice meted out to the 'tyrants and lackeys.' Personal revenge would be a small wheel turning within the larger wheel of party retribution.

"But little of this would be known abroad. The Communists in Vietnam would create a silence.

"The world would call it peace."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 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 over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

WHAT IS PATRIOTISM?

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it takes little insight to observe that this Nation is divided, deeply divided, over the issue of the Vietnam war. To fathom this division, however, to understand what it is that we are disagreeing about—that is a much more difficult task.

A good deal of the problem, I think, results from our inability to discuss the war on the same plane. Antiwar critics are accused of being traitors to their country, while those who support the war are charged with chauvinism, and self-serving flag waving. Neither view is accurate and pretensions of patriotism are too often refuges for debates of little substance.

This ideal of patriotism is an elusive thing. It is hard to define, even harder to apply. Yet, this country has always placed great stock in the patriot and all that he stands for. The great unanswered question now, I think, is exactly what the patriot does stand for. One of the best essays I have read on this subject was written for a contest sponsored by the Italian-American War Veterans on the question: "What is Patriotism?"

The author is a young girl from Rotterdam, N.Y., in my district. She won first place among entrants in Rotterdam's Richard E. Voris Post 37 contest and has just been selected to represent New York State in the national finals which will be held in August.

The author's name is Linda Moore, and I offer her essay with the recommendation of the judges, who said:

It is one of the most unique pieces of writing ever to be judged.

The essay follows:

"WHAT IS PATRIOTISM?"

(By Linda Moore)

Who was John Michael Cain? You can't tell me. No one can. His name isn't written in the history books. No statue honors his deeds. He is long forgotten.

I met him once, through the story of an old man. John Michael was his great-grandfather. The old man's eyes were glazed and his words were slow and dreamy as he told of a man whose story only he remembered.

John Michael was a young boy when the American colonies declared their independence. He didn't hate the British, but he loved America more; so he fought. He fought long and hard. He received no card ordering him to fight. He didn't need one. He volunteered. It was his duty. He was scared most the time—petrified, in fact, but he stuck it out. He didn't run.

He hated killing. Even when he was a boy on the farm he couldn't bear to see an animal die. But he killed now. He still didn't like it. He killed because it was necessary. He did it because it was something he had to do, though the first time he killed he got sick and couldn't eat or sleep for days. He stuck it out, though. He didn't run.

Then the war was finally over and John went home. He wasn't afraid anymore, but he was sad. He had no family left. He had loved them, but he loved his country, too, so he accepted what had happened and started a new life in the country he had helped to win. He became successful, if not famous, but soon he grew restless, and travelled westward across the wide plains, down to Texas.

And he was happy in Texas, thought it wasn't part of the country he had fought to create. There were the same type of people there, though—Americans, the same as he. So when they wanted to break away from Mexico he agreed, although he didn't hate Mexico. He merely loved Texas more. And so the killing started once again. An old man now, John fought and killed until it was his turn to die. And at the Alamo he was afraid, but he stuck it out. He didn't run because he loved freedom too much and he believed so greatly in the cause for which he fought.

Who was John Michael Cain? Many like him are long forgotten. They were patriots.

THE OVER-AND-UNDER-30 GROUPS COME TOGETHER IN SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATION IN NORTH JERSEY NEWSPAPER POLL

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Passaic-Clifton Herald-News, a daily newspaper of large circulation in my own district in New Jersey, conducted a poll of its readers over the past week. Over 2,700 people in the readership area were surveyed with regard to various aspects of policies of the Nixon administration.

In view of the powerful influence on our national news media that has been exercised by a vocal antiadministration minority, which claims to represent the under-30 generation, I think that there is a point to be made by bringing the results of this poll to the attention of my colleagues.

Five adjoining congressional districts were included in the poll. The distribution by district is remarkably similar to the division of the total of those polled on each question. That is to say that the sentiments of the people we represent are very much alike.

As is immediately apparent, the alternative answers are sufficiently clear cut to demonstrate agreement or disagreement with the positions of the Nixon administration. Contrary to what we might be led to believe by the national news coverage of the under-30 generation, the Herald-News poll shows substantial agreement between the two groups. Granted, there is a discernible 10 to 20 percent gap between their two positions on the political spectrum, but in no case was there any polarization of attitudes. Indeed, there is every indication that, in terms of real influence, those under 30 are more affected by the steady example of their elders than by the frenzied gyrations of some of their contemporaries who would claim to be their spokesmen.

The results of the poll are as follows:

NEARLY 3,000 READERS VOTE IN HERALD-NEWS POLL—NIXON, WAR, DRAFT, AGNEW WIN SUPPORT

The Herald-News poll conducted over the past week resulted in overwhelming support of President Nixon, Vice President Agnew, the War in Indochina and the draft.

The ratio of those over 30 to those under 30 closely paralleled the conservative majority of three or four to one.

The most lopsided victory was scored against pulling out of Vietnam immediately, with 81.03 per cent of the 2,738 persons answering the poll voting for one of the two other alternatives. This was closely followed by support of Agnew's criticisms of the communications industry, with 80.62 per cent of the votes cast.

The closest question was the one about draft deferments for college students, with 66.09 per cent voting to end them and 33.91 per cent voting to retain them.

Poll results showed that 79.29 of the respondents were over 30, and 20.71 per cent were under 30 in age. The percentages were calculated on the basis of those answering a particular question. In some cases there were multiple answers or blanks for a particular question. All answers were counted.

When the under-30s were separated from the over-30s, the totals for every question showed a solid pro-administration vote by the younger people, although it was not as overwhelming a majority as scored by their elders.

The majority was only a hairline when it came to draft deferments however, with 50.64 per cent of the under-30s favoring ending the deferments and 49.36 per cent voting to keep them.

As was the case with the early returns, the votes, received over the weekend included some comments that could not be fed into the computer.

"People in favor of war, old and young, should fight, not talk, the battles, themselves," wrote Mrs. Mildred Phillips, 325 Westervelt Place, Lodi, whose husband is a disabled veteran of World War II. We fought World War II for Europe. We didn't make any friends, we killed and crippled Americans and we created Frankenstein Russia. Killing Americans to create allies in S. E. Asia is simple. Nobody wins a war."

"In regard to Vice President Agnew, I didn't vote his ticket but I say 'God bless him,'" wrote Nunzio Paparozzi, 287 Farnham Ave., Lodi. "We need more leaders like him. For one reason or another, everyone wants an end to our involvement in Vietnam and Cambodia.

"I want to see an honorable end to this war because I know the horrors of war from experience as a medic in World War II. Many other people bring forth other reasons which are personal and sincere. Those that work for the government want to end the war so they can benefit from the expenditure of defense funds. Some of those on welfare say the same thing. The cry of some senior citizens is along the same lines. Some in education say they would like to gobble up some of that money.

"We could go on and on, but while these people say it is morally wrong, it would not bother them one bit if we pulled out and millions of Vietnamese were slaughtered by the Communists. If pulling out would solve all the other ills, the massacre of a few million Vietnamese might be worth it, but I don't believe it or condone it."

Another reader, Leo Mahon, 21 Seventh St., Clifton, wrote that "There are so many good reasons to stop all this seemingly unnecessary waste of youth, lives and equipment."

"As I sit and wonder and yes worry the only just decision I arrive at is to win this

situation once and for all and return these soldiers to their homes," he continued. "God give comfort to those families who have given their loved one for all of us, may we in turn give them nothing less than total victory."

The accompanying table lists the results of the poll in totals, by age group and by congressional district, for those who indicated their representative on the ballot. The results of the poll will be sent to each representative and to the state's two Senators.

Questions	Total		Over 30		Under 30		Roe	Helstoski	Widnall	Rodino	Dwyer	Frelinghuysen
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent						
I'm for continuing the war to a military or political victory	1,176	42	966	45	194	35	501	131	109	35	14	63
I want U.S. participation ended through a gradual withdrawal of American troops	1,066	39	860	40	190	34	500	106	79	27	9	53
I'm for pulling out immediately	525	19	335	15	178	31	275	44	34	31	5	16
President Nixon was right in ordering troops into Cambodia	2,119	78	1,742	82	346	62	925	224	174	60	23	116
President Nixon was wrong in sending troops into Cambodia	606	22	381	18	212	38	323	54	42	33	5	17
I back President Nixon in the way he is conducting American policy in Asia	2,079	76	1,714	81	334	60	914	221	171	59	22	110
I am against President Nixon's Southeast Asia policy	639	24	406	19	220	40	335	55	45	34	6	20
The draft deferment for college students should be ended	1,762	66	1,456	70	278	51	784	190	147	57	19	101
The draft deferment for college students should continue	904	34	619	30	271	49	437	79	63	32	9	29
The draft should be continued	1,986	74	1,658	79	298	54	879	212	158	53	19	110
The draft should be ended	707	26	438	21	257	46	363	60	52	37	9	21
Vice President Agnew was right in his criticism of the communications industry	2,172	81	1,783	85	357	65	956	228	174	67	24	120
Vice President Agnew was wrong in his criticism of the communications industry	522	19	318	15	191	35	282	48	37	27	4	14
I am over 30	2,136	79					976	219	154	66	23	99
I am under 30	558	21					260	58	60	24	5	32

PROBLEMS FOR ALL AMERICANS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is confronted with many critical problems. An unhealthy environment and an unstable economy, for example, are issues which must concern all Americans, whether they live in the country or the city.

This is a theme which I discussed in an article published in the special 35th anniversary edition this month of Indiana Rural News.

Although most of the subscribers to this periodical live in rural areas, they share with urban residents concern about the same problems facing our society.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this article for inclusion in the RECORD:

NOT RURAL—NOT URBAN—BUT PROBLEMS FOR ALL AMERICANS

(By John Brademas)

The war in Southeast Asia, the sagging economy and our deteriorating environment—these are neither "urban issues" nor "rural issues." They are critical problems which confront all Americans.

Inadequate housing, poor education, a polluted environment, soaring unemployment and rampant inflation—like the war in Vietnam, these are all dilemmas which touch us whether we live in an apartment in the city or in an Indiana farmhouse.

These are also the problems with which the President and we in Congress are now wrestling, and I want, from the perspective of an Indiana Congressman for over eleven years, to comment briefly on several of them.

The economic situation is especially disturbing. Unemployment is high and rising and interest rates are high and rising too.

Nearly 5 per cent of our national work force is now jobless, and Administration officials concede that this figure is expected to climb.

The latest consumer price index—for April—rose another 6 per cent over the previous month. This annual increase in the cost of living of more than 7 per cent has become intolerable to the average citizen.

Meanwhile, interest rates remain at record levels. These rates may be profitable for bankers, but they put credit out of reach for many homeowners, farmers and businessmen.

"The business slowdown is turning out to be considerably more severe than most economists had anticipated," reports *The Wall Street Journal*. But a citizen does not need a college degree in economics to know that his dollar does not buy what it once did.

Newsweek, in its May 25 cover article, bluntly characterized the state of the economy—"recession."

The magazine gave a number of concrete examples:

A farmer pinched by the rising cost of equipment and falling farm profits.

A policeman whose pay raises are eaten up by surging costs of living.

An elderly couple trying to make ends meet on a fixed income.

A small investor who sees the bottom fall out of his stocks.

Runaway money and a stagnating economy are not our only problems. We must assign new national priorities if America is to reach its potential and provide a truly great environment for its citizens.

In this effort to elevate the quality of life in America education is paramount, and indeed my principal legislative responsibility in Congress has been in the field of education.

Readers of the *Indiana Rural News* may be interested in some of the educational initatives on which I have been working during the 91st Congress. Hoosier citizens, from the farm and the city, will benefit from this legislation.

I serve as chairman of the House Select Subcommittee on Education, which has held a series of hearings on a bill I introduced last year designed to extend educational opportunities to children of pre-school age.

Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, a noted early childhood specialist, told our subcommittee that 50 percent of the development of intelligence takes place before the age of four while another 30 per cent of the growth occurs between the ages of four and eight.

Such evidence as this demonstrates the crucial importance of early childhood education. My bill, which has the support of both Democrats and Republicans, would establish comprehensive programs of instruction and services in physical and mental health as well as nutrition.

Another concern of mine is the young person who wants to continue his education beyond high school, but finds his way blocked by prohibitive tuition payments and other rising costs.

I know there are many promising Hoosier high school graduates who have the ability and desire to go on to college but are unable to do so because they don't have the money.

To help meet this need, I am sponsoring a bill which would provide additional funds for the Federal student aid programs and also assist colleges in building the classrooms, libraries, and laboratories necessary for expanding enrollment.

Education is essential, too, if we are to cope with the challenge of the pollution of our air, land, and water. We need to know more about the whole spectrum of issues related to the environment in order to reverse the pattern of abuse caused by policies born of ignorance.

The Environmental Quality Education Act, which I have introduced and which has won strong bipartisan support, would authorize funds to support elementary and high school courses in environmental studies as well as adult education and community conferences on the environment.

Measures like these, designed to increase our national investment in our most valuable resource—educated men and women—are, I believe, essential if we are to provide a better life for all Americans.

The answers to the problems that plague our society today are ones that all Americans seek—whether they live in town or in the country.

TREAD RUBBER TAX

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman CORMAN, of California, and I have introduced a bill to amend the excise tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 regarding the manufacturers' tax on tread rubber.

Typically, manufacturers' excise taxes are imposed upon articles after the manufacturing processes have been completed. The ultimate consumer purchases the article essentially unchanged from the form it was in when it was taxed. In the case of tread rubber, however, the tax is imposed after the tread rubber has been manufactured but it is used in the recapping or retreading of tires. The ultimate consumer purchases a tire rather than tread rubber. In the tread rubber tax, wastage of the product in the ultimate manufacturing process occurs after the tax has been paid. However, similar waste and scrap material used in the production of other taxable articles does not

become subject to the taxes on those articles. Our bill will change the tread rubber tax to make it essentially similar, in its practical application, to manufacturers' excise taxes generally, by permitting a credit or refund, without interest, if tread rubber which has been subject to the manufacturers' excise tax is destroyed, scrapped, wasted, or rendered useless in the recapping or retreading process in the same way as provided by existing law where tread rubber is sold for use other than in recapping or retreading highway vehicle type tires.

The second change made by the bill provides a credit or refund in the case of recapped or retreaded tires in essentially the same type of situation as existing law allows in the case of the sale of a new tire. When a taxable tire is returned by the customer and the price of a replacement is adjusted under the regular guarantee or some other arrangement, then the tax liability on that tire is adjusted proportionately. This procedure is available in the case of new tires, which are subject to the tire tax. My bill makes the same type of refund or credit, without interest, available with regard to tread rubber when a retreaded tire is returned and the price adjusted.

The two changes made by this bill are needed in order to bring the actual operation of the manufacturers' tax on tread rubber more closely into line with the operation of the other manufacturers' excise taxes.

CRACKDOWN ON DRUGS IS WORKING

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the 10-city raid on narcotics peddlers was only one of a series of steps the Nixon administration has taken to clamp down on the narcotics trade.

In a recent editorial, the Los Angeles Times comments on other actions taken by Justice, Treasury, and related agencies to break up this nefarious racket. I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

CRACKDOWN ON DRUGS IS WORKING

Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy noted in a recent speech that, last year in New York City, more young people between the ages of 18 and 35 had died from heroin than from automobile accidents.

Police departments all over the country can attest to the fact that narcotics addiction, in addition to constituting a major health hazard, is also the root cause of a great deal of violent crime.

The illegal importation and sale of drugs is a big as well as monstrous business, and no one should be under any illusions but that bringing it under control is going to be a long, difficult job.

The Nixon Administration's stepped-up drive against the illicit drug traffic shows encouraging signs, however, of paying off:

In March, federal and local narcotics agents smashed a Laguna Beach-based "canning factory" that was making millions of dollars worth of psychedelic drugs a year, and selling to buyers all over the country.

In April, U.S. Customs officials seized four tons of marijuana in Long Beach—the biggest marijuana haul ever made in the United States.

In May, federal agents arrested the Ecuadorian consul in Philadelphia on charges of smuggling in more than $1 million worth of pure cocaine.

Now, in the most important operation of all by far, narcotics agents have dealt a severe blow at a ring which is said to account for 30% of all the heroin and 80% of all the cocaine which enters this country from abroad.

More than 130 persons were arrested over the weekend in 10 cities, including Los Angeles, and more are being sought. Retail value of the drugs seized in the raid, and during the six months of investigation which preceded it, was estimated at almost $9 million.

Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell called the operation a "tremendous success," and predicted that "these arrests will diminish the flow of hard narcotics into and within the United States."

The Justice Dept., the Treasury Dept. and all the other agencies involved deserve a vote of thanks.

STRATEGIC FAILURE

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as our troops begin to come out of Cambodia and the President prepares to go before the country with his tote board of captured guns, bicycles, and rice to celebrate a tactical triumph, it is important to face the fact that, whatever it is tactically speaking, it is only another instance of strategic failure.

Even considered tactically, there are serious doubts about an operation that as of yesterday had cost 339 American and 860 South Vietnamese lives, and 1,501 American and 3,603 South Vietnamese wounded. And who knows how many of the 11,000 bodies counted as "enemy" were Cambodian peasants caught in the indiscriminate swath of war?

However one tallies the costs and benefits in a tactical sense, strategically we face a wider war, fraught with new complexities, uncertainties, and risks.

The Lon Nol government, our new and costly Cambodian client, is floundering, and we can be sure who it will grab if it starts to go under. According to a report in the June 29 edition of the New York Times, the Cambodian Army presently holds less than one-third of the country's 69,000 square miles, while the North Vietnamese and anti-government Cambodians firmly control one-third of the country and can roam at will through the remaining third.

Our Cambodian venture has had the effect of welding Communist elements throughout Indochina closer together and, worse, closer to China.

At a deeper level, the venture is a failure because it has provided another occasion for indulging in self-deception, for refusing to face the facts upon which sound strategy is based.

Prof. James C. Thomson of Harvard, who served on the staff of the National Security Council and in the State Department in the last administration, expresses this aspect of the failure especially well in a lecture he gave to a recent meeting of the Yale-in-China Association:

Every effort to avert acceptance of error and failure—every "cosmetic" approach, in current Washington parlance—is simply a formula for further evasion and self-deception and for a longer, wider war. Every effort to "save face" will lead to a new Cambodia. For any President who thinks he can now exit with grace from this twenty-year error is a President who, when confronted with the possibility of the look of defeat, will balk and grope for a new Cambodia—new flexing of the muscles, new acts of bravado, new targets of opportunity, new military adventures, up to and including, I deeply fear, the threat of the use of nuclear weapons and, if need be, the actual use of nuclear weapons. For there will always be persuasive peddlers of new ways to win this unwinnable war.

What we so desperately need out of our present President, or his successor, is something no President has yet had the courage to face and to tell the American people: that Vietnam was "lost" to Vietnamese nationalcommunism many years ago by the French, by Americans, and mostly by Vietnamese; that nothing short of world war might "retrieve" that loss; that the loss doesn't matter in terms of American security interests, and indeed has never mattered; and that an admission of error and failure that brings peace to a shattered region is, far from "national humiliation," the first step toward national regeneration, an act of true national courage.

I am inserting in the RECORD a related article by Professor Thomson that appeared in the London Times and a piece by Orvelle Scheel, codirector of the Bay Area Institute, from the New Republic. Both articles ably define the dimensions of the strategic failure:

[From London Sunday Times, May 10, 1970]

BLIND GAMBLE IN INDOCHINA

(By James C. Thomson, Jr.)

Mr. Nixon's Cambodian lunge has opened another grim chapter in the long and baffling story of the American-East Asian relationship—one from which neither America nor East Asia will emerge quite the same as before.

For more than a century Americans have been obsessed with the Far East, an obsession rooted in concepts of mission and manifest destiny. Since the turn of this century the obsession has been transformed into policy: a presumption of national interests in the region, a grand style of rhetoric to cover those interests, occasional resorts to war to protect them, but throughout a curious and persistent inability to define them.

Policies and actions have often been out of line, often a result of internal confusion in Washington. On Vietnam, for instance, what kind of war was it, and who was the real enemy? Was it a civil war or international aggression? And if the latter, was the "real enemy" Hanoi? Peking? Moscow? International Communism? Or maybe "Asian Communism"?

It is sadly appropriate that the obsession, the policy, and the confusion should find their most recent expression in the systematic obliteration of a Cambodian town called Snoul, while Mr. Nixon tells his people that such things are done to avoid "national humiliation." A while ago, before My Lai, Mr.

Nixon's predecessor stressed the centrality of his country's "national honour."

How is one to explain this ongoing American tragedy which yet another President has now compounded?

At the heart of the matter was and is China. Some say that China became to America what India was to Britain, but much more so and with a different outcome. Out of a century of apparently altruistic involvement—efforts at evangelism, education, technical assistance—as well as trade and investment, Americans developed a powerful self-image of their nation's special benevolence toward China and of China's special responsiveness.

But the fury of the Chinese revolution—Chinese Nationalism and, in time, the victory of its Communist wing—assaulted the foundations of that self-image. And the American response, in the world-wide Cold War climate after 1949, was to suspect betrayal at home and abroad. Clearly the new China was a creation of Moscow and its agent ("a Slavic Manchukuo," said Mr. Dean Rusk in 1951) and a dangerously expansionist Power. The true China remained among the exiles on Formosa; the false China must be contained and isolated.

Hence the construction of a network of alliances and bases to defend "Free Asia." Hence new efforts at the export of benevolence, the creation of anti-Communist States in America's own image. Hence, specifically, America's funding of France's struggle for military victory and/or "Vietnamisation" in Indo-China (assistance initially provided, as Mr. Acheson has recently revealed, in order to get France to do what Washington wanted done in Europe). In the process, of course, the very separate roots and identity of the Vietnamese revolution were lost on the policy-makers; equally lost was any clear perception of the fusion of Nationalism and Communism—a potent mix—that fed that revolution.

China, then, is central to America's Asian involvement. But China is not the only factor—and, indeed, has been a receding factor in the past ten years, thanks largely to Peking's military caution and internal preoccupations as well as Sino-Soviet enmity.

Two decades of containment of China's Golden Horde have bred strong habits of thought among those who make policy in Washington. There is, first of all, the well-known domino theory, enunciated originally by General Eisenhower but soon firmly lodged in the American view of Asia. The idea that if you knock over one Asian state, they all fall down, has the virtue of simplicity.

Its premise that all Asian states act alike may well stem from the traditional Western conviction that all Asians "look alike." As for policy-makers, domino-ism makes quite unnecessary any careful appraisal of the critically important differences that distinguish Thais from Cambodians, Burmese from Koreans, Indonesians from Japanese—or, most important of all, Vietnamese from Chinese, age-old foes. All that is needed is a map and an ink-brush to show the alarming consequences of one small nation's collapse.

In very recent years Washington's statesmen have begun to de-emphasize domino-ism, perhaps out of belated experience of Asia's resilient nationalism, perhaps to avoid a self-fulfilling prophecy. Yet in one fundamental respect the concept retains its hold: a fear, from the theory's earliest days, that the final domino (and perhaps the only one) is the Administration in power. That the "loss" of a foreign State to Communism means your party's loss at the polls is the most potent legacy of the "loss" of China in 1949 and the defeat of the Democrats in 1952.

Yet another habit of thought pertains to America's military ascendancy and its relation to Asian issues. From Commodore Perry to Theodore Roosevelt and Henry L. Stimson, American statesmen had believed that if you stood up to Asians, they would soon back down. To traditions of firmness and character the post-war years have added unsurpassed power. Little wonder the Stimsonian itch to deal firmly with Asians has its latter-day expression in President Johnson's decision to bomb the Vietnamese into negotiations and President Nixon's assertion, as he invades Cambodia, that Vietnam is a test of America's "will." What is missing is any sense that Asians, too, have will—and that one's will is usually strongest on one's own home ground.

Such habits are compounded by sheer ignorance of Asian realities; of age-old hostility, for instance, among Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Thais, and between all three and Chinese; of the fact that Laos is a non-country created by France, that Cambodia is the Poland of South-East Asia caught and carved between Thailand and Vietnam, and that French and American intervention has only postponed for a while the probable division of the Indo-China region between Thailand and Vietnam.

They are also compounded by patterns of official prose: by a persistent tendency towards rhetorical escalation—an ever more shrill definition of the importance of the stakes, as the price and doubts soar, to cover the paucity of stakes. Vietnam becomes important quite simply because Administrations have *said* it was important.

And they are further compounded, of course, by American pride: by presidential unwillingness to admit a colossal national blunder that spans two decades and five Administrations, and by presidential susceptibility to "solutions" that will somehow make the outcome look like less than failure.

So this month Mr. Nixon, captive of familiar pressures, gives in to the Cambodian "solution" long urged by Saigon and the Pentagon. It is a sad move for one who recently seemed as if he really wanted "out." A gamble, it is called by many commentators, here and in Washington—even a courageous gamble. More properly, a desperate evasion: an evasion of the central facts that no President has had the courage to face and to tell to his people—that Vietnam was "lost" to Vietnamese national-communism many years ago, by French, Americans, and Vietnamese; that nothing short of world war could retrieve that loss; that the loss doesn't matter in terms of American national interest; and that an admission of error that brings peace to a shattered region is, far from "national humiliation," the first step toward national regeneration, an act of true courage.

Cambodian Civil War

(By Orville Schell)

We now see that the Cambodian invasion, far from being a "brief surgical operation" quickly performed and done with, has opened wide a new and dangerous fissure. Tad Szulc in *The New York Times* of May 20 reports "senior officials" in Washington as believing that "in some ways the situation in Cambodia was beginning to resemble South Vietnam in 1960 when the Vietcong began their rebellion against the Saigon regime." George McT. Kahin, director of the Southeast Asia program at Cornell, puts it more bluntly: "President Nixon has contributed to the creation of a formidable anti-American alliance in Cambodia, making a long civil war in that country inevitable."

Until the coup in March, the Cambodian body politic existed in a precarious balance with Prince Sihanouk in the middle. To his right stood the former (and present) Premier and Minister of National Defense, General Lon Nol. He was chief of the 35,000-man Cambodian Army which was largely trained and partially equipped under US military aid amounting to some $94 million up to 1964, when Sihanouk requested that it be stopped. Although Lon Nol made trips to both Peking and Hanoi for Sihanouk, he was known for his "anti-Communist" and "pro-Western" feelings. He reportedly traveled to the Communist capitals in attempts to persuade Hanoi and Peking that the NLF and the North Vietnamese Army (NVA) should leave their Cambodian base camps. Although he did not always agree with Sihanouk, Lon Nol was included in various cabinets as a balance against the left. Sihanouk used him as a kind of warning to the Cambodian Communists not to push too hard against his own, middle-of-the-road, poorly organized Sangkum Party, which he formed hastily when he abdicated the throne in 1955.

To Sihanouk's left were the Khmer Rouge, whom he played down as much as possible, and of whom the American press has chosen to take almost no notice. The Khmer Rouge (or Red Khmers) have not been a strong force numerically in past years, but they served to point up the fact that Cambodia, although not at war, had by no means remedied the plight of the peasant or of rural government. Their numerous, but usually inconsequential, attacks on government troops were an annoyance, but less important (although the Sihanouk government claimed to have killed some 300) than the de facto control they exercised in parts of the rural hinterland, particularly around the vital ports of Sihanoukville and Kep on the southern part of the Cambodian-Vietnamese border. The NLF has been getting supplies to its troops in the Mekong Delta region in South Vietnam through these ports. Apparently Sihanouk was unwilling to move into this area and clean up the NLF operations, because it would have risked a major clash with indigenous Cambodian forces. Lon Nol did not share these apprehensions and always favored a hard line against both NLF and Khmer Rouge activities.

The Khmer Rouge, who now operate in some five different districts in Cambodia, were formed of remnants of the old Cambodian Vietminh (never very strong due to the rather pro-French stance of Sihanouk), disaffected teachers and student intellectuals, former elected officials and a peasant following of undetermined size. Estimates, until recent weeks, placed the total number of Khmer Rouge at around 3000. From leaflets left in villages through which they have moved, it is known that they want to "liberate Cambodia from the Americans," that they are scornful of religion (Buddhism), critical of police and army extortion of the peasantry, and corrupt government monopolies. Various factions of the Khmer Rouge have been so isolated from one another that they have not had any unified program. Their two main bases adjacent to Tay Ninh Province, in Svay Rieng and Prey Veng, have been closely allied with the NLF. These Khmer Rouge have harassed not only Cambodian government officials, but have joined the NLF in sorties into South Vietnam.

But there are other Khmer Rouge to the west of Phnom Penh who have been more independent. Their base camps stretch from the Thai border down along the Elephant Range to the coastal ports at Kampot. They are led by Hou Youn, who is described by U.S. intelligence sources in the *Far Eastern Economic Review* as a "man of truly astounding intellectual and physical strength." Hou Youn is an ex-National Assemblyman who was expelled from Phnom Penh during Lon Nol's crackdown on Communist activities in 1967. Demonstrations followed Lon Nol's severe treatment of peasant rebels in Battambang Province, who were said to be led by Hou Youn and the Khmer Rouge. As a result of Lon Nol became the *bête noire* of Cambodian leftists, who have since branded him as "an American stooge."

Interestingly, neither wing of the Khmer Rouge ever criticized Sihanouk by name, which does not mean that Sihanouk did not oppose their activities. Thus, in June of last year he commented that "the Vietcong fight a foreign imperialism in order to liberate their country in order to give it independence. They are furthermore supported by the South Vietnamese people while receiving no instructions from foreign organizations, whereas the Khmer Reds fight their country's government which is known by the whole world to be the guardian of national independence and nonalignment and to derive its power from the people through general elections. The Khmer Reds kill their own compatriots and are in the pay of either Maoism or the Vietminh." In an interview in February, 1969, Sihanouk said: "Leaflets scattered around by night announce the formation of self-styled clandestine Communist 'parties' or 'movements.' We do not know how many members they have, but very few in any case. I do not think that China 'controls' these grouplets, although Chinese activists in Cambodia give them assistance."

Officially, China had been chary about giving any support of an official nature to the Khmer Rouge. In past years there has been no mention of their activities in the *People's Daily*. The Chinese chose rather to support Sihanouk, even extending him a rather generous aid program.

In a sense, then, Sihanouk was the fulcrum point between the contending leftist and rightist, or pro-Western and Pro-Communist forces. With Lon Nol's coup and the US invasion of Cambodia, all that changed. Cambodia is polarized: Lon Nol and the Army (with American aid) on the right, and the Khmer Rouge (with Hanoi and NLF aid) on the left. Cambodia has become an annex of Vietnam both politically and militarily. Sihanouk has been forced to join friends where he finds them. And from exile in Peking, his alternatives are few. He has turned to the Khmer Rouge, his erstwhile enemies. Their movement, which has been small and almost unrecognized on the international scene, now has a leader of stature, the only man who has the prestige to rally the Cambodian peasants behind any mass movement. The Khmer Rouge has been rejuvenated.

On April 17, *Le Monde* reported in a headline that in Svay Rieng, already "peasants appear to be joining the ranks of the local Communist guerrillas." The article by Jean-Claude Pomonti goes on to describe the newly formed Khmer Rouge provisional government and how the war is forcing peasants into the expanding ranks of the Khmer Rouge Army in the area. He writes: "Three former deputies of the Cambodian National Assembly, Mssrs. Khieu Sam Phon, Hou Youn and Hu Nim, who rejoined the underground several years ago and are considered the leaders of the Khmer Rouge, published last March 26 a declaration of support for Prince Sihanouk." The three ex-deputies urge "all our compatriots, in the city as well as the countryside, not to enter into the army or into the police to serve as cannon fodder for the American Imperialists and for the traitors to the fatherland, Lon Nol and Sirik Matak, to not pay them taxes, to not respect their savage laws, and to sincerely and resolutely unite in the National Unified Front of Kampuchea [Cambodia], to organize guerrilla forces of the Khmer people who are ready to receive you now."

On April 21, in *Le Monde*, Jacques Decornoy reported that "a National Liberation Front of Kampuchea [that is, of Cambodia] has just been created. It already operates in certain 'liberated territories' and claims to carry out operations thanks to its 'liberator the Khmer Army.'" A correspondent for *Agence France Presse* quotes a cadre of the Front as saying that they had already "totally liberated" the province of Rattanakiri and that, "The following year, perhaps sooner, we will be at Phom Penh. But the Prince will return before that time." The correspondent reported that the "Khmer Liberation Army has vehicles and automatic machine guns taken from the Government Army." The Khmer Rouge, with the help of the NLF, seem uninterested at this point in capturing towns and cities (which will only be razed by US air strikes and armor). They are reportedly determined to create "liberated zones" *a la* Mao, from which they can put a guerrilla army of their own in the field.

Peking has taken careful note of all this. Headlines in the *People's Daily* now trumpet support for Sihanouk's government-in-exile (which includes such Khmer Rouge leaders as Hou Youn as Minister of the Interior and Peasant Problems) and for the Summit Conference of the Indochinese Peoples which was attended by Chou En-lai, Sihanouk, Nguyen Huu Tho (NLF), Pham Van Dong (DRV) and Prince Souvanouvong (Pathet Lao).

On May 4, the *New China News Service* reported Chou as saying: "Armed with Mao Tse-tung's thought and tempered through the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the Chinese people, will always give all-out support and assistance to the fraternal peoples of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam in carrying to the end the war against US aggression and for national salvation."

The day before at the Summit conference, Chou said that "the 700 million Chinese people provide a powerful backing for the three Indochinese peoples and the vast expanse of China's territory is their reliable 'rear area' [*hou-fang*]." "Rear area" is not a term the Chinese have traditionally used with abandon, inasmuch as it has the connotation of the word "sanctuary." Now it appears that they have decided to stake their prestige and support on Sihanouk. One can hardly believe that they would have given such unqualified support (after initially being so cool) did they not think that Sihanouk was capable of pulling a movement together back home.

It is increasingly probable that US-supplied South Vietnamese forces will remain in Cambodia indefinitely, for "the Lon Nol regime will need assistance," as Mr. Szulc notes in the *Times*, to deal with guerrilla and subversive activities." That raises the question whether US commanders will not at some point be directing ground operations, but more probably air strikes, against Khmer Rouge sanctuaries" (as well as those of the NVA and NFL) in a prolonged Cambodian civil war.

BABE RUTH BASEBALL

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, due to a prior commitment I was unable to attend the breakfast held recently on Capitol Hill in the interest of Babe Ruth baseball.

I am sorry that I missed this affair as I did want to renew my long friendship with one of the greatest players in the history of major league baseball—Vernon "Lefty" Gomez, who served as toastmaster and performed in his usually humorous and highly entertaining style.

We in northeastern Pennsylvania remember Lefty for his scintillating record as a pitcher for the great New York Yankees and we also remember him for the years he managed the Yankee farm team at Binghamton, N.Y., which was in the same league as my hometown team, the Wilkes-Barre Barons. So, we got to see Lefty quite often during those years and we hold him in great affection.

I understand Lefty had some nice things to say about Wilkes-Barre during the course of the recent Capitol Hill breakfast program, and for that I thank him very much.

Baseball is a great game and needs the support of many of us. I strongly support all programs in athletics for our young people and I particularly support Babe Ruth baseball, which is a truly outstanding program to develop the major league players of tomorrow. It is named in honor of the greatest player in the history of baseball and I am sure the Babe would not want to be remembered in a finer way.

So, I extend my congratulations to Mrs. Babe Ruth, Lefty Gomez, Bowie Kuhn, and the many others who are actively engaged in the promotion and further development of Babe Ruth baseball. They are performing a fine service to the youth of our country.

MINNESOTA LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS URGES REPEAL OF THE INDIAN TERMINATION RESOLUTION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker the League of Women Voters in Minnesota has done an outstanding job of focusing attention on the needs and concerns of our State's 35,000 American Indians. "Indians in Minneapolis," a study prepared by the Minneapolis chapter, has been acclaimed nationally as the most comprehensive analysis to date of urban Indian conditions.

Currently, the Minnesota league is supporting legislation introduced by myself and 28 colleagues to repeal House Concurrent Resolution 108, the 1953 Indian "termination" resolution.

The following correspondence from Mrs. O. J. Janski, State president of the Minnesota LWV, provides an excellent statement of the need to repeal this congressional action opposed so bitterly by Indian groups throughout the country.

The correspondence follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, Minn., June 24, 1970.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: Thank you for taking the lead to repeal House Concurrent Resolution 108. The enclosed letter is being sent to all Minnesota Congressmen.

Sincerely,

Mrs. O. J. JANSKI,
State President.

JUNE 24, 1970.

HON. CLARK MACGREGOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACGREGOR: The League of Women Voters of Minnesota was pleased to see that a bipartisan effort will be made to re-

peal House Concurrent Resolution 108. This states that it is federal policy to ultimately terminate Indian reservations. Although this policy has not been pushed in recent years, it still is on record as being the government's objective in dealing with Indian citizens.

We refer to this resolution, passed in 1953, because its wording was inaccurate to begin with and when it was enforced, the results were disastrous. It states:

"Whereas it is the policy of Congress, as rapidly as possible, to make the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States subject to the same laws and entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens of the United States, to end their status as wards of the United States, and to grant them all of the rights and prerogatives pertaining to American citizenship; and

"Whereas the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States should assume their full responsibilities as American citizens: Now therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is declared to be the sense of Congress that, at the earliest possible time . . . (tribes in 4 states and 5 named tribes) . . . should be freed from Federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specially applicable to Indians . . ."

The resolution is cast in terms of granting Indians the rights and privileges of citizens. Indians are already American citizens and they already are "entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens." (Military service, paying taxes, etc.) Also they are not in any sense "wards" of the United States. The government does not control the individual Indian. The relationship is based on treaties between nations.

The federal government now holds reservation land in trust status on behalf of the Indians because of these treaties. Other services follow because of the tax exempt status of the land and the nation's desire to assist this minority.

In 1962, in our League's study "Indians in Minnesota" we pointed out that "The resolution is not so important for what it would *give* Indians as for what it would *remove* from them." And this is what has happened as the sad stories of the Menominee and Klamath tribes attest.

Indians throughout the nation, no matter what their circumstances, fear this resolution. It has never been rejected by Congress and could at any time be used to threaten their limited remaining lands and their very existence.

We urge you to join in the action to rescind House Concurrent Resolution 108.

Sincerely,

Mrs. O. J. JANSKI,
State President.

CONGRESSMAN PATTEN'S YEARLY QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, each year I send a legislative questionnaire to every home in the congressional district I represent.

The response has always been gratifying—not only in the number of persons who take part, but in the deep interest and strong enthusiasm they display in expressing their views.

This year's questionnaire consists of 10 questions—six on domestic issues and four on foreign affairs.

The questions are:

Please list what you consider to be the three most serious domestic problems facing the Nation.

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said that wage and price controls may be necessary because of inflation. Would you favor such controls on a temporary basis?

Should Federal spending be increased to fight air and water pollution?

Do you favor changing the present lottery system for military service to an all-volunteer army?

Do you believe the Nation's space program should be expanded, cut back, or be continued at the present rate?

Do you support legislation that would establish Federal health and safety standards for workers?

On the Vietnam war, which one of these alternatives do you favor?

First. President Nixon's present Vietnamization policy—a phased withdrawal of U.S. combat troops to be replaced by South Vietnamese troops.

Second. Disengagement at a faster pace than the President is pursuing.

Third. Increasing the U.S. military effort.

Do you support the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks—SALT—now taking place at Vienna between the United States and the Soviet Union?

Should the United States sell military jet planes to Israel?

Do you support the idea of establishing a standby U.N. peacekeeping force?

IN MEMORIAM: ROBERT E. McCORD

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness and a deep sense of personal loss that I learned of the passing of Robert McCord, the chief clerk and senior specialist for the Education and Labor Committee, on June 21. Bob was more than a counselor, although I often relied on his perceptive and sagacious advice; he was more than a legislative expert, although he was responsible for directing and guiding bills through the committee. Bob was an understanding and sympathetic friend with a profound appreciation for the needs of the people of this country and an acumen which permitted translation into legislation.

The legislative achievements of the Education and Labor Committee in the past few years are testimony to the tenacity and persuasiveness of Bob McCord. I mention only a few of those bills on which I personally worked closely with Bob: the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments, Older Americans Act Amendments, the Construction Safety Act, the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act, and the Library Services and Construction Act.

To his widow, Audrey, and his family, I extend my heartfelt condolences. Just as Bob can never be replaced in their lives, so too is he irreplaceable on this committee. But his dedication to his job and to the people will long be a source of inspiration to those of us privileged to know and work with him.

HERO SCHOLARSHIP FUND OF PHILADELPHIA: PROFILE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, whenever a policeman goes out on his beat or a fireman goes into a burning building, he takes his life in his hands. Few of these public servants think about that. It is part of their jobs; one of the risks.

But in their minds is a great concern for their children and their future.

Policemen and firemen are on the firing line these days when big city tensions flare into civil disturbances or worse. Sometimes these public servants have reason to resent public apathy or even at times public hostility; but in Philadelphia we take pride that the great majority of our citizens support their uniformed men.

An example of this is the concern and compassion which the people of Philadelphia have shown for the children of men mortally wounded or permanently disabled in the line of duty by providing for their education and their futures.

Philadelphia is proud of the fact that it has a reputation of being the safest big city in the Nation. Its crime record, both in fewer number of actual offenses and highest in crimes solved, lies in part with the high morale of its protectors.

Certainly, much of that high morale comes through the Hero Scholarship Fund, which derives its income from the annual thrill show, to be held for the 16th year at John F. Kennedy Stadium, September 11.

Since 1940, 48 policemen have been killed fighting crime. Also, there have been 56 firemen and three Fairmount Park Police who have lost their lives.

There are now 228 students, boys and girls, attending college, and 143 have already graduated, some with doctorates, some as teachers, several as lawyers, and one as a police personnel officer, following his late father into the ranks. Some 113 others had one or more years of college.

Also, 1,811 other sons and daughters of the city's uniformed servicemen will be awarded the same educational opportunities when they are ready for college.

All this came about through a mass tragedy. On October 28, 1954, a disastrous explosion wrecked the Berg Laboratories in North Philadelphia in a crowded neighborhood. Ten firemen died and a score of others were injured Thirty-five children were fatherless, faced with a bleak future in families without a breadwinner.

The tragic death of these firemen spurred Councilman Paul D'Ortona into action. An ordinance was introduced by

Mr. D'Ortona, then chairman of city council's public safety committee "authorizing the creation of a special committee to study ways and means of raising funds for the establishment and maintenance of scholarships for the children of firemen, policemen and park police killed or totally and permanently disabled in the line of duty."

James H. J. Tate, now mayor of Philadelphia, and D'Ortona, who succeeded Tate as president of city council, called upon the late John B. Kelly, noted sportsman and civic leader, to organize a citizens committee to implement this action.

Mr. Kelly agreed to serve and a citizens committee was formed. All the ideas of public appeals for money were abandoned in the face of other such appeals and the formula of a series of "thrill shows" was chosen to raise the necessary funds for the scholarship program. The first thrill show was held September 9, 1955.

Thus was born the "Hero Scholarship Fund of Philadelphia."

The 103,000-seat Municipal Stadium, the only one big enough to hold the annual Army-Navy game, was the natural site, and this faith was justified by the bulging crowds each year since.

Show business people, famed for generosity of their time and talent, have participated in the previous 15 shows, including among many, Bob Hope, Ed Sullivan, Louis Armstrong, Ella Fitzgerald, Tony Bennett, Richard Boone, Art Linkletter, Gene Autry, and the Supremes. These are only a few of the stars who have headlined in the greatest one-night stand in show business.

Police, firemen, and park police round out the shows with a demonstration of skills and daring which puts the "thrill" in the thrill show; and more than a million Philadelphia area residents have applauded over the years. More than $1,500,000 has been raised by the thrill shows, which is carefully invested by a special committee of banking experts.

Council President D'Ortona, now the president of the Hero Scholarship Fund, said recently that "the Hero Scholarship Fund is a unique enterprise among American cities. It has proved a success here and could be duplicated in any community which cares for the men who guard the life and property of its citizens."

It has often been said that a policeman's life is a thankless one, and this can be said, just as earnestly, about firemen and park police.

It does not have to be thankless, and Philadelphia gives some of its thanks in a practical way.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 18-year-old vote issue is one that we must analyze without emotion and this same approach was the basis of an editorial in the Chicago Today, Wednesday, June 24, after the President signed the Voting Rights Act which included the 18-year-old vote. Since I share the President's view that the Court will find it unconstitutional for Congress to lower the voting age and feel that this matter should remain the jurisdiction of the States, I feel that this editorial is an effective commentary on the President's action.

NIXON TOUCHES BASE ON VOTE BILL

By signing the 5-year extension of the voting rights act, with its amendment lowering the legal voting age to 18, President Nixon has edged safely around a gaping pitfall. He couldn't have won by vetoing the bill; he can't lose by having signed it.

If the Supreme Court finds it's unconstitutional for Congress to set voting requirements for the states—as Mr. Nixon thinks it is—its ruling will prove his opinion correct. If the court finds the bill constitutional, it will prove Nixon right in signing it despite his reservations.

In either case, the President will spare his administration and his party the storms of resentment he'd have brought on by trying to do the court's job for it. And whatever happens to this section of the voting rights bill, the rest of it will stay intact. Mr. Nixon would have had to veto the whole bill—a dangerous gamble in itself.

Provisions for an early court test are built into the bill, and we hope the test will be prompt. If the 18-year-old vote is upheld it might bring a lot of changes—for instance, moves to redesign and emphasize civics courses in high school. The more time is left for planning these changes before next Jan. 1, when the law is scheduled to take effect, the better the plans are likely to be.

WHERE ARE AMERICANS NOW?

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the streets of America are filled with people marching to the beats of many different drummers. Next month, we will witness still another as the "Honor America Day" directs our attention to the most basic of all American holidays—the Fourth of July.

This great day in our history of national pride will be marked in the Nation's Capital with a lot of old-fashioned hoopla and with a new dimension. The organizers of the national observance have made a concerted effort to involve all America. This includes those among us who are hawks, doves, radicals, moderates, and what-nots. And this is as it should be.

Even the most naive among us realize that this day's planned activities mark an attempt to put some of the cohesive stuff back into the American mainstream. This, too, is as it should be. There is room, Mr. Speaker, in this great land for the full spectrum of political philosophy, activity, and partiality. There is room for those who would disagree with the course the country is taking—just so long as they are pulling with America and not against her.

Mr. Speaker, this month's issue of McCall's has issued a sort of "mid-term" report. As an introspective look at our land, the editors present the thoughts of such writers as Liz Carpenter, Arthur Miller, Paul Ehrlich, and Mrs. Malcolm Peabody, who are worldly travelers "on that jumpy, bumpy, always thrilling voyage" aboard the Spaceship Earth.

McCall's sets the stage with this special introduction:

Six months ago, after man had landed on the moon, we elected to look back over our astronauts' shoulders and try to define The Good Life on Earth. Since then, so much has happened. We have seen miracles, like the prayerful splashdown of Apollo 13. But there have also been some alarming bobbles and wobbles in the capsule we all ride together: Spaceship Earth.

From this backdrop, McCall's then provides a forum for a group of Americans who give us their "conversations" with such elements of our society as: the silent majority, a champion of the middle class, "powerless" students, and a population expert.

Of these, my favorite is the article written by one of my obvious favorites—Liz Carpenter. In typical fashion, Liz describes her crisscross travels throughout the metropolitan areas of the Nation. McCall's describes it this way:

For the past six months, Liz Carpenter, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's former press secretary and author of the best-selling "Ruffles and Flourishes," has crisscrossed America to promote her book. She traveled over 35,000 miles and submitted to interviews in 41 cities. All the while, she was asking questions, too. "I'm the kind of questioner who gives George Gallup apoplexy," she says. "But I did get a feel of the peoples and what they're thinking."

Mr. Speaker, if ever we decided to actually interview America, I can think of no better person for the job than Liz Carpenter. She is a gal of great heart and understanding. I like her gift of gab, her verbal jabs, and her unabashed love for this land of ours. It all comes out in her article. Through her sensitive style, Liz has set the mood for the subsequent articles, and I take great pride in reprinting her observations in the RECORD:

CONVERSATIONS WITH THE GREAT SILENT MAJORITY: "THEY ARE FULL OF QUESTIONS—AND THEY SHOULD BE"

(By Liz Carpenter)

Beside me on the bus, as it inches its way through the nightime fog from JFK to Manhattan, is a young girl. She can't be more than twenty-three. She is wearing a brown tweed maxi-coat and reading *Catch-22*. We begin talking, and I learn she's a nurse.

"I've just spent a great weekend with a fantastic guy, and now I'm going back—to my apartment at night and the hospital every day." She has seen too many people, she says, dying alone. "They just don't seem to have anyone," she tells me. "Maybe that's one reason I keep thinking I'd like to join a commune. I grew up in a big family, and there were always lots of people and action around. I like that. I've done lots of thinking on it, and if you found the right group, it could be great. It would beat the loneliness. I think the people I see in the hospital would have been better off in a commune, dying with a few friends around."

The bus lumbers toward the city, and I wonder why a husband and four children wouldn't do just as well as a commune.

But she doesn't seem to be thinking about a husband and four children.

The cab driver is taking me to New York's Pennsylvania Station, weaving between honking cars and delivery trucks. "Nothing's free any more, lady, not even two nails in a shoe. My wife has been going to this same shoe place for eighteen years, and she went in there the other day and just wanted two little old nails in her shoe, to keep the heel on. Always before, it was nothing. But now it's fifty cents just for two nails in a shoe."

It is not the price that bothered him, but the loss of friendliness of generosity. For eighteen years, those two nails have been something he could depend on.

In the department stores, Mr. Wanamaker's in Philadelphia, Mr. Joske's in San Antonio, Messrs. Halle's and Higbee's in Cleveland, sales are down.

First, it was the luxury items—diamonds and jewelry—things people could put off buying. Now, it's appliances—television sets and new washing machines. Clothing sales are down, too.

Meanwhile, the customer is learning how to sew again.

On a Main Line commuter train into Philadelphia, a smartly dressed matron is reading the paper. She's reading the fashion page in that way only philadelphians read newspapers, folded in thirds top to bottom.

"I've taken up sewing. I'm not the type, but I can't afford two hundred dollars for a pant suit."

I look her over and agree she's not the type. There is a diamond-eyed tiger pin on her expensive lapel.

But her decision is not unique. Over and over again store managers tell me that the sale of patterns, of yard goods is up.

"It isn't just saving money," a clerk in Cincinnati says. "It's wanting to do something themselves, getting satisfaction from a craft. Woodwork and other crafts are also booming. One of my customers told me the other day, 'I can't do anything about drugs and Vietnam, but I can sew and take my mind off them.' "

Chicago is booming. Unlike Philadelphia and New York, the restaurants are full. I mention this to Mayor Daley, and he grins. "We just don't panic so quick out here."

The mayor runs Chicago, and it works. The gravediggers dig, the sewers work, the town runs. I ask him where the Democrats should hold the next political convention. The mayor doesn't blink an eye. "Chicago, of course," he answers. "It's the best convention town in the country."

Over a drink, I ponder Chicago with an editor friend. In all the age of divisiveness, isn't it strange that Chicago can absorb Abbie Hoffman and Hugh Heffner, conventions and conspiracy trials, and still sit here undaunted—ready to take on the next comer?

"It's the most American city in the country," the editor says. "And let's face it, we've got a very red-white-and-blue mayor, who doesn't pamper the soul-searchers. There's room for everyone, but there is someone in charge."

My seat companion in the waiting room of the Minneapolis airport is a curly-haired young man—lean, intense, a smart new briefcase by his feet. Computers are his business. He has spent the day telling the city fathers of Minneapolis how much time, money, and labor they would save if the city would buy a few.

"Do you think computers have improved the human race?" I ask querulously, after expressing my own frustrations as a tax-paying member of the Zip Code Society.

"They certainly haven't cost any jobs," he says defensively. "They're creating jobs, and they're making money." He is silent for a moment. "I can't honestly say that computers have improved things basically. They give answers faster. But I don't really guess human beings are any better off because of them."

Maybe the trick is to make the computers serve us and not let us serve the computers?

He says we'll get to that.

The pretty Negro girl, a receptionist on the TV show in Cleveland, is just twenty-five. She is wearing a handsome beige pant suit and driving me to the airport in her snappy green Camaro. What worries her?

"We need to trust each other more," she says. "Take me! During the day, I work at City Hall in vital statistics, and this black man comes in the other day and says to me, 'Why aren't you wearing an Afro? Aren't you our sister?' " She takes a deep breath. "I know what I am inside. I'm for the black people. But I can be their sister without wearing an Afro."

She doesn't want to be one more vital statistic. She wants to be herself—the snappy girl riding along the Cleveland expressway in her snappy green Camaro.

She is a pretty manicurist in Seattle, and she has three children. "What worries *me?*" she asks. "I worry that when I'm gone, this country won't be safe for my kids."

She doesn't understand the "new people." She means the protesters, the militants, the shouters and damners. She hopes her kids won't turn out that way. "I just try to keep the conversation going between us," she said. "I try to make my sense of values sound reasonable to them. It's not easy. They're full of questions, and they should be. But I work hard at the answers and just hope I make a sale now and then."

Keep the dialogue going! The old rule of the diplomats, and now it is mothers who reach for answers across the negotiating tables in the dining room.

"I stand here ironing," the housewife in Portland says "and some jackass on television starts singing, 'You've come a long way, baby,' and I'd like to throw the iron right through the television set."

Her daughter, she tells me with a trace of admiration, has joined the Women's Liberation Movement. "She's lousy at ironing."

San Francisco, with its great bridge, its hills and lights, looks like an open jewel box by night.

Daylight brings less inspiring sights like the college dropouts in saffron Buddhist robes who loiter near a department store, handing out cheap, colored leaflets on the subject of love.

"Where are you from?" I ask a tall young "priest."

"Massachusetts—I mean, from God and love," he says, catching himself. "I'm from Love."

From Love, by way of Massachusetts. He and his companions have shaved heads. But if you picture them with a little hair, they look like the Harvard crew, fresh from a hard workout on the Charles River.

The Greenhouse is a fashionable health spa outside Dallas. I expected it to be filled with beautiful, idle, rich ladies, but I find its clientele includes political activists, thin, high-powered public-relations executives, taste makers, ladies bountiful, and former First Ladies.

Steaming in a sauna with me is a sophisticated young woman from a stylish Chicago suburb. Her week here is a gift from her husband for the second baby.

"What gripes me," she says amid the steam, "is that we Americans always jump to the conclusion that we are wrong. We assume everything foreign is better. The British educate better. The French have more elegance. We are constantly on the defensive. Sometimes I even do it myself. When my little boy Timmy gets into a fight with the next-door neighbor, I run out and say, 'What did Timmy do?' Now, isn't that something? His own mother automatically assumes the other kid is right. Is it out of some false sense of humility? Are we a bunch of hypocondriacs about our country? I don't advocate flagrant flag-waving, but dammit, we aren't ALWAYS wrong. And we ought to say so! We need personal pride, city pride, national pride—and we need it fast!"

"That's part of it," a prosperous rancher's wife in a towel says. "But we also lack balance, because there is no family at home—no grandparent, aunt, or uncle to give children stability and respect for authority. When we grew up, we didn't get out of line, because we didn't want to reflect on our family. And in a small town, everyone knew your family. Now we're on the move. People have scattered. No one's home any more."

On to Houston—bustling, prosperous, energized Houston. We ride into the city, past rows of awful billboards, talking about city problems. My companion, a thoughtful newspaperwoman, is optimistic about her hospitable city.

"We've started something new down here," she says pleasantly. "Quite simply, we're trying to put the joy back into dissent. We've established a forum with two chairmen, a strong Republican and a strong Democrat. When we meet, everyone has a chance to get up and express his viewpoint—with no hard feelings. It's going great. I don't know, maybe it's some sort of answer."

Instead of angry voices, instead of political tantrums, Houston is hearing some of its concerned citizens disagree—agreeably, in an atmosphere of respect. Not a new idea, perhaps, but the right idea. And it *seems* new in this contentious age. And suddenly, riding into Houston, I mind the billboards a little less.

Atlanta is still genteel, polite. But there's a bit more bustle now, a brash, new cosmopolitan air, which can accommodate both Lester Maddox and Julian Bond.

"The average book buyer in Atlanta," says the head of the department at Rich's, "is a woman between thirty and sixty who doesn't think anyone has written a book since 'Gone With the Wind.' " She pauses. "They're buying witchcraft books now. Astrology, all sorts of occult stuff."

What are they looking for, a substitute for religion? But when I ride down Peachtree Street, the churches all look new and well kept. And on Sundays, they are full.

In Birmingham, Alabama, there is a month-long, city-wide festival of the arts. Every night the townspeople get dressed up and turn out to see their high-school ballerinas dancing with a star from New York, or to hear a black teacher sing—sounding for all the world like Leontyne Price—under the baton of a maestro from Milan. They come, and each year for ten years the festival has grown a little bigger. In a very indirect way, the people of Birmingham are saying, "Don't label us red-necks and bigots."

Tomorrow there will be opera and a book-and-author luncheon, with three writers on the platform. But today the chairman is proudly showing us her city. Our last stop is at the poetry and short-story contest, where we hear local authors read their work—a businessman, a high-school teacher, ordinary people from all over Alabama.

Something is happening in Birmingham.

All over the country I find a backlash against the hiss-and-tell books, the blanket ridicule of public figures. Again and again people say to me, "I'm glad you liked the people you worked for." Or matter-of-factly, perhaps with a trace of defiance: "I liked the Johnsons, too." Often, they don't even mean they liked the Johnsons so much as they like the quality of loyalty.

I find that in Indianapolis and in Morgantown, West Virginia, at the university, seminars are under way for journalists, analyzing what is wrong with the media. They are willing to admit that the press is not the perfect institution in an imperfect world. There must be ways of telling the story of achievement as well as of failure. We must find those ways.

Back home now, I sort out the conversations, and I find myself refreshed. America has a great deal more going for it than against it. Somehow among the computers,

the Numbered Society, we are going to decide: Do not bend, fold, or mutilate this individual, for he is a human being. We are going to find ourselves and each other. Again there will be someone to answer a cry in the night.

I think about the girl in the brown tweed maxi-coat in Chicago, the young, intense computer salesman in Minneapolis, the saffron-robed "priest" hawking love in San Francisco, the taxi driver for whom nothing is free any more, the young wife in the sauna who wants us to stop apologizing for ourselves.

What are they seeking, these widely scattered souls whom I met so briefly?

Something very simple, it seems to me: a sense of community, of neighborliness, of significance amid the numbers. The young girl looking wistfully toward the commune and the brisk festival chairman in Birmingham are not so different; they are after the same things: meaning, participation, involvement. In almost every community, I felt, people were searching for friends, for lost neighborhoods—for one another.

I heard complaints, fleeting expressions of self-doubt, sensed how numbers and anonymity can overwhelm people. But I also saw humor, energy, civic pride, pure cussedness, simple patriotism.

I have the feeling that America, even in a period of pessimism, is working; that for all their shortcomings and doubts, these silent Americans are earnest, devoted, diligent, determined to do their best.

We owe ourselves a respite from our own pessimism, our own bad temper. We owe ourselves—each other—the benefit of the doubt.

It is late spring when I reach Washington again. One of those blissful sunny Sundays when the monuments are bright white and the pink and white dogwoods are laced against blue skies. The riverbanks are filled with people. A few are fishing. There are bicycles and joggers and lots of racing, tumbling children. A group of little boys are looking intently for something on the ground. They find some smooth, flat stones, and I watch them try very carefully to skip them across the river.

I think of one more encounter, a conversation with a young clergyman on the plane back to Washingtotn. What did he see in the future? I asked. Was he optimistic?

"The church has survived so many things before," he said, "that I can't doubt we'll survive the present. We'll have to find new ways to express, to affirm old ideas. We'll have to find ways to act out values that in the past we've honored more in word than in deed. We're living through a time of great shifts in emphasis. In morals, there are great extremes—from extremely rigid morality to none at all. But I think the old values are still there."

The seat-belt sign flashed on, and he paused as the plane began to descend. "I think," he said slowly, "we should have a good deal of hope, based on faith."

Not blind faith, but something else: a good deal of hope based on faith. I thought, as we parted, about what he said—and I have thought about it since.

APPROPRIATIONS HEARINGS VOLUMES RELEASED

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has released the following committee hearings volumes during the last 2 weeks:

BILL, VOLUME, DATE RELEASED

Labor-HEW, part 2, Food and Drug Administration and health items, Friday, June 12.

Public Works-AEC, part 4, AEC, TVA and Panama Canal, Tuesday, June 16.

Public Works-AEC, part 5, Members of Congress and other public witnesses, Thursday, June 18.

Labor-HEW, part 3, NIH, Monday, June 22.

Labor-HEW, part 5, Department of Labor, Thursday, June 25.

Defense, part 5, procurement, Monday, June 29.

Labor-HEW, part 4, Social Security, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department management and special institutions, Tuesday, June 30.

No additional hearings are expected to be released during the balance of this week, however, the week of July 6, the committee expects to release Labor-HEW, part 6—related agencies—and Labor-HEW, part 7—outside witnesses.

When released, copies are available to Members and others at the committee room, H–218, Capitol Building, extension 2771, as long as the supply lasts.

HALF-TRUTHS CAN MAKE US SLAVES

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, during the early part of June, many members of the administration journeyed to college campuses across the Nation to act as commencement speakers.

In my own State of Georgia, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology Myron Tribus addressed the graduating class of the Georgia Institute of Technology. The Assistant Secretary discussed the half-truths which are now readily accepted as truth by some of the more well-educated of our populace; and he stressed the need for all citizens to do their homework before actively taking sides on a particular issue.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting Assistant Secretary Tribus' address into the RECORD.

THE HALF-TRUTHS CAN MAKE US SLAVES

(Address by Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology Myron Tribus, Prepared for Delivery at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga., June 13, 1970)

Men and women of the class of 1970: I stand before you suddenly filled with the awful knowledge that all that stands between you and your diplomas—is this speech. This should be a day of celebration for you and your families. Out of respect for your desire to "get on with it," I shall make these remarks as brief as I properly can.

Your joy, and mine is tempered by the realization that on this day you are to be graduated into a time of stress. I assure you it is not entirely a novel experience. Yours is not the first generation to be assailed by doubts and misgivings—nor, I fear, will it be the last. How sure can you be, as you take up the responsibility for supporting and running this society that 25 years after your graduation day you will be able to say to the next generation, as yet unborn, that you, at last, did what we and our ancestors failed to do? How confident can you now be that by then you will pass on to them an America free of problems and strife, in a world crowned with peace and plenty? How sure are you now that you can really do it?

In a very real sense, over the next few decades, the American experiment faces its greatest challenge since the Civil War. The fate not only of this nation and this people but that of the whole human species may well hang in the balance. That is the issue I want to talk to you about today.

Our challenge, yours and mine, is to prove to ourselves and to our species that we can develop the means and the will to meet the problems of our environment, our cities, our social inequities. We must show ourselves and the world that we are on the right road, that this American experiment really leads somewhere.

At this point the wisest observer must grant that the outcome is in doubt. But *this* observer is an optimist. And I am an optimist because I know that we have the resources to meet these problems. I see emerging signs that we may be ready to apply our resources in a constructive manner. Before you give up on this experiment, think about the problems other nations face. It is easier to wrestle with America's problems than to try to cope with those of any other nation of the world with more than 50 million people.

To understand fully our problems and our opportunities requires a firm historical perspective. I spoke of the American experiment. Remember that it is precisely that—an experiment in self-government; in self-control. On the time scale that applies to nations and to civilizations this country has just taken the first steps on a journey of a thousand miles. We have just begun the overt search for the philosophies and the social and political machinery which will operate a vast, urban, technological society with a maximum of freedom for individual action and initiative. Despite the unrest it causes, surely we are better off for knowing what our problems are and for wanting to solve them. Surely we are better off for arguing not *whether* to solve them but differing only on *how*. Unless the historical facts are understood, we are likely to miss the whole point of our dilemma and waste our substance on the immaterial and the irrelevant.

Viewed as a finished product, America is a flagrant example of deceptive packaging, poor quality control, or worse. Viewed as a beginning, it is the best that man has ever done. Properly continued, skillfully modified, vigorously pursued, this start could lead to the establishment of a system for handling the new phenomenon of an urban technological society without sacrificing individual freedom. If we cannot find the path to the society we must be judged irrelevant—an interesting but not viable aberration in the historical development of social organization. The alternative to success is the beehive society.

This country and this world are irretrievably urban and technological. The facts of life, expressed in population explosive terms make it so. And while many of our problems arise from that fact, so do all possible solutions. Without the high technology we have developed and shared with the world, there would be no hope. Without the automobile, the electric power generating plants, the furnaces and the smokestacks, and all the other blights of modern civilization there would be far less air pollution. But without the technology which made them possible, population pressures alone would turn mankind into vast mindless vermin scouring the face of a dying planet vainly searching for scraps of sustenance. Such an ending would release new excesses in man's inhumanity to man on a scale unprecedented.

It remains, perversely enough, that our salvation lies in the same powers that gave us our problems. We have a system which does certain wonderful things. As engineers we can appreciate the fact that the system needs modification, needs to be redesigned in certain respects. But we cannot hope to cope with the problems we have already or to try to build any kind of livable society for the future without the vast political, economic, and technical apparatus we have already constructed.

Are our atmosphere and water supplies polluted? Only in the technical capabilities of American industry and Government do we find the magnitude of talents and resources necessary to clean them up. Is the economy of the center cities depleted and distorted? Only the combined economic power of the U.S. business community and the Government can possibly exert enough leverage to make progress. Are there adjustments needed in the distribution of the fruits of our rich economy? Only that economy, intact, as a whole, has the power to remedy those inequities.

What I'm saying here is simply "adjustment si, revolution no." This is not an apocalyptic message. Western thought stops short of saying that revolution is never necessary. But I cannot help but believe that in this period of history, in the United States, the revolutionaries must be judged irrelevant on their own terms. They seek to destroy the only apparatus which has the power to put right the injustices which they, rightly in some cases and wrongly in others, perceive. McLuhan has said that once an activity ceases to be essential to existence it becomes an art form. Perhaps this is what has happened with revolution in this country in this day.

The real question, then, is can we make progress within the system? Is the system as unyielding and as hopeless as the prophets of despair would claim? I cannot help but think not. Who would have believed just a couple of years ago that we would have an administration publicly committed to disengaging this country from the Vietnam war? Most of the actions that the Nixon administration is taking in withdrawing American troops from Vietnam would have satisfied the dearest hopes of the veriest dove in the early Vietnam debates. This aspect of the Administration's policy is the direct result of the public debate, stated in rational and peaceful terms, which has occurred on this momentous issue. We saw in the last election President Nixon's "Silent Majority" and Senator McCarthy's "Children's Crusade" make their voices heard on a national scale. We see now new coalitions of University administrators and students in direct political action. The involvement of the young in the political process, if it means communications between generations *that have done their homework*, will strengthen the American system.

There's an important phrase there—"have done their homework." If the communications are to be meaningful, both sides must not be swayed by slogans. The charge that the system is totally unresponsive does not stand scrutiny. In the last few years the establishment has moved to eliminate cyclamates, DDT, phosphates in detergents, lead in gasoline. All of these moves were very expensive to some people. But the system has responded. The response came *after* public support became manifest. There are some who would have had earlier response, but we are all blessed with 20-20 hindsight. And we fail to credit the system for the successes it had in the things that never happened, the unsafe drugs and products that never got to the market.

I raise these examples to make clear that the "establishment" in this country is not isolated, aloof, all powerful, and destructive of the wishes of any minority. Today's minority, today's dissenters, in an era of change may well become tomorrow's administration. But if America is to survive its trial, they must get there via debate and persuasion—persuasion through logic and morality, not the brick and the stick. Minority opinions can have great impact on the national direction and will.

Of course change always comes too quickly for some and too slowly for others. The gap between these two factions is always narrowed by communication, always widened by violence—whether it be physical violence or the psychological violence of namecalling. The tragedy at Kent State was preceded by intemperate and uncompromising statements and actions by persons on both sides of the controversy. When violence is unleashed someone is bound to get hurt.

Violence and namecalling are terribly inadequate substitutes for thinking, and thinking is man's prime survival weapon. Other creatures are stronger, are swifter, breed even more rapidly. But man can reason. When he does not reason, he gives up his only adaptive advantage and threatens his survival. It is still true that those whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.

So we must reason together and communicate with each other not just for peace of mind or for domestic tranquillity but for our very survival.

Can we engineer a future in which the ideals American philosophy so nobly states are at last reality? Surely not by destroying. But by changing, adjusting, building, yes, most certainly. We have at our disposal the largest, best balanced, and most versatile scientific, technical, and economic resource the world has ever seen. I think the events I have cited show definitely that we can be the masters of that system rather than its servants. Remember that our system is a free market economy. To survive it must remain also a free market in ideas. We are a *noisy, unquiet,* creative people. Our directions and our actions are hammered out in conference, in public debate, in the press—in short in the freest idea market in the world. Our greatest hazard is any force which tends to distort or suppress that free market.

The expression of an idea in violent terms or in terms of actual violence demeans the value and the permanent impact of that idea on the National consciousness. The Vietnam Moratorium of last Fall was peaceful and therefore drastically changed public opinion of the protesters' motives and of the worth of their cause, virtually overnight. I have not the slightest doubt that a violent demonstration would have had precisely the opposite effect on public opinion and on our Nation's troubled course in Southeast Asia.

Next to actual and rhetorical violence perhaps the most destructive distortion in the free market of ideas is the half-truth. From Biblical times we have known that the truth would make us free. But we must go all the way, for the half-truth can make us slaves. In a state like Hitler's Germany, where my generation saw how subtle half-truths were deliberately used to manipulate public opinion, there was a clear cut situation. Ours is more subtle and more vexing because the half-truths are often, perhaps most often, not deliberate.

Largely our half-truths originate with good men who are simply unable to handle the complexity of information they get to make judgments and decisions. And just as often one of his fellow experts will contradict him using another half-truth.

Let's look at some interesting half-truths. I am sure you all have heard about the lack of space in American colleges. Our higher educational system, it is said, simply cannot absorb all the qualified applicants. Penn State, for example, expects to turn away 10,000 qualified applicants this year. On the other hand, a survey by the New England Board of Higher Educational reports 11,700 vacancies going begging at 123 colleges in that area.

One shortage of capacity then, is a half-truth, only part of the story. The actual situation is a complex of the geographical distribution of facilities, the level of tuition and other costs at various institutions, and the American predilection for name and status in picking a school, among other factors.

But you see that the bald statement "We haven't enough facilities for higher education" is a half-truth which could send us scurrying on a building boom which would be at best a very incomplete response to the real problem: We need our construction resources elsewhere. Our colleges are already desperately overextended financially.

The men of science and technology are not immune to the half-truth. Recently two noted scientists began a rather noisy campaign to have permissible limits on radiation dosages cut to one-tenth of their present values. I cannot help but be shocked by the flagrant use of half-truths in their attack on the existing standards. The whole issue revolves around the fact that while a large dose of anything can indeed harm you, there are lower levels which the body does easily tolerate. You can get sick on an overdose of vinegar.

The moral values here are certainly sound. If we could surely prevent one case of leukemia through these actions, the actions would be justified. But there is no good evidence that the postulated relationship between body damage at high and low doses of radiation does indeed exist.

Another classic example of completing half-truths is the current investigation of the herbicide 2–4–5–T. It has been banned from many uses because there is suspicion that it may cause genetic damage. There is no conclusive experimental evidence yet that it actually does so. The issue is clouded because early tests used contaminated material. The case is particularly interesting because it is undoubtedly true that some of the chemical's troubles, or at the very least its public image, stem from the fact that it is used as a defoliant in Viet Nam. In other words, its emotional connotations may be the most serious burden the chemical carries, in the absence of conclusive scientific evidence against it.

It is precisely here in these undefined areas, where insufficient data exist, that we face a grave danger—the danger that we will lurch from one extreme action to another down the road to oblivion. We have enough demons to exorcise from our way of life without making up some more. Here, as in the political and social field, the overstated case and the oversimplified solution are grave dangers. They waste our substance and energy on actions which at best are ineffectual and at worst make the situation worse.

As I say, so many of these half-truths are not really deliberate deception. One of our main problems is that the time scale of the decisions we must make and the actions we must take is extremely short and the volume of information we must take into account is staggering. Yet we must make more sure than ever that our decisions are sound. We are trying to undo a myriad of troubles which stem from unwise choices of men who went before—in many cases of men who still are with us and still participating in the decision making process.

Herein lies another challenge. We need to consider a new public risk taking—there are no safe paths left for us.

Can we, a nation of over 200 million people, learn to make wise decisions under ever accelerating emergencies within the limits of the powers given to men? Or is the final fac-

tor in our extinction as a species to be that we built a sociology, an economy, and a technology which, in sum, was too complex for human intelligence to handle?

Again I am an optimist. Again we must look to hopeful signs, rather than on-the-shelf remedies. One major thing our American experiment seems to need is real-time on-line data handling. (That's modern lingo to say we now need to know many things in a hurry.) Our computer technology, the most advanced in the world, enables us to handle a much greater volume of data on a specific problem than ever before. Systems analysis promises to enable us to keep track of more factors in making decisions. Computer simultation is beginning to let us evaluate possible solutions in days rather than years. And if it turns out that the solution being modelled makes the problem worse, all we have to do is discard the idea, not live with the pollution or other mess than a real trial would have left us. I know we can devise the means to harness this revolutionary tool, the computer, in the service of man and can keep it from being our master.

So overall I must be optimistic that we can make our experiment work because of several factors. I see the emergence, just the beginning, of a decision-making technology commensurate with the vast amount of information we must handle and the complex decisions we must make. I see possibilities that new methods, still being worked on, can absorb these sophisticated techniques and use them to advantage. I see good evidence that our system can recognize and react to the opinions and desires of minorities and I must believe that in a free idea market, good ideas tend to drive out bad. I see evidence that the young people are becoming aware of the possibilities built into our free idea market. I see that many of them realize that they can make their voices heard through established procedures, whether that means demonstrations or conventional political activity, for they are both established in the American dynamic.

All of these things are hopeful signs to me. The complacency of the fifties and the unrest of the sixties is about to give way to genuine creative action in the seventies. We are about to break through the barrier between rhetoric and creative progress. We have been through periods of apathy, non-violent demonstration, and wanton destruction. We see that the first precludes progress, the second creates progress, and the last destroys progress. We are just learning how to make our fellow citizens concerned in a creative way. I fervently hope that we are learning to arouse emotions strong enough that we think and perhaps even act without arousing emotions so strong that we lose the capacity to reason.

Has the age of the social and political revival meeting ended? Reports of last month's peace rally in Washington all noted a certain lack of fervor in the crowd. That very astute reporter Richard Starnes speculated that "there is growing disenchantment among the young with the hackneyed oratory of revolution." I think, and I certainly hope, that this is true. Because we need the young to help us operate this wonder machine which we have created but can't quite work. We need their fresh insights.

Those who have stood apart too long across the so-called generation gap have much to say to each other. Those who have gone before can tell you of battles for human rights and dignity already fought and won. You can tell of what has been missed; and about the battles we can yet fight together. From our experience—both in success and failure—we can provide a fair road map to show you how to get from where we have gotten you to where you want to go.

In this two way discourse, I urge you not to regard what you have recently learned as a new discovery for the human race. I assure you that you did not *discover* sex and love. Strange as it may seem, your parents were there before you.

But we must none of us see the world in half-truths. All of the young people who protest are not unwashed bolsheviks acting out aggressions against their parents; all businessmen are not totally mechanical, profit-oriented exploiters. It is also time to allow for the fact that not all who would revolt really know what they are doing and that those in charge may be in the same boat. We shall get nowhere until we all accept the humility appropriate to those who know they have a great deal yet to learn.

We must look at our society together, clearly and realistically as we can, not in parts and in half-truths, not separately. My generation sees a massive and flexible system to produce physical necessities and luxuries—the summit, so far, of man's historic struggle to free himself from physical toil in order to shift his energies to higher considerations; you see the humanity left by the wayside of progress and the dehumanizing force of efficiency. As Louis Banks of *Fortune* magazine so beautifully put it, "We saw the gross national product, they saw the gross national byproduct—of mindless urbanization, environmental pollution, and the whole wasteland of public dereliction."

Many of you here today have a great opportunity because you are engineers. As engineers, you will work at the interface where technology is applied to public problems. You can bring the visions of your generation directly to bear on the conditions and directions of the world. You can bring human values into the operation of the system and turn its vast potentialities to benefit mankind.

But we cannot work on half-truths and we cannot work without communication. It is now up to your generation to see that there is communication between the human values and the technological process. And it is up to you to keep open the channels to the past; to use what is usable, to cast out what is untrue and what is unkind.

The modern poet Pound once wrote to another poet, across a gulf of time far longer than that which separates you and me:

"I make a pact with you, Walt Whitman—
I have detested you long enough.
I come to you as a grown child
Who has had a pig-headed father;
I am old enough now to make friends.
It was you that broke the new wood,
Now is a time for carving.
We have one sap and one root—
Let there be commerce between us."

Let this be your mission. If we are to survive, we must have a continuity with the past. If we are to survive, we must have the new values and directions which youth can give us. Without that synthesis, the beginning we have made will die, and with it what a president in an even more troubled time called "the last, best hope of mankind."

The generations before you have fashioned a wondrous tool to serve the good of man. They have not perfected it and have not always used it well. It passes now to you. We truly admit that we have not always lived up to the values we loudly proclaimed. Now it's your turn. Can you—will you do better? I hope so, for the future is yours.

THERE IS A "SILENT MAJORITY" IN AMERICA'S HEARTLAND

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we hear often of the "silent majority." Many ask if there really is such a group and if there is, what are the thoughts, feelings, and opinions of its members.

What better place to find out than in the heartland of America, Nebraska. ABC News selected Hall County in my home State of Nebraska and its county seat, Grand Island, which is located near the geographical center of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the answers to these questions will be shown on most ABC stations tonight at 10:30 p.m., e.d.t., on a program entitled "Straight From the Heartland."

I would urge each of my colleagues to peruse the following material and view the program tonight. The "silent majority" does exist and it is the heart of this great Nation of ours. It follows:

SURVEY PROBES ATTITUDES, OPINIONS OF THE "HEARTLAND" ON ABC NEWS "NOW" SERIES PROGRAM

Is there a "silent majority" in America's heartland? If there is, what are the thoughts, feelings and opinions of its members?

To find out, ABC News commissioned Audits and Surveys, Inc. of New York City to survey a typical Middle Western small city to find those answers, and results of that poll are featured on the ABC News "Now" series program, "Straight From the Heartland," Monday night.

After extensive research, ABC News selected Hall County, Nebraska and its principal city, Grand Island, as the focus for the survey and the program. Located near the geographical center of the United States, Grand Island is largely agrarian and, in many ways, a typical heartland community. With a population of approximately 30,000, it is a medium-to-small city. Its economy shows a mixture of farming, business, industry and the professions. Grand Island is heavily Republican and in 1968 gave Richard Nixon a two-to-one margin of victory over Hubert Humphrey. Perhaps most important, Grand Island is far enough from any urban center that its outlook is not dominated by big city problems.

Is there a "silent majority"? The ABC News poll shows that 87% of the people in Grand Island and surrounding Hall County believe there is, and that 68% feel they are part of that group.

The survey included 501 persons, all over the age of 18 and drawn from a wide range of economic, social, political and educational backgrounds.

Having established that a "silent majority" exists for Hall County residents, the Audits and Surveys poll set out to uncover what general attitudes are prevalent in this heartland region.

A majority of the people polled, 62%, believe that the nation's most serious problem is the war in Vietnam. Respondents listed race problems, the state of the economy and student unrest as other major problems facing the nation.

On the topic of the Southeast Asian war, 85% of those polled said that President Nixon is working for a just and honest peace in Vietnam. A healthy majority, 76%, believe the Paris peace talks are a waste of time. By contrast, 78% feel the United Nations is an active and important force in working for world peace.

President Nixon received high marks on his overall performance as chief executive. On a scale from zero to ten, with ten the highest rating, the President's average score was 7.0. He averaged a 6.4 for his attempts to end the Vietnam war.

In a similar rating, Vice President Agnew was rated 6.1 overall.

The President and the Vice President received the most overall support from persons 65 and older and least support from the 25–34 age group.

Turning to the economy, the poll disclosed that 45% of the respondents feel that government spending is most responsible for rising prices, whereas 28% blame labor unions.

On the question of race relations, 76% say they do not believe blacks are second class citizens. However, 83% of all persons questioned are opposed to busing as a means of achieving integration.

The ABC News poll results show that drugs—as they are elsewhere—are a concern to Grand Island. More than 90% of those questioned feel drug use, including the smoking of marijuana, is an urgent national problem, and that the problem affects communities of all sizes.

On the subject of abortion a majority, 57%, said they believe this decision should be left to the woman and her doctor.

What of the much-discussed "generation gap"? Poll results on "Straight From the Heartland" indicate that 60% of the population agree it exists. Only 57% of those persons between 35 and 65 see a generation gap, while 8 of 10 in the 18-24 age group claim that it is real.

Organized religion is an important factor in Grand Island, which has a church enrollment of almost 27,000 of its 30,000 residents. Forty-six per cent of those adults responding to the poll questions on youth felt that the majority of youth in this country are religious and God-fearing. On the other hand, 72% of the people said they feel religion and God are not emphasized enough today in this country.

An interesting result gleaned from the poll is that almost no heartland residents felt concern over the "threat of Communism" as a serious problem in American life. One point nine per cent of the total sample cited the "threat of Communism" as a serious problem, and only 1.7% of those persons who said they are part of the "silent majority" expressed this concern.

"Straight From the Heartland" is written and produced by Sid Darion and directed by Howard Enders. ABC News correspondent is Don Farmer. The program is sponsored by the Philco-Ford Corporation. Executive producer for the ABC News "Now" series is Arthur Holch.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION EROSION CONTROLS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the rapid building growth of Howard, Montgomery, and Anne Arundel Counties in my neighboring Eighth Congressional District of Maryland provide a variety of examples of the Government's challenges in fighting soil erosion and the sedimentation of our streams and rivers. In April I toured I-95 highway construction sites in Howard County with James D. Braman, Assistant Secretary of Transportation for the Environment. Here we observed a number of instances of needless soil erosion resulting from highway construction where, apparently, long-held Federal guidelines for soil erosion control had not been followed.

Following our field inspection, the Federal Highway Administration announced in early June that all future building contracts would contain specific regulations to assure effective control of water pollution resulting from soil erosion on highway construction projects. I have asked the Department of Transportation that we have absolute assurance that these contract terms be such as to guarantee there will be no recurrence of the disastrous erosion and stream pollution conditions such as occurred in Howard County.

Delegate Harry W. Lerch, of the Maryland General Assembly, Committee on Environmental Matters, has contributed valuable research as well as legislative attention to these pressing problems of soil erosion and the siltation of our streams and rivers. Mr. Lerch over an extended period of time has demonstrated a particular concern with the pollution problems related to the I-95 construction. Following his most recent survey to determine the authorities' compliance with enforcement commitments, he wrote the Federal Highway Administrator concerning his observations and the need for prompt action by Federal authorities. Mr. Lerch's dedicated interest and work on behalf of many environmental matters in the State of Maryland as well as in regard to this specific project are reflected in the following newspaper account from the Washington Sunday Star of June 7, 1970.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, June 7, 1970]

OFFICIALS PROTESTING I-95 SITE EROSION DESPITE NEW CODE

(By Martha Angle)

Spurred by complaints that soil runoff from construction of Interstate Route 95 is polluting Maryland streams, the Department of Transportation has announced new erosion regulations for future federal highway projects.

But the new nationwide regulations have not satisfied two Montgomery County lawmakers who remain concerned about the lack of adequate sediment controls on the existing I-95 project in Howard and Prince Georges Counties.

Rep. Gilbert Gude, R-Md., and Del. Harry W. Lerch, a Republican member of Maryland's House of Delegates, are both pressing federal officials to clean up the mess they say exists along the I-95 route.

Lerch first began calling attention to pollution caused by the highway project two years ago when he was working on a state law establishing sediment controls for the Patuxent River watershed.

VIEWED FROM AIR

A licensed pilot, he flew over the I-95 construction site in the winter of 1968 and said he was shocked to find miles of exposed earth and massive soil runoffs into the Patuxent and its tributaries.

After checking with the Federal Highway Administration, the Montgomery delegate was assured that federal authorities had strict soil conservation practices which would be enforced along I-95.

But last week, Lerch revisited the construction site, photographing many of the same spots he had checked two years ago. The lawmaker said he found little sign of improved conservation efforts.

"In many places, I could find no evidence at all of any structures to prevent the eroded dirt from flowing into the Patuxent," Lerch said in a letter to Francis Turner, federal highway administrator.

DEEP GULLIES REPORTED

In many areas, Lerch charged, he found gullies deep enough to stand in, culverts filled almost to the top with silt, and streams clogged by sediment.

The new federal regulations, announced by Turner last week, call for all future road-building contracts to contain specific regulations to assure effective control of water pollution resulting from soil erosion along highway projects.

Turner said that in the past, "these pollution controls were voluntary in nature."

"Henceforth," the federal official said, "they will be spelled out in the contracts with provisions made for separate payment for the control work provided."

Lerch, in his letter to Turner, noted that federal authorities just last March flatly assured a state legislature committee in Annapolis that they already had enforceable soil conservation standards for highway projects.

Gude last month took Asst. Secretary of Transportation James D. Braman on a tour of the I-95 project in Howard County, and then discussed the erosion problem with Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe.

Last Friday, Gude wrote to Volpe and mentioned that he had previously seen instructional memoranda that included strict requirements for soil erosion control practices.

The GOP congressman, who represents Maryland's Eighth District, said it was nice to learn the federal highway administration was adopting new conservation policies but implied that he had heard that before.

"I would like to know specifically the enforcement steps to be taken" to carry out the policies announced by Turner, Gude said.

EDITORIAL ON GULF OF TONKIN RESOLUTION

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, increasingly the electronic media is venturing into the field of editorial comment. With the immediacy of radio and television and the emphasis that can be given through the spoken word, this editorial expression can be highly effective.

Radio station KEX in Portland, Oreg., last week delivered an editorial on the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution by the Senate.

I was not privileged to hear this comment, delivered by Fulton Wilkins, general manager, but I did receive a written copy which I would like to share with my colleagues.

EDITORIAL BY KEX RADIO

The subject of this editorial is serious in substance but KEX takes a rather sporting approach to reflect our views. It has to do with an amendment submitted by Senator Robert Dole of Kansas to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of 1964. A resolution by the legislative branch of our government to permit then President Johnson to conduct military operations in Vietnam. At this point the resolution serves no real purpose other than just another rally symbol for the far left to protest.

There is a peculiar baseball game going on in the United States Senate these days. Senator William Fulbright, as captain, and his famous dove team have taken the field to catch or short-stop every attempt by the administration team trying to score an end to the war in Vietnam.

Who's the player at bat this inning? It's

rookie Senator Robert Dole of Kansas just up from the minor leagues—considered by the more experienced players in the field as a hot dog—an easy out. The last time up, he struck out on the Cooper-Church curve ball. However, the next batter, Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia, hit that same pitch pretty good—his wording to allow the President to protect our troops in battle was a solid line drive.

Now Senator Fulbright's team over shifts—far to the left—when playing against right-handed hitters. So, the skipper in the administration dugout signaled for Senator Dole to hit to the opposite field. With a motion to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution, Dole came through with a stinging drive over first base that rolled all the way to the bamboo fence—completely taking the scrambling fielders by surprise. They are now gathered around the pitcher's mound frantically planning how to play the next batter.

This long extra inning ballgame is not won by a long shot, but that hit in the clutch by Senator Dole may very well earn for him—Rookie of the Year honors. Also, this timely blow can somewhat circumvent further division of the people in the stands by political opportunists.

One does not have to be a baseball fan to recognize that Senator Fulbright and his followers have been out maneuvered on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Fulbright is furious that his plans for lengthy, spectacular debate are now rather trifling—as well they should be. Such negative efforts in the senate have done more to divide the country than anything else.

Senator Fulbright angrily chastised Senator Dole as a bush leaguer with no standing, but failed in his efforts to block the amendment so that he could have his fling before the press. That ballgame has been rained out.

KEX submits that any pitcher who throws curve balls knows to duck. The ball comes back much harder and straighter than it is thrown.

THE ADMINISTRATION CRIME PROGRAM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Republican Memo of June 25 lists 13 bills which the Department of Justice considers to comprise its crime package. This brief compilation presents a handy reference as to the administration's attack on the all-important problem of crime in the United States.

I insert at this point in the RECORD information on the above-mentioned legislation:

THE ADMINISTRATION CRIME PROGRAM

(NOTE.—The study that follows was prepared by the Staff of the Senate Republican Policy Committee and is not designed as a Republican Policy Statement, but for the presentation of facts and views relevant to this subject.)

STATUS OF 13 ADMINISTRATION CRIME BILLS IN THE SENATE

1. S. 30, Organized Crime Control Act of 1969

Substance: S. 30 embodies the recommendations of the President's Crime Commission, the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws, and other groups. The bill consists of 10 titles, including the Administration's general immunity (Title II) and syndicated gambling (Title VIII) proposals. Other titles establish special grand juries authorized to sit for extended terms in large cities (Title I); codify existing Federal civil contempt law designed to deal with recalcitrant witnesses in grand jury and court proceedings (Title III); create a new false declaration provision eliminating outmoded evidentiary restrictions in present perjury prosecutions (Title IV); authorize the Attorney General to protect and maintain Federal or State organized crime witnesses and their families (Title V); authorize the taking of depositions in criminal cases (Title VI); regulate litigation seeking to suppress the infiltration of legitimate organizations by racketeers or the proceeds of racketeering activities, where interstate or foreign commerce is affected (Title IX); and provide for increased sentence—up to 30 years—for dangerous adult special offenders—the recidivist, the professional offender, and the organized crime leader (Title X).

Current Status: S. 30 was reported in the Senate December 18, 1969, (Judiciary Committee Report 91–617). Supported by the President in his statement to Congress on Organized Crime, April 23, 1969. S. 30 passed the Senate January 23, 1970. Referred to House Judiciary Committee January 26, 1970, the bill is pending in House Committee.

2. S. 1461, Criminal Justice Act Amendments: Defendant Representation

Substance: This bill would increase the scope of legal services available to defendants in Federal criminal cases who are financially unable to obtain counsel by authorizing (1) appointment of counsel for persons charged with probation violation or seeking relief by way of habeas corpus or under 28 U.S.C. 2255 (claim of right to release by attack on sentence on constitutional grounds), and for detailed material witnesses; (2) establishment in districts with over 200 annual appointments of counsel for indigent defendants of a public defender or publicly financed private defender office; (3) increase of the hourly rates of compensation and the maximum fees allowable for court appointed attorneys and for persons rendering expert service.

Current Status: Associate Deputy Attorney General Santarelli testified on S. 1461 before Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, June 24, 1969. Reported in Senate April 23, 1970, (Judiciary Committee Report 91–790), S. 1461 passed the Senate April 30, 1970. Referred to House Judiciary Committee May 4, 1970, the bill is pending as H.R. 9856 before House Judiciary Committee.

3. S. 1624, Wagering Tax Amendments

Substance: This proposal is designed to close the gap created by Supreme Court decisions holding that some of the provisions of the wagering tax statutes violate the Fifth Amendment's privilege against self-incrimination. It would prohibit the use against the taxpayer of information obtained through his compliance with the wagering tax laws, while at the same time it would increase the coverage and amount of the taxes, and would authorize a grant of immunity to essential witnesses.

Current Status: President Nixon supported S. 1624 (and H.R. 322) in his statement to Congress on Organized Crime of April 23, 1969. Hearings were held on the bill by the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, June, 1969; and it is now pending in full Judiciary Committee. Majority Leader Mansfield said on June 13, 1970, at page 19587 of the *Congressional Record*, "S. 1623. [sic], wagering tax amendments: Definite Senate passage this session." The bill has been referred back to Senate Finance Committee because of tax provision. No House action.

4. S. 2073, Protection of minors from obscene mail

Substance: Recommended by the President and submitted to the Congress by the Attorney General, this legislation would prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the distribution of matter harmful to minors, or advertisements for such matter, to anyone under the age of 18. Violators to this prohibition would be subject to up to 5 years imprisonment, a $50,000 fine, or both, for a first offense. Subsequent offenses could result in double those penalties.

The material to which this bill applies is defined as that which depicts, describes or represents nudity, sexual conduct or sado-masochistic behavior and which is "offensive to prevailing standards in the adult community concerning what is suitable material for minors," and which is "substantially without redeeming social value for minors."

Current Status: S. 2073, favorably reported by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, is pending in the full Judiciary committee. The House version (H.R. 11031) is pending in the House Judiciary Committee. Hearings on H.R. 11031 were held before Subcommittee 3 of the House Judiciary Committee in September, 1969.

5. S. 2074, Transportation of salacious advertising

Substance: This legislation, recommended by the President and submitted to the Congress by the Attorney General, would prohibit the interstate mailing or distribution of advertisements or solicitations designed and intended to appeal to a prurient interest in sex. Violators could incur penalties of up to 5 years imprisonment, or a $50,000 fine, or both, for a first offense. Subsequent offenses could result in double those penalties.

Current Status: S. 2074, favorably reported by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, is pending in the Judiciary Committee. Introduced in the House as H.R. 11032, it is now pending before the House Judiciary Committee. Hearings were held in September, 1969.

6. S. 2600, Bail Reform Act amendments

Substance: This proposal would authorize judges to: (1) preventively detain, after a hearing, a person charged with certain categories of crimes who, the judge found, would pose a danger to another person or the community if released, regardless of the conditions of release imposed; (2) consider danger to the community, as well as ability to put up bail money, in setting release conditions; (3) revoke the release of a person who violates the conditions of his release, (the person could also be charged with contempt of court for violation of conditions); (4) impose an additional prison sentence on persons convicted of committing a crime while on bail; and (5) impose a minimum sentence for bailjumping.

Current Status: Introduced in the Senate as S. 2600, this bill is pending before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In the House the bill is pending as H.R. 12806 before the House Judiciary Committee. Attorney General Mitchell testified before Subcommittee 4 on October 21, 1969; on November 20, 1969, the subcommittee recessed hearings subject to call.

7. S. 3246, The controlled dangerous substances act

Substance: This 103 page bill to amend the narcotic, depressant, stimulant, and hallucinogenic drug laws would substantially revise existing drug legislation, changing the constitutional basis of control over dangerous drugs from the taxing power to the commerce power. The act would establish four general schedules of dangerous drugs

graduated according to accepted medical value and potential for abuse. Within limitations, the Attorney General would be authorized to move substances from one schedule to another and to schedule drugs not previously listed. The proposal also contains a new and comprehensive penalty structure designed to provide courts with both the guidance and the flexibility which will enable them to handle offenders on an individual basis. The bill would also increase the scope of the warrant and arrest authority of agents of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and would establish controls over drug dealers and manufacturers through the use of appropriate licensing and record keeping procedures.

Current Status: The Attorney General submitted a bill on July 15, 1969, the day after the President sent a message to Congress on the drug problem. S. 2637 was referred to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. The Attorney General and Director, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, testified before this Subcommittee on September 15, 1969. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Director testified further on October 20, 1969. After considerable staff work the full Senate Judiciary Committee reported *a clean bill, S. 3246,* on December 16, 1969, (Judiciary Report 91-613). With minor floor amendments the bill passed the Senate by unanimous vote on January 28, 1970.

In the House the proposal was divided into two parts and introduced as H.R. 13742 (narcotics only) and H.R. 13743 (dangerous drugs only). The bills were referred to the House Committees on Ways and Means and Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has conducted hearings and, although S. 3246 has not yet formally been referred to a Committee, it has in effect been considered by this Subcommittee during hearings. The Director, BNDD testified before the Subcommittee on February 3 and March 3, 1970. H.R. 13742 and H.R. 13743 are pending in committee.

8. S. 3261, Community Treatment Centers for Parolees and Released Offenders

Substance: This proposal, which was supported by the President in his message on Reform of the Federal Corrections System of November 13, 1969, would amend the law to authorize the Federal courts and the U.S. Board of Parole to require, as a condition of probation or parole, an offender to reside in or participate in the program of a residential community treatment center, provided adequate facilities are available.

Current Status: S. 3261 and H.R. 2175 are pending in Senate and House Judiciary Committees (Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures and Subcommittee #5, respectively).

9. S. 3541, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Amendments

Substance: Amends Title I (LEAA) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 in several respects, including permitting LEAA to waive the requirement that a designated percentage of a grant be allocated to local governments in certain circumstances; strengthening the provisions relating to grants for educational purposes; authorizing specific grants of discretionary funds, within prescribed limitations, without matching State funds; authorizing specific grants for the construction, acquisition or improvement of State and local correctional facilities and the improvement of correctional programs and practices; and authorizing open-ended appropriations for fiscal year 1971 and beyond.

Current Status: Submitted to the Congress on February 17, 1970, S. 3541 was introduced in the House as H.R. 15947. House bill pending with Subcommittee #5, House Judiciary Committee. Hearings concluded March 19, 1970. S. 3541 pending in Senate Judiciary Committee.

10. S. 3563, Nontestimonial Identification of Suspects

Substance: Permits a judicial officer to issue an order that suspects appear and give non-testimonial evidence, such as fingerprints, palm prints, footprints, measurements, blood specimens, urine specimens, saliva samples, hair samples, handwriting exemplars, voice samples, photographs, and lineups. The order would be issued *only* if the judicial officer finds that there is probable cause to believe a crime has been committed, that there are reasonable grounds, not amounting to probable cause to arrest, to suspect that the person named or described in the affidavit committed the crime, and that the results of specific nontestimonial identification procedures will be of material aid in determining whether the person committed the crime.

Current Status: Submitted to Congress March 3, 1970, S. 3563 was introduced in the House as H.R. 16354. Pending in the Senate and House Judiciary Committees. Assistant Attorney General Wilson testified before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures on March 10, 1970.

11. S. 3564, Youth Corrections Act hearing examiners

Substance: This proposal is designed to improve the administration of the Youth Corrections Act by the U.S. Board of Parole (Youth Corrections Division) by authorizing hearing examiners, rather than members of the Board as now required, to conduct interviews with youth offenders.

Current Status: Submitted to the Congress on March 9, 1970, S. 3564 was introduced in the House as H.R. 16353. S. 3564 was reported in the Senate May 13, 1970, (Judiciary Committee Report 91-866), and passed the Senate on May 15, 1970. H.R. 16353 was referred to the House Judiciary Committee on May 18, 1970, and is pending with subcommittee No. 2.

12. S. 3583, prohibition of certain convicted persons from holding union office

Substance: Section 504 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 504) enumerates offenses which disqualify a person from holding union office. Presently persons convicted of robbery, bribery, extortion, embezzlement, grand larceny, burglary, arson, violation of narcotics laws, murder, rape, assault with intent to kill, assault which inflicts grievous bodily injury, or a violation of certain subchapters (reporting and trusteeships) of the Act, or conspiracy to commit any such crimes, are prohibited from serving as an officer, director, agent, or employee (except clerical) of any labor organization or as a labor relations consultant for five years after conviction or the end of imprisonment.

This proposal would amend Section 504 by increasing the number of offenses included in the statute. Disqualification would be extended to cover kidnapping, perjury, forgery, and any violation of the Act, unlawful payments under the Taft-Hartley Act, any violation of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, mail fraud, obstruction of justice which constitutes a felony, certain kickback, fraud, and racketeering provisions of Title 18 U.S.C., and any attempts to commit any of these crimes. Convictions before as well as after enactment would be included.

Current Status: Submitted to Congress March 11, 1970, S. 3583 was introduced in the House as H.R. 16407. Pending in Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and House Committee on Education and Labor (Special Subcommittee on Labor).

13. 3650, anti-bombing legislation

Substance: This legislation, which was recommended by the President and submitted to Congress by the Attorney General, is designed to strengthen the Federal criminal laws concerning the illegal use, transportation and possession of explosives. It would amend 18 U.S.C. 837 in several respects, including expansion of the definition of "explosives" to include incendiary devices, increases in the maximum penalties for illegal transportation of explosives, and adds new definitions of federal crimes: malicious bombing of federal premises, unauthorized possession of explosives in federal buildings, malicious bombing of property used by persons engaged in commerce or for activities in commerce, possession of explosives knowing that they will be transported or used illegally.

Current Status: Submitted to Congress March 25, 1970, S. 3650 was introduced in the House as H.R. 16699 and 16700. Pending in Senate and House Judiciary Committees.

FOR BLACK INITIATIVE IN CRIME CONTROL

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in response to several of my colleagues who have specified an interest in the speech I delivered to the National Council of Negro Women in St. Louis, November 24, 1969, I insert the text of my remarks as follows:

FOR BLACK INITIATIVE IN CRIME CONTROL

Since my election to Congress—I have had numerous occasions to speak on various topics. I have addressed myself to the injustice of poverty, the indignity of hunger, the tragedy of racism. I have talked about the immorality of war, the nature of student protest, and the importance of placing a priority on education. I have spoken of the rights of man and the rights of citizenship.

Tonight, I want to call your attention to a vital issue—an issue just as important as any I have spoken of before. I want to talk about crime and how it effects people—particularly black people.

My choice of this topic should not be confused with the racially motivated appeals for law and order—nor should it be mistaken as a thirteenth-hour decision to join the hysterical demands for instituting a police state in America.

I am disturbed by the seeming implication—that unless you ride under the "Law and Order" banner of the George Wallaces—or unless you ride shotgun for Attorney General Mitchell—you must be against law and order—therefore, for crime. The Right Wing and the Reactionaries of politics have tried to make it seem that they are the only people who can make the streets safe for Americans. But they should have no monopoly on the issue of crime and certainly, they have not advanced any reasonable solutions. I have grown very weary of the racial overtones which accompany these loud clamors for law and order.

It is time to face squarely the issue of crime—and if possible—it is time to set the record straight. The subject is highly controversial. Because the way the slogan—law and order—has been used, statements are easily misunderstood and often—distorted. Regardless of the risk, the problem of crime

in American must be discussed. The discussion, however, must be directed toward comprehensive solutions to the problem—and not used to increase the fears and hates of Americans for other Americans.

Far too many politicians use crime as a political issue. The campaigns of Yorty, Procacinno, Wallace, Reagan, Agnew, and Nixon—serve as prime examples. They don't talk about murder, they don't talk about robbers, or extortionists, or fraud artists. They talk about some vague "crime which evades clear description. They talk in glowing generalities about a "return to law and order"—to domestic tranquillity—about the threat of this permissive society. And though it is never spelled out—it is made quite clear that social reform has no place in the kind of social order they seek. When claims are made about their ability to "control crime"—it usually means they will maintain the status quo—economically, socially, and politically. Too often, what is meant is that they will stifle dissent and rid this land of the notions of justice for all. The slogan "law and order"—couched in racists jargon—shouted from a lily white political bandwagon, carries many frightening implications.

Implied in these demands for law and order—is total police repression of attempts by blacks and other minorities to effectuate social change. Many campaign speeches sound like this:

"The streets of our country are in turmoil. The Universities 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 from without. We need law and order. Yes, without law and order, our nation cannot survive. Elect us and we shall restore law and order."

If those phrases sound familiar and ring of something you've heard before—let me assure you, Nixon didn't say that—Yorty didn't say it—not George Wallace either. They said things very much like that—but this paragraph came from a campaign speech made over thirty years ago—1932—Hamburg, Germany. The spokesman—a man we all came to know—Adolph Hitler.

"Law and order" become dirty words when they are used by people who mean to repress rightful redress of grievances by citizens. law and order leaves a bad taste—when it so clearly and intentionally ignores the consideration of justice.

We must condition ourselves to make the distinction between persons who use the issue of crime for its emotional value and appeal—and those who address themselves to the issue of crime as a necessary discussion of a national problem which must be resolved. The ability of the American people to make that distinction will determine the degree of success in any battle against crime. Moreover, the ability of the American people to make that distinction—will inhibit or contribute to the progress of the United States on other Domestic fronts.

We must realize when we are being whipped into a state of frenzy by persons who appeal solely to our emotions. We must demand that we be given the reasonable basis for action—not just an emotional basis for reaction. We must turn away from those who insult our intelligence and turn to leaders who respect our ability to reason.

Crime is a dramatic issue—an emotional one—because nobody likes to live in fear for his life or his property. Crime is a pertinent issue—because Americans are fearful of the rising crime rates throughout our cities. The spokesmen who have dwelled upon the topic of crime and the slogan of law and order—are also at issue—because they have clouded the issue of crime itself. A discussion of crime—and an analysis of the political discussions of crime which have taken the spotlight—both are in order. Both matters are valid issues of National concern.

We have observed the dangers of this issue—that crime will be subjected more to the emotions than to the processes of logical reasoning. I am hopeful that two years of emotional, political and racial "jawboning" of the issue of crime has been enough. It would seem that we should have reached the point in this society—that we are ready to sit down and objectively look at the crime problem. The "yelling about crime"—hasn't solved the problem, so we should be anxious to move into productive discussions.

I think this community is ready for the facts about crime and for the truth about rising crime rates. It is only in such a climate that we will find a long term solution.

Crime—as defined by Webster—"is an act committed in violation of a law prohibiting it or omitted in violation of a law ordering it."

In these terms, it is simple to explain why black Americans have been uniquely concerned with the prosecution of criminals and the maintenance of law and order. We have been concerned because it is the government which decides, based on the disposition of its leadership, what laws shall be enforced and what laws shall be conveniently ignored.

We have been concerned because enforcement of the fair housing law, the school desegregation orders, the equal employment opportunity laws—have not been pursued by officials of the government—while the anti-riot laws, only recently enacted—have captured the energies and imaginations of the law enforcers.

We have always been concerned with the hypocrisy of the law. We know from experience that laws can be used—on the one hand—to serve the convenience of the white population—while on the other hand—to prolong the grievances of the black population.

Black people have no quarrel with the need for protecting the population from criminals. It is the black population who suffers most from street crimes. We are the ones who are victimized. Our brothers and sisters and children are the ones being shot down on the streets—our homes are being burglarized—our wives and sisters raped—our business robbed and bombed.

White middle class citizens raving about crime are not subjected to the brutalizing, agonizing confrontation of raw naked crime. Black people and poor people are the victims of the real crime in the streets—our sympathies are with the victims—not with the criminals. We know the fears, the death, the tragedy.

Nevertheless—we are not about to panic and resort to joining the hysterical ranks of those who call for a total repression for all blacks. We acknowledge and point out that the black communities, are the prime victims of the crime—but we also acknowledge and hasten to point out lest we forget—that we would also be the victims of the suppression which would result if so-called crime controllers get sufficient support to carry out their plans.

We cannot continue to be the prime victims of crime and also the people who have the least protection from criminals.

For this reason, our silence on the issue of crime can no longer be tolerated. Even at the threat of being misunderstood and misconstrued—black leaders throughout the nation, must speak out, must seek the protection of their communities from criminals and from those who seek to condemn the total communities for these crimes.

Black people must find a way to show our concern for crime, our own fear of criminals—but in a way that is not interpreted as a step toward condoning a police state. We are afraid of murderers and rapists. We are similarly afraid of the idea that given enough police, the government can keep down crime. We seek protection so that our places of business and our homes—will not lay victim to the constant treat of robbery—but we do not want to see the day when every house and every place of business requires a posted policeman.

If crime is to be curbed, we must examine the problem, the causes as well as the effects and the symptoms—and attack it at its roots. I do not agree with those who feel every crime can be sociologically explained away. I do, however, know that current crime statistics and characteristics reveal a definite relationship between certain environments—and the potential for their producing criminals.

We can spend billions on crime control—and if we spend nothing on crime prevention—the problem will continue to reproduce itself.

The final report of the Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training—issued last month, October 1969—points out that there are striking differences among criminal offenders as individuals. Among the offender population are the psychologically disturbed, alcoholics, drug addicts, seniles, and persons who have been caught up in the cycles of poverty and unemployment.

The report points out a deep concern for the fact that many of today's offenders are—"young, unschooled, and without significant work experience, furthermore many come from the urban slums, and a large number are members of minority groups that suffer economic and social deprivation."

The report gives us another serious reason for becoming concerned with the total crime problem. According to the Commission, current trends in American society indicate who is likely to be among the crime population in the future. Once again, it boils down to the conditions of the inner cities, the prevalance of minority groups, the growth of ghetto conditions and slums.

These facts put black leadership in a peculiar position. We know who the present and potential law offenders are. We know the conditions which breed them. We know that in the last analysis—at the root of crime—are the desperate conditions of the ghetto; the inadequate, overcrowded, ill-equipped schools, the unbearable, dilapidated overcrowded housing; the unemployment; the broken families—all the vicious forces that push the poor urban black outside of society. Blacks have been pushed out of society by the continued loss of hope, loss of faith—loss of any real chance to become a part of the society.

So, we can admit, as commissions and committees and advisory councils have reported, time and time again—the majority of the people in the crime cycle come from the social levels of the poor and the disadvantaged.

But there are glaring misconceptions about crime in black communities. Too many believe that drug addiction and poverty are the causes of most of the crime. Drug addicts usually commit passive crimes such as shoplifting and prostitution. The poor who are desperately trying to make ends meet commit very few crimes. But the crimes against persons—muggings, robberies, bombings are usually committed by hardened criminals who should be dealt with as such. They have created a reign of terror and a climate of fear which has changed our lives.

We no longer take strolls at night, shop at night, and we are afraid to use the city parks. We are victims of fear—we are victims of crime—and, by and large we have not been the ones to raise our voices in protest.

The people screaming "law and order" are the suburbanites detached from the realities of the crime problem by superhighways. I am amazed—by the notions held by many white people—that the ghettos are safe if your skin is black. This is the greatest indication that those who profess to know the most about crime—know the least about the bare essentials of fact.

If you are poor, your chances of being robbed, mugged, raped or beaten up—are far greater than if you are middle-class. If you are black, your chances of being robbed or mugged is three times greater than if you are white. But if you are both black and poor, you know what fear of crime really means—and you know what I mean when I say we must end crime in our streets.

To effectively deal with crime, we must first deal with the racist concepts which determine the "modus operand," in our communities. We must deal with elected officials who think that crimes committed in the black community—by black people—so long as it does not seriously affect white people—is unimportant. Even if they do not openly condone it—they quietly permit it.

This an obstacle which must be overcome if we are to be on our way to reducing the crime rate. When our elected officials, our police commissioners, our circuit attorneys, our judges and our juries—treat crime by black people against black people—as seriously as they treat crime which affects the white middle-income communities—then we will be on the road to a solution.

Murder in this country is a very serious crime—but in black communities, the taking of a black person's life by another black person takes on the aura of a carnival or a circus.

In St. Louis—which is typical of most big cities—over 175 black people have been killed on the streets this year by black people. If past experience dictates what will happen to 175 blacks who committed these crimes, 40 will never be arrested or found, and of the 135 who may be arrested, 100 will be released without prosecution. Not one will be convicted and sentenced to death. Not one will be convicted or sentenced to life in prison for taking the life of another black human being. Very few of them will be convicted or sentenced to terms of 20 years. Most of those convicted will serve short sentences in the workhouse and return to kill again.

But any man (black or white) who kills a white man under the same set of circumstances—will be tried and convicted by the daily press even before he goes to trial. As long as murder in the white community is considered a serious crime—and murder in the black community is considered a way of life—crimes of violence will continue to increase.

It is a prime example of the tragic dual standard which permeates this nation. It is a sad commentary on the quality of justice and law enforcement in our country.

The responsibility for changing this system must be shared by black leaders who must rise up in indignation at any further toleration of the degredation of black life.

The choice for black leaders seems clear. We must speak out to change the system so that the law respects and protects us as it is meant. We must work for social and economic reform to eradicate the conditions which breed crime in the slums—or we must silently try to cope with black hoods who attempt to intimidate and rob our communities without interference of the law.

We must not let the apathy of the power structure toward the needs and problems of black communities afflict us too. It is for those of us who know both the causes and the effects of crime—to take the lead in effecting reasonable programs for reasonable solutions to the total problem of crime.

In my view, the following recommendations must be made a part of any reasonable and comprehensive solution to crime.

First, and of prime importance—the conditions of the inner city, the slums which breed crime must be eliminated. Until this nation gives priority to these tragic domestic ills, the probability for curbing the wave of crime will be remote.

Second, the law must be applied equally—across the board—to black and white. Equal rights and equal protection under the law must be assured—and crime, wherever it occurs and whomever it strikes, must be considered a matter for law enforcement and prosecution.

Third, the quality of law enforcement agencies and personnel must be uplifted. The attitudes of law enforcement personnel must be free of prejudice. Citizens must play an important role in crime detection—but will do so only if they have no reason to mistrust the motives of the police.

Fourth, the total thrust of penal institutions must be revised. The job is to rehabilitate—not isolate—criminals. The quality of prison personnel, the conditions of prisons, the methods of prisons—must be drastically improved.

Fifth, our court system must be expanded, and a more equitable system for the appointment of judges must be established.

Finally, crime, its prevention and control, is a community problem. All forces and resources of individual communities must be brought to bear on crime. Community efforts must be aimed at community institutions—so they can be made responsive to community problems. Poverty and deprivation must be driven out—with the realization that the conditions for breeding crime are being eradicated.

Let it not be said that Clay has finally given in to the cry for law and order. Let it be said that Clay is concerned about crime. Let me say that we can spend $5 billion on crime control—and unless we spend an equal amount on crime prevention—the crime wave will not be broken. While we cannot tolerate the climate of fear which clouds each of our existences—neither can we tolerate the inhuman conditions and existences which breed inhuman acts. We want protection from the criminals who threaten our lives and our properties today—but we also insist upon saving the lives of those who may be prompted to destroy our lives and our properties tomorrow. We must prevent crime—protect citizens from crime—and rehabilitate those who resort to crime. This is the responsibility of a society which has outgrown the narrow-minded view of suppressing rather than facing up to a problem.

The real day-to-day concern of the ordinary American citizen for his safety at home and in the streets of his community must be faced honestly and intently by all of us who speak as representatives of the people.

We who speak for a return to the democratic and humanistic program that once made this country a beacon of hope—cannot afford to allow the false prophets of Nixon's "New Order" confuse and mislead the American people on this pressing issue.

So, I have stated in this speech. There are indeed specific corrective steps to be taken to insure better safety and tranquility for our cities and streets. I intend to use my office and voice to bring these changes into being.

We will not allow this national campaign of political hate-mongering and racial division to obscure the legitimate role of the police and penal institutions in a democratic society.

For too long, we have allowed those political opportunists in all parties to obscure this issue with hysteria and prejudice. Make no mistake, if we fail to advance concerete actions on this matter, we shall continue to see the issue dishonestly exploited by every backward element on the political scene.

Let me finally make clear to you today—the urgency and difficulty of the task I have outlined. We must isolate and expose the emotional and racist programs—that simply more police and bigger jails to deal with the increase of crime in our cities is the answer.

We cannot fool ourselves with the illusion that all we have to do is institute the kind of short-range steps of crime prevention and rehabilitation that I have stressed today. For urgent and necessary though these steps be, they will fail unless our country turns around and rededicates itself to the social vision and human priorities of John Kennedy and Martin Luther King. As Dr. King pointedly expressed it—"we can never have safe streets in a sick society."

Unless we become more concerned with the level of our vision than with the level of our voices—we shall fail as people. Without also reordering our national priorities from war to peace, from international intervention to domestic investment—we shall fail as a nation.

MELTING POT OF THE WORLD

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States had traditionally been termed "the meltingpot of the modern world." Until very recently, many writers and social analysts portrayed America as a huge cauldron into which the varied elements existing in the world were poured. It was thought that from these diverse ingredients would emerge a uniform product, and this product would be recognized as the archtypical American. Some analysts went so far as to say that such homogeneity should exist in this country. Uniformity was thus made an underlying goal of American life.

A closer examination of the actual facts of American evolution points to a very different type of progression and a very different end product. The cookie-cutter image of the American, the uniform product emerging from the cauldron of American life has little relation to empirical fact.

Instead, we find it difficult, if not impossible, to discover who personifies the term "American." This country has been populated and has grown because millions of people from all parts of the globe have made their way to these shores. This movement began in the 17th century and has continued, although at a slower pace, into the second half of the 20th. In its own way, each of these groups has contributed to the fabric of American life. Yet in that process, each has retained some characteristics that set it apart from the others.

But, just as one group of observers made the mistake of postulating a fictitious homogeneity, on the other side, we find an opposite and equally dangerous extreme. We find that there are individuals who have tried to exaggerate the differences among groups in our population. By creating stereotyped images of these groups, too often these images bear little relation to the fact.

By their actions, both sides have established dangerous precedents—dangerous because they threaten to interfere with the fullest exercise of individual freedom. The observance of Italian Unity Day provides the opportunity to correct both these precedents. Unity Day is a means by which the Italians in our population can demonstrate their own unity and, at the same time, their diversity.

Italians do have a common heritage that can be traced to a mother country.

We all know that pride in a particular heritage is one means by which an individual can establish his relationship with a larger group. In the process, the individual establishes his own identity.

The feeling of a common heritage among Italians is strong. But, Italian Unity Day has been organized to do much more than merely reaffirm that heritage. The Italian community has grouped to protest what has become all too prevalent in our present society—the portrayal of many among their numbers in terms that defame, ridicule, and unjustly stereotype.

I have been outspoken against the use of terms and images that demean any group, and am in strong support of the principles behind Italian Unity Day. I was one of the original cosponsors of legislation in the House of Representatives urging the cessation of the production and the distribution of films and programs which defame and stereotype any ethnic group. In addition, this legislation urges that such standards be rigorously enforced by the motion picture and broadcasting industry.

In recent years, the demeaning of individuals of Italian descent has become too common and too persistent for members of the Italian community to remain silent any longer. For a democracy to persist and to grow, there must be harmony among the various groups that comprise it. The pursuit of life and liberty cannot continue if individuals are subject to harassment on any level. If the rights of one portion of the larger society are abridged, the rights of all are endangered.

Italian Unity Day must then serve as an important lesson for this Nation. This country has no room for bigotry and for stereotypes, and this day seeks to illustrate that in very clear terms. The Italian people are a people proud of their heritage, but they are a diverse people, too. They have made contributions in all areas of American life.

Let Italian Unity Day be the day that Americans recognize the contributions of the Italian community and disavow once and for all, the use of stereotypes to describe the Italians or any group within our population. The goal of Italian Unity Day will then be realized: The promotion of greater understanding of each individual for his fellow man.

THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS LAUDS CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY FOR HIS POSITION ON IMPORT QUOTAS ON TEXTILES

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the Chicago Daily News editorialized on the subject of import quotas. In stating its adverse opinion with respect to the imposition of such quotas, the News singled out for commendation the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

As all of us in the House are aware, our friend and colleague, PAUL FINDLEY, is extremely knowledgeable on the subject of international trade. His expertise, as again evidenced in his comments before the committee, certainly is deserving of the attention given it by the News.

I happen to share his views. Thus, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD for the information of the House:

IMPORTS AND LIVING COSTS

The drive to clamp import quotas on foreign textiles and shoes is gathering momentum in Congress, despite the dangers such a move poses both to U.S. trade abroad and to the fight against inflation at home. Restrictions on such imports would result in retaliatory measures against American exports, especially agricultural products, and increase the average family's outlay for clothing as well as shoes.

The National Retail Merchant's Assn. estimates that the textile quotas—for which the powerful cotton industry is lobbying hard—would cause a 15- to 25-percent boost in the price of many clothing items. Considering the fact that rising clothing prices are even now a major factor in the spiraling cost of living, the prospect of further increases warrants public concern. All the more so since Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), as front man for the cotton growers, manufacturers and labor unions, contends he has a commitment that President Nixon will not veto the textile import quota bill if it passes Congress.

Protectionism is gaining strength in Congress. In the House, 306 of 435 members have petitioned the President to try to prevail on the exporting countries to impose shoe quotas "voluntarily."

One of the few voices raised loudly and clearly against the quota drives is that of Rep. Paul Findley, a Republican from central Illinois' 20th District. Though the biggest industry in his home town of Pittsfield is a shoe manufacturing plant, he has courageously opposed the shoe quotas as well as the textile quotas. But as Congress' leading champion of legislation to limit farm subsidies to $20,000, he has concentrated on the cotton interests spearheading the textile campaign.

In a recent appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee, Findley pointed out that taxpayers already are paying nearly $1 billion a year to subsidize cotton farmers—many of them to the tune of $100,000 or more a year. Textile import quotas would be a further subsidy not only for the cotton grower but for the entire cotton manufacturing industry—for which the taxpayer would pay a second time in the form of higher clothing prices. It makes no sense, as Findley said, to further coddle an "industry totally dependent upon government checks, government handouts and political favors."

If indeed Thurmond has a commitment from the President not to veto the textile import quota measure—presumably as part of the so-called Southern strategy—then we would remind Mr. Nixon of his trade message to Congress in 1969. In it he said that import quotas arbitrarily imposed would in the "longer term . . . add to domestic inflation and jeopardize our competitiveness in world markets at the very time when tougher competition throughout the world requires us to improve our competitive capabilities in every way possible."

The nation's current economic situation makes the warning even more pertinent now than it was then.

"MAN AND HIS CONSCIENCE"

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, our system of military service currently personified in the draft has often, in the past, been unresponsive to the heterogeneous makeup of our society. Surely we laud those who respond to their country's needs by offering their services to the Armed Forces; but all too often we have looked with scorn at those who are, because of deep moral convictions, unable to offer that type of service to their country. Conscientious objection to war or a war has always been found within our society, but our involvement in Indochina has caused an increasing number of young men to refuse participation in that conflict. I do not judge, nor would I attempt to do so, the sincerity of those convictions; but I do believe that we must be certain that the system of hearing these personal objections is sufficiently attuned to hear what these young men are saying and to fairly evaluate their personal objections. The pressures which these men are subjected to—either fighting for their nation or enduring the possible scorn of their peers by refusing to so fight—lend additional support to the concept of an all-volunteer army.

I submit for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the June 19, Wall Street Journal which speaks to this problem:

MAN AND HIS CONSCIENCE

From the earliest days of the Republic the Government has wrestled with the problem of conscientious objection, and a new Supreme Court ruling isn't going to make the task any easier.

In the Revolution and the Civil War, the official approach was simple enough. Anyone conscientiously opposed to military service could avoid it if he provided a substitute or paid a commutation fee.

During World War I, the law merely exempted conscientious objectors from combatant service—that is, from bearing arms. Many served in medical units, as ambulance drivers or in other ways, often displaying conspicuous courage. Several thousand, however, refused any type of military service and many were confined in army camps.

By World War II Congress had come around to exempting from all military service those who were opposed to participation in war "by reason of religious training and belief." During the war, the courts held that religious beliefs included the humanitarian beliefs of atheists.

In 1948 the Universal Military Training and Service Act said religious training and belief is an "individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code."

That was certainly vague, and the Supreme Court in 1965 made it vaguer. In a case involving a man who adhered to the teachings of no organized religion, the court held that a nonreligious individual could qualify as a conscientious objector if his beliefs were as important in his life as a religious person's belief in God.

Now the Supreme Court has broadened that test. Henceforth a nonreligious person can be adjudged a conscientious objector if his views are "deeply held" and are not based solely on "considerations of policy, pragmatism or expediency."

Fortunately the publicity that attends such court cases tends to inflate the apparent size of the local draft boards' problem. At the moment there are only 36,500 conscientious objectors compared with nearly 900,000 men classified 1-A. But the chances for injustice cannot be lightly dismissed merely because they affect "only" tens of thousands.

The overwhelming majority of local draft boards are manned by individuals who are themselves highly conscientious, and by now many board members can draw on what they've learned from years of experience. Yet the ability to peer into a man's conscience, and unerringly read what's found there, is not something that can be acquired merely with the passage of time.

It's understandable that some boards have tried to ease their task by giving special weight to a man's religious affiliation. A Catholic, for instance, is likely to have more difficulty than a Quaker in proving his conscientious objection. But many Catholics are sincere conscientious objectors and many Quakers have served regular tours of duty in the armed forces.

There simply is no easy guide—especially now, when a draft registrant merely must prove that his views are "deeply held." Though the Selective Service System has supplied local boards with new rules to follow, the chances for error obviously have multiplied.

What's the way out? Well, long-range, the difficulty of identifying conscientious objectors surely is further argument for movement toward a volunteer army, for service in any conflicts other than major wars. The problems involved are imposing, but so are those of maintaining reasonable fairness in a permanent draft.

Shorter range, Selective Service should overhaul its appeals process to assure speedy hearings for draft registrants who question the findings of local boards. If a draft system must be maintained for any length of time, there is much to be said for setting up professionally staffed boards and making sure that they adhere to consistent standards—or at least assigning professional aides to present boards.

In our society the life of a conscientious objector is anything but smooth. There seems no justification for making matters rougher by requiring local boards to practice amateur psychology.

MORE PARKLANDS NEEDED

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, because of our growing population, it has become very clear to all Members of this body that it is imperative that additional parklands be made available for the use of our citizens. In responding to that need, President Nixon transmitted a special message to the Congress requesting that the Secretary of the Interior be granted authority to transfer excess Federal land at a 100-percent discount to local units of government which want to use such land for parks and recreation sites.

Since there is a great need for additional parklands in many of our metropolitan areas and the Federal Government does own many acres of land in these areas, this would seem to be an ideal solution. Furthermore, with the strained financial situation of many units of local government, it would be very difficult for them to pay the true market value of this land. For this reason, the Secretary needs to be empowered to transfer the land free of charge.

Recently, the Subcommittee on Government Activities of the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on this proposal. At that time, I submitted a statement in support of that legislation.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting a copy of this statement into the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE BEN BLACKBURN, OF GEORGIA, CONCERNING PARKLANDS

Mr. Chairman, as you and the members of your Subcommittee know, I am one of the sponsors of H.R. 16038 which, with several identical bills concerning parklands, was the subject of hearings held on June 9, 1970.

I wish to go on record as strongly urging the enactment of this proposed legislation.

This is a time when not only the members of the Congress, but all citizens of our country have been made acutely aware of the serious problems of an environmental nature with which we are faced, and on which prompt action is of extreme importance.

In a message to the Congress on February 10, 1970, President Nixon outlined a 37-point program on environmental quality, comprised of 14 administrative measures and 23 legislative proposals. He included all of these among five major categories—water pollution control, air pollution control, solid waste management, parklands and public recreation, and organizing for action. The inclusion of parklands and public recreation among these major categories is significant. I share the President's feeling that action in this area is of equal importance to our nation as is action with respect to the other categories, although public attention may appear to have been focused more sharply by the news media on the more dramatic problems of air and water pollution.

President Nixon spoke of recreation facilities as "among the most vital of our public resources", and expressed concern at the rapidity with which land suitable for such purposes is being swallowed up for other use. Greater priority must be given now to the acquisition and preservation of the lands that are and will be needed for public recreational use.

H.R. 16038 would do this by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey surplus real property to State and local governments for park and recreational purposes at a public benefit discount of up to 100%. This aspect of the bill is of primary importance to me, in view of my concern that municipalities with very limited sources of revenue be included in the segments of the American public to benefit from the use of surplus lands for park and recreational purposes.

The bill also affords the means for increasing the amounts available from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for use in acquiring additional lands for park and recreational purposes. It also would make possible the relocation of Government installations from property which could better be used for other purposes, such as park and recreation.

Of the many bills which have been introduced concerning this aspect of the environmental problem, only H.R. 16038 and its identical bills contain all of the elements needed to effectuate the comprehensive program placed before us by President Nixon. I earnestly urge that the Subcommittee act favorably on the bill.

WE, TOO, HATED GOING TO WAR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Suburban Life, of La Grange Park, Ill., a community newspaper serving the western suburbs of Cook County, carries a column in which its staff members comment on current events. It was with great interest that I noted the article on Thursday, June 25, by Karl Bell, discussing the draft and question of individual conscientious objectors.

Mr. Bell is a World War II veteran, as am I, and I feel that the conclusions he reached in his article are logical and feel that the article as a whole was a objective summary of a very complex subject:

WE, TOO, HATED GOING TO WAR

(By Karl Bell)

Through its decision this month broadening the reasons for which conscientious objectors may not be drafted into service, the U.S. Supreme Court has created a problem rife with irony.

In effect, the ruling says that for moral as well as religious reasons citizens have the right to refuse to bear arms.

Strangely, the decision comes at a time when many feel that gun control laws, if enacted, will be an encroachment on their constitutional right to bear arms.

Curiously, while the constitution provides the latter right, it does not make it mandatory for conscription-eligible men to defend their country, nor does it state, as I recall, that none may be penalized for refusing to bear arms for their country.

Just how draft boards will interpret the court's decision will be particularly interesting to watch, especially for those of us who have been in combat service.

Needless to say, one wonders exactly how draft boards will determine the sincerity of a draftee claiming to be a conscientious objector.

How can the board know, for instance, whether the objections are politically motivated? Unfortunately, conscriptees can't pick and choose the kind of war they'd fight in. Or can they?

Something of a parallel exists in civilian life to policemen and security guards who may be called upon, any day, to kill in civilian life to protect themselves and the rights of others, but the similarity stops there, for unlike servicemen, they may quit the job any time they please.

In view of the growing protest movement against the Vietnam war, it would have been more timely and applicable for the court to have ruled on the constitutionality of American troops being sent into combat on foreign soil without the consent of Congress, rather than their being committed on the say-so of a President.

As I recollect, the Constitution clearly states that although the President shall have the power to declare war, it may be done only with the consent of Congress.

However, since the court's decision concerns itself not with that court to have ruled on the conscientious objectors, the cart has been placed before the horse.

What person with humane feeling in his heart toward his fellow men does not abhor the thought and ugliness of war?

Sincere protest on religious grounds to bear arms for one's country is one thing. Protesting on personal and moral grounds makes most of us conscientious objectors.

Most of us would have preferred to stay home during World War II, but being diet-conscious we went simply because we didn't want to have our children eating sukiyaki for breakfast, spaghetti for lunch, and sauerkraut for supper.

I'm sure, however, that the "new generation" under their "Peace" banners will be as concerned about this country's welfare as we were.

BILL SCOTT REPORTS

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a copy of our monthly report to the people of the Eighth District of Virginia in the RECORD at this point for the information of the Members:

BILL SCOTT REPORTS

Fourth of July Gala: "Honor America Day" will be celebrated throughout the country on July 4 in an effort to rekindle the American spirit of patriotism and represent the high ideals that made America great. Preparations are being made for a giant gala in Washington featuring national celebrities. Detailed information should be available through the news media.

Metropolitan police and firemen: Congress has passed a measure increasing the pay of District of Columbia teachers, policemen and firemen. Of special interest to policemen and firemen who work in Washington and commute from Fairfax and adjacent areas is a provision permitting them to reside within a radius of 25 miles from the Capitol and for the chief of their department to waive even this restriction on residence in individual cases. You may remember that a number of policemen living in our district expressed concern regarding the residence restriction and, in order to assist, I introduced the measure which was incorporated in the bill just passed. Enactment should help reduce the difficulty of both the police and fire departments in reaching their full authorized strength.

Health benefits bill: Our Post Office and Civil Service Committee has favorably reported a measure providing for an equal sharing of the cost of federal employee health benefits. The bill is now before the Rules Committee and has not been considered by the House. In the event the measure is passed, it will provide for a 50–50 sharing ratio of costs beginning next January. As you know, hospital and doctors bills have increased over the years and the percentage paid by the government has gradually decreased. This bill, if enacted, would continue the 50–50 sharing ratio automatically in the future regardless of changes in cost.

Public works: A few days ago the House passed the annual Public Works Appropriation bill which, among other things, increased funds available to states for sewage treatment plants from $800 million this year to $1 billion for the fiscal year beginning July 1. This should help reduce pollution to our rivers. However, some practical method must be devised in the future to dispose of sewage without putting it in our streams.

The same measure appropriates $600,000 for the continuation of preconstruction planning of the Salem Church Dam on the Rappahannock River between Stafford and Spotsylvania Counties. This multi-purpose dam, when completed in the next 8 to 10 years, should permit a large number of persons to enjoy the recreational value of the river, provide essential water for counties in the urban corridor below Fairfax, eliminate the dangers of flooding in the Fredericksburg area and provide for well regulated stream flow and salinity control in the lower area of the river.

Additional Federal judges: The Congress has passed and the President signed a measure providing for 54 additional federal judges, including one for the Eastern District of Virginia. The President, however, has not yet submitted the name of anyone to fill this new position.

Preliminary census report: The Bureau of the Census has informally given us the following estimates of the population of various counties in the 8th district. These figures are subject to revision before they become official. Hanover County is not included because even the preliminary count has not been completed. However, an estimate last year by the Bureau of Population Studies of the University of Virginia put the population of Hanover County at 37,055. The preliminary census figures are as follows:

Caroline	13,528
Charles City	6,120
Essex	6,916
Fairfax (8th dist. portion)	218,298
Fauquier	26,040
Goochland	9,904
King and Queen	5,358
King George	7,959
King William	7,467
Lancaster	8,635
Loudoun	39,943
Louisa	13,507
New Kent	5,054
Northumberland	8,880
Prince William	109,616
Richmond	6,464
Spotsylvania	15,904
Stafford	22,921
Westmoreland	12,367
Frederick	14,389

A part-time assistant: Peter S. Sitnik is a part-time staff member. He retired some years ago from the grocery business in the Mt. Vernon area of Fairfax County and came to the office shortly after it was opened with the understanding that he would not work full time. His principal responsibility deals with the newsletter and keeping our mailing list up-to-date, although he helps with numerous other activities in the office. After we have composed the monthly report, Pete takes a copy, reproduces it and delivers the entire issue for mailing, seldom going home until the job is completed. A graduate of American University, he is a past President of the Mt. Vernon Kiwanis Club and is understandably proud of his 15 years perfect attendance. Much of his spare time is spent boating in the Northern Neck, but he is always willing to do any task assigned and is agreeable to working long hours when necessary. A combat infantry veteran, Pete was with American troops which met the Russians at the Elbe River in 1945. I rely heavily on this "part-time" assistant.

Social security: A 5% general increase in old age, survivor and disability benefits are provided for in a bill passed by the House. In order to pay for these additional costs and to meet an actuarial deficit in the hospital insurance program, Social Security contributions for both employer and employee would be 5.2 percent for 1971–74. This would be applied to the first $9000 of an employee's wages instead of the present $7800. Maximum payment by the employer and employee would thus be $468 each in 1971. The Social Security Trust Fund would continue to be sound financially. The bill also provides for future automatic increases in benefits and in the taxable wage base in the years ahead as living costs increase. Of course, Congress is always in the dilemma of wanting to give adequate benefits to beneficiaries without unduly increasing the burden upon those who presently contribute to the fund.

Prince William land exchange: The District of Columbia Government owns approximately 350 acres of land in the Featherstone area of Prince William which the county has been attempting to acquire for a sewage treatment plant, recreational purposes and joint use as a sanitary landfill. At the request of the County Board, a measure to authorize the conveyance was introduced in both Houses of Congress. After extensive hearings and negotiations, a House District Subcommittee has favorably reported a measure apparently satisfactory to all parties authorizing transfer of a 37-acre portion of the tract to the county for a sewage treatment plant, transfer of marshland to the Deparment of the Interior for cash or other land, and conveyance of the remainder at market value. As a part of the package, the county agreed to issue a permit for the D.C. Government to operate a landfill in another part of the county. It is expected that the measure will be acted upon in the House after the July 4 recess.

Golden Eagle program: Many constituents have expressed concern about discontinuance of the Golden Eagle annual permit to visit federal parks and camp grounds. There was some question about reducing the annual fee from $10 to $7 per year and one Member even voted against the bill because he felt that everyone should be permitted to visit National Parks free. However, the measure as passed by the House provides for annual passes to visit National Parks anywhere in the country at the rate of $10 per car per year.

Wage Board bill: The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has favorably reported a bill to modernize the Wage Board Pay System which affects over 800,000 federal employees in crafts and trades. The Committee bill provides: 1. For the establishment of an advisory policy committee, representing both the government and employee organizations. 2. Five wage steps in lieu of the present three steps. 3. A uniform permium pay increase of 7½% for 2nd shift workers and 10% for 3rd shift workers. 4. For bringing nonappropriated fund employees working on government installations under the Wage System. There may be a fight on the House floor regarding the 4th provision because many believe only government employees should be included in the Federal Wage Board Employees Pay System.

Veterans legislation: Two bills benefiting service-connected veterans passed the House on June 15, 1970. H.R. 17958 increases compensation and liberalizes certain requirements for determining eligibility of widows for benefits. This bill provides an approximate 10% raise in compensation and would enable widows who have remarried to revert to their earlier eligibility when a second marriage is ended by divorce or death. It also establishes as service-connected certain diseases relating to nutrition incurred by prisoners of war Provisions of the House bill were added to a previously passed Senate bill and referred back to the Senate. H.R. 370 increases the grant from $1,600 to $2,500 for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for veterans of World War II and Korea who have certain disabilities such as loss of one or both hands, one or both feet or who are blind to a prescribed degree. Both measures require further action in the Senate.

Something to ponder: "With modern medicine doing so well at increasing our life expectancy, we'd better be careful about adding to the national debt—we might have to pay it off ourselves, instead of passing it on."

DRUNK DRIVERS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. ROBISON, Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of including in the RECORD the first in a series of articles found in the Christian Science Monitor on drunk drivers. As the headline to that article points out:

Over the past 5 years, the Vietnam war has killed more than 27,000 Americans. During the same period, drunk drivers on U.S. highways have killed 134,000 people. Yet society remains strangely apathetic to this tragic waste.

Estimates are that one in every 50–90 automobiles you see on the highway is being driven by a drunk driver. One of every two fatal highway accidents is attributable to drinking. This trend must be reversed.

Mr. Speaker, not only do we need more stringent laws in this area and not only do we need more stringent enforcement of those laws which do exist, but most of all the American public—each one of us—must recognize the drinking driver for what he is: a potential killer.

I call the following article, written by Guy Halverson, to the attention of my colleagues and urge them to consider the means that must be employed to solve this problem:

STOP THE DRUNK DRIVER: BEHIND THE WHEEL OF EVERY 50TH CAR

(Over the past 5 years, the Vietnam war has killed more than 27,000 Americans. During the same period, drunk drivers on U.S. highways have killed 134,000 people. Yet society remains strangely apathetic to this tragic waste)

(By Guy Halverson)

CHICAGO.—"It's a bad one, all right," the grim-faced police officer next to me said as we skidded to a stop alongside the twisted automobile. Chunks of jagged broken glass lay scattered across the freeway. "Ten to one says liquor was a factor," he shrugged. "It usually is."

Ahead of us were the red and white flashing lights of squad cars and a fire truck, the vehicles silhouetted starkly against the dark Albuquerque sky. Four men in white, carrying a large respirator, were jumping from an ambulance and running down a steep hillside.

For Deputy Chief M. Fred Johnson, a 35-year veteran of the Albuquerque, N.M., Police Department, as well as this reporter, what we witnessed that chill April night at the interchange of I–40 and I–25 was an unforgettable and heartbreaking scene.

The driver of the smashed vehicle—in his early 20's—had been observed by a police spotter hurtling in and out of traffic along the crowded New Mexico freeway at speeds approaching 100 miles an hour. As he sought to maneuver the sharp interchange, he lost control, jumped a deep ravine, and rolled onto a completely new section of freeway in front of a stream of cars before being hurled through a side door and down an embankment.

Almost miraculously, no other cars had become involved.

LIQUOR NEVER MENTIONED

Despite interviews by reporters with police and relatives, neither of the next day's local newspaper reports mentioned alcohol. Yet the grim fact was that the young driver—who had narrowly missed smashing into other cars—had been drinking heavily prior to the accident. Moreover, he had been driving without a valid operator's license.

That gloomy, wind-swept night in Albuquerque could hardly be called unusual. Throughout the nation, law-enforcement officials could recount thousands of similar episodes—grim records of single- and multiple-vehicle collisions.

There was the Texas family killed in a head-on collision with a drunk driver one Sunday morning in 1969. And the Wisconsin mother and her eight-year-old son killed this year in front of their home when they were returning from a concert. And the three people killed in Louisiana not so long ago when a pickup truck driven by a problem drinker crossed a dividing line and smashed into them head-on.

The United States is in the midst of an undeclared—and almost unrecognized—war in which its highways have been turned into a virtual battleground. Here a small group of social and problem drinkers are yearly killing up to 28,000 people, causing 800,000 accidents, and accounting for economic losses conservatively estimated at between $7 and $8 billion.

Many insurance companies are being forced to tighten automobile underwriting and to post sizable rate increases because of mounting highway losses involving drinking drivers.

"HIGHWAY COMMANDOS" IN MILLIONS

No one knows how many of these "highway commandos" there are. But they number in the millions. Allstate Insurance Company estimates that 1 out of every 50 cars coming at you on the highway is driven by a drunk driver. One prominent police-science expert more conservatively figures one out of every 90 cars.

Traditional sanctions are not halting these highway killers. They drive with or without a license, despite radio and TV warnings, despite fines and jail sentences.

According to Dr. Robert F. Borkenstein, chairman of the Department of Forensic Studies at Indiana University and a leading expert in breath testing, there is virtually no place in the United States where drinking driving is totally prohibited.

The neon parade of bars and package stores along the nation's highways provides corroboration that auto-oriented America—with its 85–90 million drinkers—too often considers the bottle and the throttle acceptable companions.

In most states, indeed, statutory definitions of what constitutes "intoxicated driving" remain at dangerously liberal levels.

WRONG WAY ONTO THE FREEWAY

Jan, an honor student, only shortly graduated from the University of Oklahoma, accepted a date on Thanksgiving Day, 1967. Carefully belted into the seat of her companion's new, low sports car, the two young people were suddenly struck by a large pickup truck coming the wrong way on a freeway exit. Jan was killed.

The pickup driver was drunk, an uncapped liquor bottle on the seat beside him. He had repeatedly lost his driver's license and was without auto insurance.

"I've experienced tragedy many time in my family, but this was surely the shock of my life," the girl's aunt, who had raised her from a child, told me. "It was so unnecessary, so senseless. It could have been prevented."

Since the beginning of this century, traffic accidents have killed more than 1.7 million people—more than the combined death toll of all military personnel in every major war from the American Revolution to Vietnam. During the past five years alone, the highway roster included at least 134,000 men, women, and children, according to National Safety Council estimates.

The toll continues. About 150 people a day.

The strong correlation between highway deaths and liquor has never really been hidden to researchers. "We have received a communication containing the history of 25 alcohol-related accidents occurring to automobile wagons," an article in the 1904 Quarterly Journal of Inebriety, noted. "Fifteen persons occupying these wagons were killed outright, five more died two days later. . . . Fourteen persons were injured, some seriously. A careful inquiry showed that in 19 of these accidents, the drivers had used spirits within an hour or more of the disaster. . . ."

ESTIMATES VARY WIDELY

Back in 1946 the National Safety Council estimated that drunk drivers triggered about 18 percent of all fatal accidents. Today, in 1970, 1 out of every two highway deaths is attributed to liquor. That astonishing figure may well even be higher. Some authorities, in fact, fear that may be as high as 70 percent of all fatalities.

One recent study undertaken by the State Laboratory of Hygiene and the University of Wisconsin's Department of Preventive Medicine suggests that almost two-thirds of Wisconsin drivers killed in traffic accidents were under the influence of alcohol at the time. Equally as ominous, the report (based on blood samples taken from 507 drivers killed between February, 1968, and May, 1969) indicates that alcohol is a factor in 56 percent of all fatal accidents involving young people under 18.

Many law-enforcement departments, moreover such as the State of Washington Department of Motor Vehicles, have clearly established that there is a high correlation between individuals who drive while drinking and those who use drugs.

"We're deeply concerned about the role of the drinking driver," says Willard Howell, director of the Office of Alcohol Countermeasures in the U.S. Department of Transportation. Mr. Howell's anguish is widely shared among safety experts. Ronald H. Parsons, stocky Sheriff of Kent County, Mich. (encompassing Grand Rapids) told me he thought alcohol was probably a factor in between 50 and 60 percent of all fatalities handled by his department.

PICTURE "BLEAK AND DISMAL"

In New Orleans, where the 1969 death toll of 108 fatalities was the highest since 1929, Dudley Andry, director of the Metropolitan New Orleans Safety Council, admits being depressed by the constantly spiraling statistics. "The picture here is bleak and dismal," he said one day in late March of this year. On the small table in front of him was a chronological rundown of fatalities in New Orleans for the past year.

The hefty volume resembled a telephone directory in size.

"Look at them," he said quietly, deep anguish mirrored on his face.

"January, 1969, a white male doctor, 8:15 p.m., alcohol blood concentration .10 percent."

"22-year-old woman, alcohol concentration, .12 percent."

He flipped the page.

"White male, age 54, killed by liquor."

"How do we stop it?"

How *do* we stop it?

The research that has gone into this 10-part series indicates that it is not being stopped largely because the American public remains puzzlingly apathetic. That apathy is apparent at every level of society.

Despite an imaginative $18 million program under way at the Department of Transportation (to be discussed in a subsequent article), there is virtually no long-range, coordinated federal and state program to deal with the drunk driver. Leadership from Washington is desperately lacking.

LOCAL PROBLEMS ABOUND

Despite two landmark laws—the Highway Safety Act of 1966 and the National Traffic

and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966—Congress continues to spend little for highway safety.

Indeed, while Congress authorized some $267 million for the first three years of the National Safety Act, only $92 million has been released for obligation, according to the National Safety Council. At least 40 safety bills have been passed in the last few years, but none of them has received adequate financing.

State and local community programs fare no better. The liquor industry in many states is quietly sabotaging legislative efforts to enact legislation aimed at drunken drivers. In over two dozen states it's possible to renew drivers' licenses by mail. The safety council of one major Southern town of over 300,000 people is operating on a shoestring budget out of an office that reminds one of the dreary setting for a 1940's private detective film. The punitive legal approach in most communities is strictly out of the 1940's, too. Fines and license revocations seldom deter problem drinkers, who desperately need clinical or therapeutic aid.

Paradoxically, courts and juries are loath to convict known drunk drivers, even when the evidence is overwhelming. One magistrate north of Seattle often deliberately defers findings on drunk-driver cases so that a lesser charge can be given. (This practice has triggered the ire of the Washington State Patrol.)

Out of one group of 1,000 drivers in California who killed someone while driving under the influence of liquor, only one-fourth received felony convictions for drunk driving. Less than 5 percent ever went to jail.

Last year a Midland, Mich., woman, whose car was hit by a drunken driver while driving along an interstate highway, found on checking state records that he had garnered five previous convictions for drunk driving and had rung up an extra 15 points against his record within a two-year period. At his last trial—the one involving the Midland woman—the judge fined the drunken driver only $30, plus $70 court costs and suspended his license for 90 days, the woman told me. (The license suspension was subsequently extended to one year by the Michigan Secretary of State.)

State motor vehicle licensing record systems are too often tangled monstrosities. Recordings of sentences, fines, and license revocations are either not entered at all, entered erroneously, or disappear through peculiar circumstances at a later time. Indeed, the lack of effective coordination within and between the records people of the different states is matched only by the deep-seated rivalries and lack of coordination between many of the highway safety specialists and alcoholism-treatment experts themselves.

"NONRECORD" CLEARS EXECUTIVE

Several years ago a highly respected, $20,000-a-year Midwest executive with a well-known corporation ran his rented car off a 30-foot embankment on a California expressway. He was arrested and booked for driving while intoxicated. He engaged a lawyer at an extremely high fee. The lawyer had the case delayed until such time as it would be cleared from the docket. Within three months the whole episode had been forgotten with no record of the accident.

This reporter's research indicates there are thousands of "nonrecords."

Law-enforcement departments—too often understrengthened, underpaid, overworked—frankly concede that they find less and less time to deal with highway safety, especially now that "rising crime" is so firmly etched in the public consciousness (even though serious crime statistics lag far behind motor-vehicle accident statistics).

In one major Texas city I spent an evening "riding shotgun" with an officer who admitted that in over a year of patrolling a beat (in the area of heaviest concentration of bars in that city) he had not given out one ticket for drunk driving. He was no exception. I found that true almost everywhere I went—Los Angeles, Dallas, Chicago, Washington, D.C.

NO NATIONAL PROGRAM EXISTS

Most experts say one reason the drunk driver is not being curbed is that there is as yet no realistic, hard-headed attack on alcoholism in the U.S., such as has been the case in most European countries. Until the deeper question of alcoholism is attacked, new police equipment, stiffer court sentences, and millions of license revocations won't really resolve the problem.

The Monitor has learned through a Department of Transportation source that a confidential special task force report on highway safety prepared for the President has severely criticized the entire punitive approach in dealing with the drunk drivers. This is a conclusion shared by most rehabilitation experts.

Testimony last year before a special subcommittee on alcoholism and narcotics, headed up by Iowa Sen. Harold Hughes (himself a reformed alcoholic), clearly indicated that there is no comprehensive federal program in this area, even though the United States now leads the world in the number of alcoholics.

The entire federal expenditure in the alcoholism treatment area is estimated at a minuscule $4 million annually.

Compared that $4 million to the estimated $8.2 billion in tax revenue that government at all levels—local, state, federal—collects from the sale of alcoholic beverages.

Compare that $4 million to the $7 to $8 billion in economic losses caused on American highways annually by drinking drivers.

"NO SAFETY CONSTITUENCY"

"There just is no highway safety constituency," laments Howard Pyle, president of the National Safety Council. Mr. Pyle, leaning back in a chair in his large office at NSC headquarters in Chicago, recalls that in his four years as governor of Arizona, back in the 1950's, only one person ever bothered to come into his office to discuss road safety. And until the recently stepped-up advertising campaign against drunk drivers by the council and private insurance companies, Mr. Pyle doubts that the situation had changed very much.

Mr. Pyle concedes that the NSC has been trying to get a coordinated national attack against drunk drivers under way for "about three years." He says, "We thought we would be stronger if we had widespread support. But the only major group that we've been able to get with us so far is the American Medical Association.

"Ninety million Americans drink—and they just don't like the privilege abridged. That's what you call a constituency in reverse."

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL BY BLACK AMERICANS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in the Middle East is one which touches the lives of more than just those fighting to maintain their freedom. It is a matter which affects all men, for it represents a fight for freedom and the preservation of individual liberty.

Yesterday's New York Times carried a full-page ad sponsored by an outstanding group of black Americans. It announced their support for Israel. Moreover, I believe it exemplifies how deeply and profoundly this crisis touches the lives of all men.

In light of the importance of their statement, I take this opportunity to include it in the RECORD.

AN APPEAL BY BLACK AMERICANS FOR U.S. SUPPORT TO ISRAEL

The crisis in the Middle East is a cause of great concern to all Americans—non-Jew as well as Jew, black as well as white. Our concern as black Americans is motivated not only by the threat to world peace which is posed by the Arab-Israeli conflict. We are also moved by the ideals of democracy and social justice, ideals which we have struggled to achieve in this country and which we firmly believe the United States must uphold in the Middle East. In our opinion, the United States can best stand by these ideals by unequivocally guaranteeing Israel's security.

While we are aware that Israel, like any other nation, has its shortcomings, it is by far the most democratic country in the Middle East. What is remarkable is that the high degree of political freedom in Israel has not diminished despite the constant need to maintain military preparedness. In contrast, countries like Iraq, Syria, and Egypt are dictatorial one-party states where the press and the courts are rigorously controlled and non-Moslem minorities are severely persecuted. Moreover, Israel has made tremendous strides toward achieving an equalitarian economic order. Its sophisticated system of educational, health, and welfare services is more advanced even than in our own country and has enhanced the quality of life for Arab as well as Jewish Israelis. The incidence of poverty in the Arab countries, on the other hand, remains appalling. The income from oil has been used to sustain wealthy sheikdoms—and often terrorist organizations as well—but rarely to alleviate the suffering of the poor.

We are deeply concerned about the plight of impoverished Arabs, particularly those who have been made refugees as a result of the three Arab-Israeli wars. But we do not feel that the continuation of the conflict serves the real interests of these people. Prolonged hostilities and inflammatory calls for the destruction of Israel can only divert precious attention, energy, and resources away from an attack on the pressing social and economic problems of the Arab people.

Some Americans, including a small minority of blacks, have expressed the feeling that the Middle East crisis is fundamentally a racial conflict between nonwhite Arabs and white Israelis. We think that this point of view is not only uninformed but dangerously misleading. It ignores the fact that approximately half the Jewish Israeli population consists of immigrants from Asia and Africa. And it also implies that there is an inherent solidarity of nonwhite people. This notion should have been laid to rest not only by the tragic Nigerian civil war, but also by the continuing brutal persecution of black Africans by the Sudanese government which, it must be emphasized, is militarily allied with and assisted by the Egyptian government. We should add in this regard that Israel, with its impressive program of foreign technical aid, has contributed far more than any of its Arab enemies to the development of black African nations.

We, therefore, support Israel's right to exist for the same reasons that we have struggled for freedom and equality in America. And it is again for these reasons that we believe that only peace and economic development can bring real justice to the Arab people. The present crisis in the Middle East endangers both Israel's existence and a better

life for the Arabs. We believe that the United States has a vital role to play in ending this crisis. If it does not stand firm in the Middle East, the Soviet Union will be encouraged to increase its intervention, thereby escalating the conflict still further.

We urge the United States government to use its great influence to help bring the Israelis and the Arabs to the conference table where they can work out among themselves a just and negotiated settlement. *We also urge our government to take steps to help guarantee Israel's right to exist as a nation.* For the present this means providing Israel with the full number of jet aircraft it has requested.

Raymond Pace Alexander, Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Margaret Belcher, President, National Association of Negro Business and Professional Clubs, Inc.; James Booker, Consultant to Kerner Commission; William H. Bowe, International Secretary-Treasurer, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Shirley Chisholm, U.S., Congresswoman, 12th District, New York; LeRoy Clark, International Vice-President, United Furniture Workers of America; William L. Clay, U.S. Congressman, 1st District, Missouri; John Conyers, Jr., U.S. Congressman, 1st District, Michigan; Earl Davis, Minority Affairs Director, Committee on Political Education, AFL–CIO.

Georgia M. Davis, State Senator, Kentucky; Walter G. Davis, Director, AFL–CIO, Department of Education; C. L. Dellums, International President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Charles C. Diggs, U.S. Congressman, 13th District, Michigan; William Gary, Administrative Assistant to the President, International Union of Electrical Radio & Machine Workers; Hugh M. Gloster, President, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Georgia; Simeon Golar, Chairman, N.Y.C. Housing Authority; Ernes Green, Director, Joint Apprenticeship Program, WDL/APREF; Richard Hatcher, Mayor, Gary, Indiana; Augustas F. Hawkins, U.S. Congressman, 21st District, California.

Dorothy Height, President, National Council of Negro Women; Vivian Henderson, President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia; Aaron E. Henry, President, Mississippi State Conference NAACP; Norman Hill, Associate Director, A. Philip Randolph Institute; William R. Hudgins, President, Freedom National Bank of New York; John H. Johnson, Publisher, Ebony, Jet, Tan and Black World; Leroy R. Johnson, State Senator, Atlanta, Georgia; Vernon E. Jordan, Executive Director, United Negro College Fund; Thomas Kilgore, Jr., Senior Pastor, Second Baptist Church, Los Angeles, California; Martin Luther King, Sr., Pastor, Ebenezer Baptist Church, Atlanta, Georgia; John Lewis, Executive Director, Voter Educational Project; Arthur C. Logan, President, United Neighborhood Houses; Marion Logan, Secretary, Southern Christian Leadership Conference; William Lucy, Executive Assistant to the President, American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees.

Louis Martin, Vice-President & Editor, Sengstacke Newspapers; Frank C. Montero, Assist to President, Tishman Realty & Construction Corp.; Ronnie M. Moore, Executive Director, Scholarship, Education and Defense Fund For Racial Equality, Inc.; John Morsell, Assistant Executive Director, NAACP; John H. Murphy, president, Afro-American Newspapers; Eleanor H. Norton, Chairman, N.Y.C. Commission on Human Rights; Frederick O'Neal, Actor; Peter Ottley, President Local 144 Hotel, Hospital & Nursing Home Union, SEIU; Basil A. Paterson, State Senator, New York; Ernest M. Pharr, Editor, The Atlanta Inquirer.

Channing Emery Phillips, President, Housing Development Corporation; Robert E. Powell, Vice-President, Laborers International Union of North America; A. Philip Randolph, Vice-President, AFL–CIO; Jackie Robinson, Chairman of the Board, Freedom National Bank of New York; Bayard Rustin, Executive Director, A. Philip Randolph Institute; Horace L. Sheffield, Executive Vice President, Trade Union Leadership Council; Arthur D. Shores, Member, Democratic National Committee, Alabama; Asa T. Spaulding, Owner, Spaulding Consulting and Advisory Service; Marcus Stewart, Sr., Editor, The Indianapolis Recorder; Carl Stokes, Mayor, Cleveland, Ohio.

Louis Stokes, U.S. Congressman, 21st District, Ohio; O. L. Tandy, Publisher, Indiana Herald; Gardner Taylor, Past President, Progressive National Baptist Convention; Jesse H. Walker, Executive Editor, New York Amsterdam News; Wyatt Tee Walker, Pastor, Canaan Baptist Church of Christ, New York City; William J. Walls, Bishop, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church; Roosevelt Watts, Executive Vice-President, Transport Workers Union; Robert Weaver, President, Bernard M. Baruch College, New York; Roy Wilkins, Executive Director, NAACP; Thomas G. Young, Vice-President, Local 32B, Service Employees International Union; Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League.

(Sponsored by the A. Philip Randolph Institute, New York, N.Y., A. Philip Randolph, president; Bayard Rustin, executive director)

TELLING IT LIKE IT IS ABOUT BIRMINGHAM

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, too often the city of Birmingham, which it is my privilege to represent in the Congress, has been the recipient of undue criticism.

I am encouraged, however, by an article which appeared recently in the Dallas Morning News and which was carried as the lead story by a black Birmingham paper, the Birmingham Times, and which tells it like it is about my city.

This article was written by a Washington Bureau correspondent for the News, Robert E. Baskin. Mr. Baskin apparently took the time to take a good, hard look at Birmingham in contrast to some other out-of-State writers who have seemed merely to give the city a superficial glance and write with a "my mind is made up, don't confuse me with the facts" attitude.

The city of Birmingham has made tremendous strides in recent years and it is time they were noted.

That the Birmingham Times would reprint this article, in my judgment, is an indication that Mr. Baskin's feelings are shared by the black community in Birmingham and that, Mr. Speaker, says a great deal.

I am greatful to Mr. Baskin for his article and include it herewith:

BIRMINGHAM DONE DIRTY ON IMAGE

(By Robert E. Baskin)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—Like Dallas, Birmingham has been one of the most maligned cities in the country, and the image of the city that has been created is totally erroneous.

Birmingham, of course has had its racial difficulties. There has been strife and bitter feelings all aggravated by undue attention from northern bleeding-hearts and do-gooders.

In the distant past Birmingham may have been a somewhat raw, rough city. But it is no longer that way.

This writer recalls stopping overnight during World War II and taking a cab to the Tutwiler Hotel from the railroad station.

When the Negro Porter appeared to take our bag, the cab driver got out and kicked the porter. "He was too slow," the driver said.

It was pointless to remonstrate with him. It was simply a manifestation of the redneck attitude of that time toward the Negro.

Today things in Birmingham are different.

There has been a full degree of racial integration-reluctant, of course, but nonetheless effective. And the citizens of this bustling steel city are looking to the future and trying to prevent further civil disturbances.

In Birmingham you can walk the streets day or night without fear of yoking, robberies and other mayhem. This is something you cannot do in Washington or New York or most northern cities.

While you may read a good deal about racial friction in the south, you will find that it does not amount to anything like that which exists in the north.

The other evening I and another newspaper correspondent decided the time was appropriate for a meal of genuine southern, pit-cooked barbecue. There are a good many places in Birmingham that specialize in this. But we were advised that the best place of all was a small restaurant in the Negro district.

We inquired, mindful of conditions in Washington, if it would be safe to go there. The answer was affirmative.

The restaurant was a very small one, but we got quick service of some barbecued spare-ribs. They were excellent, and we had a second serving. We were the only white persons in the place, but there was no strain. Everyone was courteous.

Later, we walked out on the street to find a cab. The people we encountered were friendly. There was no fear in the air. In fact, we felt that we were among friends.

In Washington no white person would think of going into a predominantly black district to get a plate of spare-ribs. The racial conflicts in the nation's capital are too intense for that.

It has been unfortunate that Birmingham has been depicted as a city of racial antagonisms and troubles. It is really unfair and a distortion of things as they are. If the slightest trouble breaks out in a southern city like this, however, much attention is focused upon it by the national news media.

Meanwhile, in Washington, New York, Detroit and other northern cities there can be all sorts of racial difficulties existing and little will be said about this.

It's much nicer to be in Birmingham. Despite all the things that have been said about it, Birmingham is one of the dynamic cities that is leading the south to better days.

WAR AGAINST POLLUTION

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the quality of our environment has been a subject of much conversation and concern among the citizens of this country in recent months—especially since the time the President announced plans for an all-out war against pollution.

I take this occasion to report to you that in my home State of Tennessee we are making progress in the battle against pollution, according to reports from our soil conservation service.

On June 25, 1970, an article appeared in the Greenville Sun, Greenville, Tenn., quoting Mr. J. R. Sasser, head of the soil conservation service for Tennessee, on the problems of pollution and the steps being taken to remedy the problems. The Greenville Sun is one of the outstanding daily newspapers in my congressional district.

I have joined in cosponsoring seven administration bills designed to fight air and water pollution, and I hope all of them can be enacted into law very soon.

To give readers of the RECORD an insight as to what is being done in my State to fight pollution, I submit the following article:

LOCALLY LED CONSERVATION PROGRAMS CREDITED WITH DRAMATICALLY REDUCING SOME POLLUTION

Locally-led, federally-aided conservation programs have dramatically reduced some forms of pollution and improved the quality of our environment, according to J. R. Sasser, head of the Soil Conservation Service for Tennessee.

"To many of us who have been concerned with conservation for a long time, it is a little startling to find our goals of conservation, purer water, and a better environment in the middle of a national crusade," Sasser said. "Reforestation establishment of grasses and legumes, terracing, and other practices installed by the landowners of Tennessee have had a measurable effect on pollution abatement.

The SCS has been giving technical help to local soil and water conservation districts since 1939, according to Sasser.

"Sediment, for example is the largest pollutant of water," Sasser said. "Sediment washes from unprotected land into streams and lakes. The soil particles can carry disease and wastes, ruin fishing, and increase the cost of purifying water.

"More than 30 years of conservation work by the landowners of this country has greatly reduced the volume of soil washing from rural lands. In 1969, cooperators of Tennessee's 95 soil conservation districts applied more than 40,000 acres of contour farming practices. This one conservation practice saved about 0.3 million tons of soil from polluting our State Streams and lakes," Sasser continued.

Sasser pointed out that a large portion of sediment pollution today comes from urban construction sites, roadbanks, parking lots, and other nonfarm use. Unprotected roadbanks can lose soil at a rate in excess of 150 tons per acre every year.

"Many conservation practices that are effective on farmlands can also be used to curb nonfarm erosion." Sasser said.

"Air pollution from agricultural sources is a rare localized problem now," Sasser said. "But wind-blown soil from farmland once polluted the air over a large part of the nation.

"Clouds of dust blew from land that had been mis-managed and overused, darkening the skies over Washington, New York, and other eastern cities.

"Air pollution of this magnitude has been eliminated by conservation programs. Permanent cover, tree windbreaks, wind stripcropping, and better management in many ways are keeping the landowners' soil at home—and out of the air.

"Burning woodlands and crop residues (wheat, straw, cornstalks, and the like) once sent natural plant nutrients up in clouds of smoke that blanketed the countryside in Tennessee for weeks at a time," Sasser said. "Now thanks to enlightened conservation methods and State and Federal fire control programs, indiscriminate burning is no longer practiced. This source of pollution from our farmlands has been almost eliminated."

In Tennessee a relatively new practice called no-tillage crop production is proving to be a very effective method of reducing soil loss. Essentially the technique involves the planting of row crops such as corn and soybeans in grassland with special planters. "Scientists have shown significant reductions in rainfall-induced erosion from watersheds used for no-tillage crops." There is quite a difference in the quality of runoff water, Sasser said. "Instead of being laden with erosional debris, water runoff from no-tillage farmed fields is clear and sedimentation in streams and lakes is greatly reduced."

"Some people may be surprised to learn that conservation farming reduces the need for chemical pesticides and herbicides which are sometimes guilty of air and water pollution," Sasser continued.

"Crop rotations are used to conserve and improve the soil and fight insects, weeds, and diseases," Sasser explained. "Certain plants kill nematodes, for example. A rotation to include these plants—coastal bermudagrass, crotalaria, and even marigolds—will help control nematodes."

"Pests such as the European corn borer and pink bollworm may live through the winter in old stalks left standing in the fields. By mulching (cutting down or shredding) the old stalks, the pest's homes are destroyed and the need for chemical control is reduced. The mulch also reduces wind and water erosion."

"The conservation farmer strives to reduce soil loss and runoff," Sasser said, and this reduces the likelihood of fertilizers and chemicals washing into streams and lakes."

"New ways are being found to use or dispose of wastes that once went into streams. Wood chips, fruit processing plant wastes, animal by-products and a long list of other materials are proving to be useful as soil conditioners or fertilizers," according to Sasser.

"Our Soil Conservation Service specialists are spending a larger amount of their time each year in helping towns, industries, feedlot operators, and others install sewage lagoons, catch basins, or sanitary landfills to handle wastes."

SCS technicians have helped select sites and install approximately 35 new sanitary landfills in Tennessee to replace open dumps.

The whole concept of conservation is founded on planning for the protection and improvement of the environment—a positive approach.

Sasser said that the pioneers in the positive approach to environmental improvement are Tennessee's Soil Conservation District Supervisors and conservation farmers. "These dedicated people have led the fight against pollution for more than 30 years—often alone, without adequate funds, and for too long largely ignored by their urban and metropolitan neighbors," Sasser said.

Lasting monuments to their tireless efforts are the contour strips of cropland etched into 1.6 million acres of Tennessee's sloping landscape. It is also in the 84,000 farm ponds and the 500,000 acres of trees planted on eroded idle land over the past 30 years. It is these visable accomplishments and more—it is the cleaner air we breathe, the purer water we drink, the more healthful food we eat.

Nearly 45,000 basic conservation plans have been developed on more than 6,000,000 acres of land in Tennessee. Sasser said that most conservation work is done in rural areas by farmers and ranchers—but that the technical help that has been proven successful in rural programs is also available for nonfarm use.

BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY IN VIETNAM

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the services beyond the call of duty our forces have performed in South Vietnam. American military personnel have commonly utilized their spare time engaged in such activities as constructing hospital facilities, churches, and schools. They have adopted children orphaned by the war and created scholarship funds to make possible education for the young. Volunteer medical personnel have saved thousands who would otherwise have been doomed to death.

Any army, given proper training, sufficient pay, and incentives for developing morale can be molded into an efficient fighting unit. American Armed Forces, at the very least, have always been considered among the most militarily effective in the world. Vietnam, however, is a unique war that has created new demands upon our troops. They are asked not only to physically crush the enemy, but also turn widespread mistrust of the South Vietnamese Government into confidence and support. These are two products which can not be instilled in or forced upon anyone, but instead must be fought for and won. There has been a slow, but definite shift in South Vietnamese attitudes and support away from the Vietcong and toward the Thieu-Ky government. One of the reasons for this shift has been the real desire shown by American servicemen to improve the living conditions of the Vietnamese civilian population. With this goal in mind, they have given much of their spare time with no military strings attached—something for which the North Vietnamese are not known.

Throughout this war, as with those in the past, Americans have been continually honored as soldiers; the time has come for them to be honored as humans. Our commitment in Indochina has caused much debate, but the performance of our forces has caused none. They have acted in a manner which transcends ethnic differences or military order and have asserted a humanity which knows no geographic restriction. Countless South Vietnamese will remem-

ber the Americans more as a group responsible for their child's being alive or for his education than as representatives of a nation supreme in its fighting prowess. Perhaps this will be a more healthy—and lasting—impression.

The following reprint from Reader's Digest, an article written by Kenneth Y. Tomlinson and entitled "Beyond the Call of Duty in Vietnam," most vividly illustrates several of the humanitarian deeds performed by our troops:

BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY IN VIETNAM

(NOTE.—In the midst of an unpopular and bloody war, our soldiers have often become samaritans, engaged in those small, selfless acts of mercy that never seem to make the headlines)

(By Kenneth Y. Tomlinson)

Braving heavy communist gunfire one muggy afternoon in April 1969, helicopter pilot Lt. Robert Vinson picked up eight seriously wounded men deep in the treacherous Ashau Valley of Vietnam, and flew them to the base hospital. It was the end of three grueling days of combat and resupply missions for this 23-year-old from Belmont, Mass. In that time, he had seen four of his squadron's helicopters shot down and three pilots killed.

But, weary as he was, Vinson had still another mission he wanted to fly. Right after debriefing, he took a chopper 20 miles north to a village nestled among the rice paddies of the Huongdien Peninsula, just below the Demilitarized Zone. He trudged through a muddy field to a half-finished school. Surveying the work, he said to a Vietnamese builder, "We're going to need more cement. I'll have some here in a few days."

In the last year, even while fighting communism, Vinson has been engaged in a personal war of his own—against sickness and ignorance in rural Vietnam. When he first visited the isolated Huongdien Peninsula in early 1969, three poorly equipped medical dispensaries served 34,000 people. There were only nine schools, each riddled with bullet holes, and the sole, two-room high school had to hold classes in three shifts. "This is intolerable," he said. "These people must be helped."

Wherever he went thereafter, Vinson was on the lookout for surplus material. Flying a colonel to a briefing in Danang one day, he saw a large stack of two-by-fours piled next to the landing pad. "That lumber could help put 50 kids in a school," he told a supply sergeant. The colonel was flown back to camp with lumber crammed in with him. Vinson scrounged bags of rain-damaged cement, tin and lumber from ammunition boxes. Other helicopter crewmen joined in to help, and every effort they made was matched by the people of Huongdien. After Vinson's 158th Aviation Battalion donated $1000 for an addition to the high school, the South Vietnamese district chief searched for funds for a second building.

What has it all meant to Huongdien? Five dispensaries have been constructed and stocked with medical supplies. Six new schools have been built, while the nine others have been repaired. The high school now has eight rooms—and a library. The day before Vinson left Vietnam last January, village and hamlet chiefs honored him in a simple ceremony. The district chief said, "We can never thank you enough."

Quality of Mercy. All over South Vietnam our soldiers are engaged in similar humanitarian missions. An artilleryman from New Jersey spends a free afternoon stacking sandbags at an orphanage outside Pleiku so the children will be protected from communist mortar attacks. An Army engineer from California distributes toys he bought in Hong Kong to the Longbinh orphans his unit adopted. A Marine rifleman from Texas, on his way in from an all-night patrol near Danang, stops to treat huge sores on the back of an old Vietnamese man. The list of individual acts of mercy is unending. In fact, as one senior military officer told me, "My hardest task is keeping track of the incurable humanitarianism of our troops."

Last year U.S. Army volunteers helped construct 1253 schools and 597 hospitals and dispensaries, contributing $300,000 from their own pockets. Personnel of the Third Marine Amphibious Force helped build 268 classrooms, 75 dispensaries and hospitals, and 78 churches, temples and pagodas. The $40,000 contributed by Marines to a scholarship fund ensured an education for 935 children. Air Force men gave personal and financial assistance to 1218 schools, medical facilities and orphanages. Air Force doctors, dentists and medics treated 390,000 Vietnamese in volunteer programs.

One shining example is the 120-bed Hoakhanh children's hospital, dedicated early in 1969, and one of the most modern of its kind in the Far East. Financed with money raised by combat Marines, it is an outgrowth of smaller, crowded hospitals and roadside dispensaries, where Marines and Navy corpsmen had volunteered their help to sick and injured children. There are two operating rooms, isolation facilities and a maternity ward equipped with incubators; 25 Vietnamese nurses are being trained to work in the new facilities. Last year, 16,000 children were treated at the hospital, many of whom would otherwise have died.

As I walked through the main ward earlier this year, I saw a wiry boy of 11 playing games with a group of visiting Marines. Seven months before, he had been caught in a fire and brought in with burns over 75 percent of his body. He told my interpreter: "All my life I will never forget this place and these healing people. Some way I will repay them."

Meet some of the countless other "healing people" involved in helping the South Vietnamese:

The "new parents" of the Americal Division. When Capt. Charles Adams, a 27-year-old Protestant chaplain from Springfield, Mo., visited Binhson Catholic Orphanage in Quangngai Province in May 1969, 60 children were subsisting on one or two bowls of rice a day and sleeping on the floors of a school. The chaplain told a group of men in the Americal Division's Fifth Battalion, 46th Infantry, about the situation, and they eagerly agreed to help. "Don't worry, chaplain," said one veteran sergeant. "Those kids have just got themselves some new parents."

Combat troops began sacking food from captured enemy caches—sometimes as much as 500 pounds a week—and shipping it back on returning helicopters. Mess sergeants at battalion headquarters set aside surplus food. Soldiers found 40 Army cots in a salvage dump, repaired them, and for the first time the orphans slept in beds. On payday, troops in the field passed cups for contributions. Ten percent of poker winnings was earmarked for the Binhson orphans. By the end of the year an eight-room, cinder-block structure had been built to house them.

The battalion's 800 men continue to give $400 a month. They want the orphanage—just one of the 350 helped by our servicemen—to be self-sufficient by the time our troops leave Vietnam. The first small step toward this goal: 15 pigs and 22 ducks purchased for Binhson.

Servicemen who become friends of outcasts. Air Force pilots visiting a relocated (because of Vietcong harassment) leper colony on the shores of Danang Bay last year were shocked by what they saw. Some 240 lepers and their children were living in primitive huts and tents. Masses of flies swarmed around helpless lepers in a makeshift hospital. "I'm coming back to help these people," said Lt. William Kruger, 25, an Air Force Academy graduate. His companions felt the same way.

Soon there were more weekend volunteers—Air Force, Army and Marines—than could be transported to the isolated beach, which was without a dock. Improvised building materials—lumber, sheet metal—were thrown overboard 50 yards from shore and guided in by GIs standing shoulder-deep in water. By the time monsoon rains began last fall, the men had 40 houses built for the lepers.

Quartermaster First Class Sam Lopiccolo—village builder. Soon after the U.S. Navy moved into the lower Camau Peninsula, a longtime Communist stronghold, a group of refugees wanted to settle nearby for protection. Lopiccolo, 27, of Waterloo, N.Y., salvaged material to help them build a village. In three weeks 500 families had settled along the once-barren banks of the Cualon River.

All this did not go unnoticed by the Vietcong: a dozen villagers were soon kidnaped, while two others were shot when they refused to pay V.C. tax collectors. Booby traps were set around the perimeter of the village, and the Vietcong put a price on Sam Lopiccolo's head. Undiscouraged, he and the villagers began constructing a school. After guerrillas slipped into the village early one morning and blew up the partially completed structure, Lopiccolo and the people doggedly rebuilt it.

Sam Lopiccolo now is helping the people of a newer village downstream build a school for their children. He has twice extended his tours of duty in Vietnam and is now in his third year. "This job can't be done in one year or two," he explains. "That's why I stay."

Chief Warrant Officer George Railey—orphanage counselor. Working night after night while finishing his third tour in Vietnam, this Special Forces veteran built a merry-go-round for the children of an orphanage near Pleiku. (The carrousel turns on the discarded axle of a 2½-ton truck. The horses are made from salvage metal. Its center piece is a gaily painted gasoline tank.) During the dry season the orphanage's sole source of water was a 1200-gallon tank truck Railey drove. He used a chain saw to cut firewood for cooking during his lunch hour. Each day he picked up three teen-age orphans and took them to his shop, where he and his men trained them to be mechanics.

Railey methodically visited eight remote Montagnard villages twice each month, distributing gifts and surplus food to the often-hungry hill tribesmen of the Central Highlands. When I traveled to these villages with Railey last January, he was awaiting confirmation of a fourth year's extension of duty in Vietnam. He told me he had found new meaning in life, working with the suffering victims of war. That work tragically ended three months later. He was killed in an accident while taking presents to Montagnard refugees at Letrung.

Sgt. Richard Pellerin—medic to the Montagnards. Pellerin, 27, who joined the Army after dropping out of the University of Michigan Medical School, is one of two medics who alternate duties at Pleidjereng, one of many Special Forces camps located at strategic hot spots along the Cambodian border. One medic is always out on patrol. The other operates the camp dispensary and goes down to the primitive Montagnard village of Pleidoch three times a week to help the sick.

I watched Pellerin treat a young woman, badly burned when she had rolled into a fire a few nights before; her leprosy-deadened sense had not alerted her to the pain. A small boy waited to lead us to his sick father. Seeing the child lifted the spirit of the intense young medic. "When I got here, nearly every kid in this village had trachoma, an eye infection," Pellerin said. "Now we would have to go looking for a case to treat."

Sgt. 1st Class Lonnie Johnson—jack-of-all-help. When the 36-year-old Green Beret learned that a mother in the remote mountain village of Dongbathin was having difficulty in childbirth, he made his way to her home, carried her to a truck and raced to Camranh, where a Navy doctor successfully delivered the baby. After a Vietcong rocket killed eight Nhatrang civilians last September, Johnson found tin and wood to build the survivors a new home. Last Christmas he gave 1500 orphans toothpaste, soap, candy and nuts collected from fellow servicemen.

As Johnson and I sat on our bunks at a Special Forces camp at Pleiku, I asked him why he has done so much for the Vietnamese. "I was raised by my grandparents, who were sharecroppers on a farm in Alabama," he said. "We were very poor. I got one pair of overalls to last a year. My shirts were made from fertilizer sacks. When I got to Vietnam and saw these people and their children, I remembered what it was like. I made up my mind I was going to do everything I could for them."

Everywhere I traveled in Vietnam, I saw men like these. Yet their amazing humanitarian accomplishments are nearly always overlooked amid daily battle reports and domestic conflict over the war itself.

"The number of our GIs who devote their free time, energy and money to aid the Vietnamese would surprise you," declared Bob Hope at the end of his latest Christmas tour of U.S. bases there. "But maybe it wouldn't," he added. "I guess you know what kind of guys your sons and brothers and the kids next door are."

A SANCTUARY FOR CALIFORNIA'S TULE ELK

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 17561, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the desirability of establishing a national wildlife refuge in California and/or adjacent Western States for the preservation of the California tule elk. I would like to include in the RECORD a portion of an excellent article by Mike Frome, entitled "Endangered Elk," which appeared in the May 1970 edition of the American Forests magazine.

After noting that the tule elk of California had been placed on the list of rare and endangered species by the U.S. Department of the Interior and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, Mr. Frome declared:

Any species so reduced in number that less than 400 remain on earth should receive maximum protection.

In supporting legislation to study creation of a national wildlife refuge, Frome commented that—

Refuges have played a key role in every successful wildlife restoration in our history. And there is now clear need for establishing a permanent sanctuary to protect the tule elk.

And in an eloquent conclusion to his fine article, the writer quotes the eminent author, Dr. Lloyd Inglis, on the urgency of quick congressional action to save the tule elk:

Let it never be said of our generation that we hastened the extinction of that species. It took ages of nature's time to produce a species. To be guilty of contributing toward the extinction of a species is like tearing up the foundation planks of the universe.

The portion of Mr. Frome's article on the "Endangered Elk" follows:

ENDANGERED ELK

This leads one to inquire further into federal attitudes toward endangered species. In this regard, hearings were held recently before committees of both houses of Congress to consider the future of what must be the most celebrated rare and endangered mammal in the United States—the tule elk of California. The story of the handsome California wapiti, or dwarf elk, is now well known. Great herds of untold thousands once roamed the central and coastal valleys of California. A century ago their habitat was invaded. The elk were slaughtered, both by ranchers eager to eliminate competition for their livestock and by market hunters supplying meat to stampeding miners of the Gold Rush. A few animals hid in the bulrushes, or tules, of the Miller and Lux cattle kingdom and when discovered were given protection by Henry Miller, the ranch boss. From that slender group the tule made their miraculous comeback and in 1933 were transplanted to become the famous herd in Owens Valley, east of the Sierra Crest.

All has not gone well, however, in Owens Valley, where the elk live on an area of 300 square miles, approximately half of which is administered by the City of Los Angeles. The area serves primarily to insure metropolitan water supply from the Owens River and its tributaries but also has been used, under lease, for livestock grazing. In recent years cattlemen have complained about having to share their range. Consequently deliberate efforts are made to restrict the numbers of elk. Whenever the tule elk increase to over 300, a legal hunt is held to reduce the total to 250, a figure set arbitrarily by the California Fish and Game Commission as "the carrying capacity." On three weekends of last October such hunts were responsible for killing of 78 animals. All the evidence strongly indicates the exercise was far more of a slaughter than a sport, that it did not differentiate between weak and strong specimens in the so-called culling, that it bore scant relationship to scientific game management.

The tule elk has been placed on the list of rare and endangered species by the Department of the Interior and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. In its Tule Elk Habitat Management Plan, developed for national forestland adjacent to Owens Valley, the Forest Service termed this smallest of North American elk "a rare and unique big game species with high esthetic appeal," adding that: "The challenge to manage the herd and its habitat so as to maintain the animal for the future is great." Certainly any species so reduced in number that less than 400 remain on earth should receive maximum protection. This fact seemed clearly recognized in 1967, when the City Council of Los Angeles authorized establishment of a refuge at Owens Valley. But through the potency of the autonomous commission controlling the water and power supplies of Los Angeles, this refuge has never been established.

This is why five California Congressmen and Senator Alan Cranston introduced legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to study the desirability of establishing a national wildlife refuge for preservation of the tule elk. Refuges have played a key role in every successful wildlife restoration in our history. And there is now clear need for establishing a permanent sanctuary in Owens Valley to the exclusion of conflicting interests and activities.

Leadership to protect the tule elk did not originate in the Department of the Interior. It began with a handful of people in Southern California, now called the Committee for the Preservation of the Tule Elk, and has grown into a groundswell of public opinion expressed throughout the nation.

The existing policy governing the Owens Valley rangeland, with an endangered species at stake, is senseless. Where state biologists buckle under political pressure, the federal government must act. Failure to seize the initiative discredits the President's pledge and earnest desire to improve the environment. In response to pressures of the people, there is now a new creation called the Inter-Agency Land and Wildlife Committee for Owens Valley, composed of representatives of Los Angeles, the local counties involved, the State of California, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. Its efforts, hopefully, may prove beneficial, but they cannot so long as livestock is considered the priority value of the resource.

"I urge the active support of the effort to establish a national wildlife refuge for the tule elk which have been dangerously reduced in number," declared Dr. Lloyd Inglis, the eminent author of *Mammals of the Pacific States*, in a statement dispatched to the Congressional hearings that would have been wholly fitting coming from the Secretary of the Interior. "Let it never be said of our generation that we hastened the extinction of that species. It took ages of nature's time to produce a species. To be guilty of contributing toward the extinction of a species is like tearing up the foundation planks of the universe."

COLLEGE STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN ELECTIONS

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as the November elections approach, many representatives of our institutions of higher learning have indicated that their college or university might actively become engaged in politics, to the extent of campaigning for certain candidates.

This is becoming a great source of concern to many professors and other members of the academic community because of the possible effect it could have on the university as an institution. One of the most vital features of our university system is that free thought is encouraged and the university does not try to institutionalize this thought in favor of any particular set of policies.

Recently, Prof. Franz Michael, of George Washington University's Institute of Sino-Soviet Affairs, presented a commencement address to the School of Public and International Affairs. In his address, Professor Michael showed how the university has always remained aloof from political entanglements with the exception of German colleges during the rise of Hitler. The German instance shows how the university system can be destroyed or manipulated in order to preach only one variety of thought.

For the information of my colleagues, I am hereby inserting Professor Michael's address into the RECORD:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS PRESENTED TO SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERISTY

Students, parents, colleagues, and distinguished guests, it is, indeed, an honor to be asked by students and colleagues to speak on this special occasion. We live in a somewhat unusual time, to put it mildly, and it has not been easy to find a proper theme; but after some deliberation, I decided "to do my thing."

Commencement, from the French noun *commencement*, literally means "a beginning," a beginning, that is, of the real life after the schooling you have received in preparation has been completed. It has been traditional to speak on this occasion about the world of affairs which you are about to enter and about its dangers and opportunities. It is a temptation to speak of those. I would rather speak to you, however, on the problem faced by the institution of the university, which is very much a part of the real world and with which you are so familiar, since it has been a part of your life experience, especially during the past year.

It is a troubled world we are facing, but the troubles of our universities are, perhaps, at the core of the malaise from which we suffer. What, then, is the role of the university in our world? It is a trite thing to say that the university is an educational institution, but it seems important to stress that again. Education is a complex process. For one thing, education is the transmission of knowledge; for another, it has to provide a logical system in which knowledge is to be treated.

Since the early middle ages universities have served as custodians of human knowledge as it accumulated. The *universitas literarum*, the concept which gave the university its name, meant the universality of all knowledge, the whole scope of intellectual pursuit. This accumulation of knowledge became the storehouse of the past which has grown as our knowledge has increased. Entire new fields of knowledge opened up. We may smile today at the discipline divisions of the middle ages. There were the liberal arts and the professions. The liberal arts were divided into the so-called quadrivium, the four fields of specialization: Arithmetic; Music; Geometry; Astronomy. A methodological approach for training of the mind comprised the so-called trivium: Grammar; Logic; Rhetoric. There was a great deal of argument about these divisions. The other half of university education consisted, then, of the professions: Theology; Law; Medicine. This was the scope of knowledge and of the conceptual framework of the time. From this has evolved the whole field of natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities of our time.

Far more important than the increase of accumulated knowledge, however, was the changing framework in which it was understood. The medieval scholar was secure in his basic beliefs and premises. These were provided by religion, a set of values common to all. *Religio mater scientiae*, religion was the mother of science and within its tenets knowledge was developed. There may be argument within the doctrine; in fact, science had to assert its findings against the narrow bigotry of the world and the universe. Galileo became the most famous example of the fight between the human mind and doctrine. He was forced to recant his findings about the globe and its movement around the sun, but he still had the last word: *Eppur si Muove*—and yet it does move.

But while the church prevailed and eventually changed its own concepts of the relationship between its values and the world of reality, it could no longer serve as the vehicle of scholarship which dealt with another approach to life, the search for truth regardless of any doctrine or of any preconceived framework of what must be. There were many attempts to construe philosophical systems which would explain it all. The new slogan was *philosophia mater scientiae*—philosophy is the mother of science. And some attempts to find the answers within the confines of a construct that explains it all still continue. Marxism doctrinally applied is the most prominent among them today.

But the life of the Western universities and the tremendous breakthrough made over the last two centuries and especially over the last few decades in our understanding of the world in which we live and in the management of our lives were not based on the acceptance of any one philosophical system; rather, they were based on the concept of the free working of the human mind. The outcome of scientific investigations and the gaining of new knowledge had to be unfettered by any preconceived formulas. The human mind, properly applied, could delve into the mysteries of the world of matter and of ideas and come out with a deeper realization of its truth. To be sure, there had to be orderly thinking; the orderly method to be used was reason.

The eighteenth century has been called the beginning of the Age of Reason. The groundwork had been laid by John Locke and English Liberalism. The relentless attack against all shibboleths of the past and the devastating wit of a Voltaire characterize this liberation of the mind. Voltaire died in 1778, the year of his return to Paris following a long exile. His return was celebrated with tremendous ovations acknowledging him the sage of the century. Voltaire was eighty-four and the ovations proved too much for him. Naturally they killed him, but what a glorious death! By that time the principle of the freedom of the human mind was accepted throughout the Western world.

This belief in reason is not maintained in a moral void. The eighteenth century philosophers held as premises basic humanist values: compassion for their fellow men and an ardent sense of justice. These protagonists for reason believed most strongly in justice to each and all, and practiced what they preached. The whole period of enlightenment was characterized by a lively questioning of authority and the stress on law as a guarantee of human freedom.

The main political application of this principle came first in the United States. This concept of freedom formed the basis of the Declaration of Independence, and provided the foundation for the American Revolution. This is still the fountain of our tradition. This is how the development of free, orderly thought at our universities is related to the reality of our life. I say orderly thought because it is crucial that we retain our respect for reason. Wild utopian schemes can only be asserted eventually by force, terror, and intimidation.

The German philosopher Kant, in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, formulated the relationship of reason to reality. In his formulation: Thought without experience is empty, experience without thinking is blind. This interdependence is also the essence of modern science: the theoretical and empirical approach, one leading to the other and back again; thesis tested and reconstructed.

The belief that from data and their analysis the truth could be found has led to extremes, especially in the social sciences. The conviction by some ardent souls that, through measuring and quantifying, the so-called soft sciences could be transformed into the life of the hard sciences is still with us. We ought to be more understanding of the complexity of the human world, and also more modest. We must realize, in addition, the limitations of our own standpoint and experience. The famous German historian Ranke, the father of modern history, claimed that in his writing he would tell the story "wie es eigentlich gewesen"—as it truly was. We know now that we cannot ever free ourselves completely from the thousand influences to which we are exposed through time and space, through upbringing, experience, and our own predilections, to be ever as objective in thesis, in selection of data, or in their evalution as we would like to be. The German poet Heine has put it most imaginatively. He had a dream in which God the Father appeared and offered the poet a choice between two blessings which God held in his hands: in one hand God held Truth, in the other the Search for Truth. And Heine chose; "Give me the Search for Truth," he said, "For the Truth is for Thee alone, oh God."—It is the search for Truth which is our endeavour.

The purpose of the university is, then, to create a climate of intellectual freedom in which the students are to gain the knowledge and method of analytical approach in their chosen fields of study that will prepare them for their role in handling the problems of our society and making ours a better world. It has been your professor's duty and vocation to share with you to the best of his ability his knowledge and his understanding of the methods of a free search for truth to obtain this goal. This is what university education is all about.

Today it is equally necessary to state what the university is not: It is not a market place for politics. Wherever political pressure has swayed or broken the free search for truth, the universities have become prostitutes of government or political forces. That was as much true in the past as it is in the present. Where all cognition has to be related to the Nazis' blood and soil, or to Marxist doctrine, or to The Thought of Mao Tse-tung, truth always suffers and society is the poorer. Academic freedom is the freedom *from* government, the freedom *from* political power, and *from* intimidation—the freedom to teach not what a majority or minority orders, but what the search for truth demands.

This is the heritage of the intellectual tradition in which our educational institutions were born and under which they made their contributions. What progress has been made towards that freedom and human dignity to which we aspire has been based upon it. Let us not lose it.

It has been said that the universities must change. Goodness, as if there had not been change all along. We no longer teach the trivium and quadrivium. We have discarded old concepts, have developed new disciplines, and have continually enriched and deepened the fields of study. The realization that change comes with movement of time and men has been ever present in the minds of thinking men. In our Western philosophical tradition, in ancient Greece, Heraklitos knew that *panta rey*—all is in flux. To portray the constant change in all life, he used the image of the stream and the inability of men to touch the same water, though the stream itself remains constant.

Today we speak of the generation gap. Goethe knew about that. In his great drama *Faust*, Goethe contrasted the ideas of the philosopher with the questions and often mischievous thought of Mephistopheles. So it was the devil who said: "Aus Recht wird Unrecht, Wohltat Plage; Weh Dir, dass Du ein Enkel bist; vom Rechte das mit uns geboren ist, von dem ist leider nie die Frage." Somewhat freely translated, this becomes in English "Right turns into wrong, blessing into curse, woe to the coming generation. The right that has been born with us remains, unfortunately dormant." In speaking through Mephistopheles, Goethe thus talks of the question of what is right and of the necessity for right to change with the change

of generations. Right, Recht in German, has a double meaning. It means not only the moral concept of what is right, but the Law as well. As a child of the Enlightenment, Goethe conceived of change as expressed by norms and not by arbitrariness. It would not have occurred to him that Law—the foundation on which all human justice rests—could itself be threatened.

Yet this is what happened in our time. I witnessed it as a student in Nazi Germany. We had Nazi student groups come into classes, threaten and intimidate professors and fellow students, and demand the removal of Jewish and other teachers and their replacement by appointees of their own choosing. We had the "crystal" night, when Nazi vandals broke all the windows—only property damage, you know. Then the Nazis took over and applied what they had preached. Personally, you will permit me to remember my father, who had taught all his life until he was ordered from the pulpit by the Nazis. The German universities knuckled under. Professors were removed, political figures appointed, and a tremendous loss to the German intellectual tradition resulted. I must say of the German professors that the majority were no heroes. They did not stand up as a group for the basic freedom of the universities. They compromised. They were practical about it. I remember the philosophy professor who spoke of the relativity of the objective approach and the need to adjust to the currents of the times. So step by step they adjusted. And it was the Nazi youth leader Baldur von Schirach who said, "In a higher sense the young are always right."

We face a very similar problem today. There is an obvious lack of understanding of the task of the universities. Once the University goes into politics on any side, it has lost its standing and purpose as the custodian of the intellectual tradition and the guarantor of the free-enterprise of the human mind.

A basic principle of this system is tolerance of different ways of thinking. Tolerance is a difficult thing to maintain. I remember an old lady in Philadelphia. She was not an old lady in tennis shoes, but she was no less determined. The classic statement she made at a dinner some years back was, "We have to be as intolerant as they are in order to make them as tolerant as we are." Intolerance is not limited to the totalitarian world. It appears in our own ranks under the guise of many causes. Some of the young, impatient with an imperfect world and immature in their grasp of the reality we live in, are most easily affected and made use of by forces they do not fully comprehend. Dissent is one thing. Ultimatums, threats, intimidation, and violence are quite another. Dissent we have had all along. It is a basic principle of democracy. Again, it was Voltaire who wrote in a letter to a friend, "I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it." The phrase has since become a household word in Western democracy. It is the very thing we are fighting for. It is almost ludicrous to hear the word dissent taunted today as if it were denied to everyone. Dissent is vital, not only in politics; it is the very essence of academic discourse.

But what is practiced today under the name of dissent is something else again. Some of the young claim that they are not listened to. Of course they are listened to, but it never occurs to them that they may be wrong. And if I may say so, what they have to say shows mostly woeful ignorance of history, which is to them irrelevant, and of the very problems with which they hope to deal. Most of them have not read even the classics of the faith they are professing. In a discussion with some of these ardent believers on the problems of Viet Nam, they were overheard accusing me of smothering them in facts. I believe that nothing is more needed today than facts and their understanding. Instead, we have emotion in lieu of reason and the attempt to force a view based on emotional generalities on those who regard knowledge and reason as important elements of decision-making.

The Nazi had a saying: "Und willst Du nicht mein Bruder sein, so schlag' ich Dir den Schädel ein." "And if you don't want to be my brother, I will crack your skull." The attempt to force the acceptance of views by means of violence is no longer dissent, even if some so-called liberals stand applauding in the wings. But we have that today in the actions of the young, who are unwilling to take no for an answer and will use any means to disrupt the institutions they cannot force to accede to their demands. They are not a majority of the younger generation, which is one of the best we have ever had. But it is worrisome that so many students, with all their idealism, have been so isolated from reality that they have learned to believe in a short-cut to their goals through strong emotions. A Czechoslovak student has written in the journal *Dissent* of the American youth as "pampered children of our permissive, affluent society, throwing tantrums because father gave them only education, security, and freedom, but not Utopia," and who have, as he states, "simply not faced up to the fact that you cannot build a Utopia without terror and that before long terror is all that remains."

Two weeks ago I met a colleague, an economist at Tufts University. He told me that he was just recovering from the daze he has been in since February, when a group of these "idealistic" college and highschool kids attacked his university, burned his library, and destroyed his manuscripts and research material, a matter of ten years of work. Some "idealism!" You may have read about the Indian scholar at Stanford who had the same experience. From my brother at Ohio State I hear of the howling mob that smashed windows and beat up the head of his department and bloodied one of his colleagues. I had a letter from Seattle about a group of students who attacked with wooden clubs other students, twelve of whom were wounded, two placed in the hospital. Many more stories could be related, but these are personal notes, not collected statistics. It seems amazing how little these outrages have been treated by the press, which, whether sensation-hungry, intimidated, or for what other reason, has leaned far too much to the side of the vandals.

This vandalism recalls the days of the past. There is the marching, the slogan shouting, and the pompous, obfuscated phraseology of Hitler's ideologue Rosenberg, comparable to the totalitarians of our day, to a Professor Marcuse, whose writings ooze intolerance. They have been described as representing "the taste for pretentious nostrums put forth in inflated language which induces excitement rather than thought" by one of the leading socialist professors at the University of Essex. It is all so far away from the reason on which universities must remain founded if they are to survive.

As a professor, I have for many years taken pride in watching the younger generation. They are a wonderful group and there is nothing wrong with there idealism. It would be very wrong if our young generation felt no longer impelled to believe in principles and in making the world a better place. The problem is the how, the where, and the means. The university is not the market place of daily politics but the last forum of rational ideas explored and transmitted, undisrupted by the pressure of political forces. I realize that this is the purpose of the vast majority of all of us. But it is nonetheless disturbing to miss some reaction from the majority of students to rally in protest against the vandals in their midst; and it is reminiscent of the past to see professors sufficiently intimidated to be willing to compromise, particularly at universities that have claimed to be the greatest. The collapse of the faculties at some of these formerly leading institutions has provoked contempt among some of our distinguished British colleagues. This British reaction has been ably summed up in a recent article by the well-known writer Robert Conquest, to whom I owe some of my references.

Let me say clearly, however, that I feel no reason for pessimism. Behind the scenes, a tremendous and successful revolution has been achieved and is still going on in the universities and outside of them. The image of the United States has radically altered over the last years, particularly in race relations and social justice. When I came here from the war in Asia thirty years ago, I was aghast at some of the prevalent attitudes, particularly towards race. Anyone who remembers this time will agree that there has been a true revolution in this and other fields. We still carry on in the tradition of the American Revolution. This has been a revolution towards freedom and not away from it.

In the totalitarianisms of our time there is modern tyranny. Yes, they speak of "revolution," but their revolution aims to impose doctrine and to assert new control over life and thought which will take us back to darker periods of the past. Their purpose is truly counter-revolutionary. Theirs is the very opposite of the tradition of the American Revolution, or the French Revolution, for that matter. At the heart of the American Revolution are the concepts of free thought, concepts of the Age of Reason.

In the Jefferson Memorial you will find inscribed the words of the Declaration of Independence, the words of reason, "We hold these truths to be self-evident," and on the opposite wall you will find a personal quote from this great American. Jefferson wrote, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against all tyranny over the minds of men." This is the revolution for which we must fight. This could be the motto of any university.

In graduating from the university, you will find that you may well move from one side of the so-called generation gap to the other. You will become targets of the young and uninformed. You will not lose your ideals, but you will have to learn to present them in your work and in your participation in society. In this future life, do not forget the universities. They are a most precious heritage of our freedom and their defense is our common cause.

WE PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE: A PETITION TO PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District of Kentucky object to rioting, looting, and arson. The hate spewing forth from the mouths of militants throughout our land has resulted in a polarization of those who love the United States of America and is evidenced by a Pledge of Allegiance signed by many Americans in the Fifth Congressional District.

I submit the pledge and names of signees for the perusal of the Members:

WE PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE: A PETITION TO PRESIDENT NIXON

We, members of the Silent Majority, object to demonstration and desecrations to our flag promoted by professional revolutionaries.

The television networks are filled with interviews of people talking about being "turned off" and alienated from their country.

We the undersigned have been alienated, too. We are alienated by the unpatriotic rabble we see on our television screens.

If you are going to listen, don't forget that we, too, are Americans.

We want you to listen not only to the angry mob, but also to the loyal, taxpaying, concerned Americans who believe that change must come only through constitutional means—not by violence and threats of violence from a small minority who attract the television cameras.

Our message to you is that we also want the war in Vietnam to end. But we think your decisions in Vietnam and Cambodia are in the best interest of America.

Do not fail us now in the face of a mob brought to a frenzy by enemies of our country.

Ruth Parker, Martin L. Parker, James M. Rush, Janice C. Rush, Kermit Hale, Irene Hale, Noah & Joann Baker, June Swartz, Dean Hale, Mildred Hale, Willis Taylor, Stella Taylor, Shirly Wyatt, Mary Rush, Tilmon Taylor, William P. Vaughn, Shirley C. Vaughn, S. S. Vaughn, Bertha H. Vaughn, Gladys H. Smith, W. H. Brumback, Ethel B. Brumback, Georgia Brumback, J. J. Brumback, Lawrence Woolums.

Mrs. Lawrence Woolums, Margaret Jones, Kathryn Scott, Katherine Jones, Mary Hadge, Mrs. Randall Hoge, Robert D. Gray, Sr., Inez C. Gray, J. W. Calvert, Lula Calvert, Mrs. Holmes Knuckles, Holmes Knuckles, Dan C. Creech, Mrs. Dan C. Creech, John H. McGeorge, Lillie Mae McGeorge, James E. McGeorge, Charles R. McGeorge, Patricia D. McGeorge, Joe C. Cornett, Thory F. Cornett, William Cornett, Lorene Cornett.

Rosa Carpenter, Norma Carpenter, William Carpenter, G. C. Farris, Jr., Ava Jean Farris, Keith Farris, Karen Farris, Kim Farris, P. H. Young, Beatrice Young, William J. Young, Jack Young, Otto Gibbs, Martha Gibbs, Jesse Gibbs, Fred Gibbs, Robert Gibbs, James Bruner, Amanda Bruner, Lawrence Duff, Jimmie J. Swafford, Jennings Gilbert, Mrs. Jennings Gilbert, Reece Baker, Flossie J. Baker.

Nettie J. Johnson, Cyrus J. Johnson, Arlie H. Cornett, Henrietta Cole, Elizabeth Haskins, Viola Emmette, Charles Emmette, Margaret W. Dyche, Preston Doughty, Freda Doughty, Mike Doughty, Rev. Sherman Adams, Mrs. Sherman Adams, Rev. Gargus Shackelford, Lois Shackelford, Brenda Shackelford, Jim Shackelford, Marie Anderson, Fray Anderson, Dave Harkleroad, Lucille Harkleroad, Gertie Cornett, Edna Wilder.

W. L. Owen, Emma Owen, Sally M. Owen, Naomi Owen, Mrs. C. Walden, C. Walden, K. C. Keney, Mrs. K. C. Keney, Kenneth V. Keney, Mrs. Kenneth V. Keney, Ruth Walker, Russell Green, Maggie F. Newman, Annie Hammons, Luther Engle, Ruby Engle, Johnny Fiechter, Mrs. Johnny Fiechter, Debbie Fiechter, Susan Fiechter, Russell Mardis, Heldon V. Hail, Ruth B. Hail, Linda Hail.

Hughie Hopkins, Shirley Hopkins, Jerry Lynn Hopkins, Wiley Hensley, Bama Hensley, Jim Logan, Minnie Logan, Robert C. Storm, Bertha Storm, Donald C. Storm, Robert L. Adams, Thena B. Adams, Eunice F. Raymer, Ollie M. Howard, Mary Swaner, Glennie Johnson, M. H. Raymer, James R. Bales, Willie Dee Bales, Elizabeth Carnell, Pearl M. Laws, Kathleen McHargue, C. R. Chesnut, Alice Chesnut.

Virgil Onkst, Dorothy W. Onkst, Wayne Onkst, Cheryl Onkst, Billy Onkst, Robert C. Jones, Julia F. Jones, Geneva Walters, Debbie Ward, Lizie Ward, Norman McKnight, Mrs. Norman McKnight, Melvin McKnight, Mrs. Melvin McKnight, Junior McKnight, Mike McKnight, Mary McKnight, Marjorie Onkst, James P. Onkst, Doris Prewitt, Jimmy Prewitt, James H. Hacker, Laura Hacker, H. C. Collett.

Lillie Collett, Loueta Smith, Chris Brummett, Dollie Brummett, James E. Hammack, Louise Hammack, Willie Hubbard, Lula Hubbard, Virgil Collett, Lenos H. Slusher, Eunice Slusher, Betty Freeman, Charles V. Freeman, Massie Collett, Wesley R. Jones, Cecil E. Yeary, Mrs. Cecil E. Yeary, Nannie Isaacs, Harry Isaacs, Vida Dentach, Minnie Garney, Edward Isaacs, Charles Gabbard, Ollie Gabbard.

Paul Sparkman, Nannie Sparkman, Paula C. Sparkman, Robert P. Sparkman, W. E. Sawyer, Grace Sawyer, Harrison F. Sawyer, Anna Lee Sawyer, Owen R. Jones, D. R. Jones, Mrs. D. R. Jones, Geary W. Wright, Mrs. Estella L. Wright, Bessie Smith, Winford Smith, Mrs. Charles C. Gaines, Charles Gaines, Linda Gaines, Sandy Gaines, Ward Gaines, Mrs. Ward Gaines, John Schott.

Hazel Fletcher, Paula Fletcher, Brenda Dunn, Sherry Dunn, Pearl Chadwell, Donny E. Vaughn, Elaine Lewis, Velva Gilbert, Sudie L. Lewis, Eliga Lewis, Donald Binder, Dolones Binder, Terry Binder, Donna Binder, Grace J. Howard, Dorthea B. Hampton, Wilma C. Hanchell, Elmer S. Nelson, Mrs. Harve McClure, Harve McClure, Joe Brown, Billie Brown.

TIRES: DISPOSAL PROBLEM SOLVED

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in this era of increasing individual awareness of environmental problems, I am always pleased to learn of specific accomplishments in our efforts to abate pollution in any form. Used and then discarded tires are an all too familiar sight to most of us. However, the magnitude of the problem may not be as well known.

Each year some 100 million scrap tires—about a million tons—are discarded. Placed tread to tread, it is estimated that they could circle the earth twice at the equator. Unfortunately, they are not strung out, but are piled high in junk or trash yards throughout the country. More disturbing yet, they are discarded along the road, in vacant lots, or burned, creating a black plume of offensive pollutants.

According to an article in the June 8, 1970, issue of Chemical and Engineering News, this disposal problem has now been solved. Bureau of Mines research personnel in cooperation with scientists and engineers from the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. have developed a disposal process which is essentially pollution free and also yields usable chemical and raw materials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

TIRES: DISPOSAL PROBLEM SOLVED

Disposal of worn-out tires has been a problem for years. In this age of pollution control, the stench and black smoke from burning old tires, the standard method of disposal, is no longer acceptable. Firestone has an answer. By summer's end, the company will have in operation a pilot destructive distillation unit at its Akron, Ohio, manufacturing complex to solve the tire disposal problem without "any solid waste, water, or air pollution."

The process will yield usable chemicals and raw materials for recycling into various manufacturing processes. If the pilot distillation plant proves commercially feasible, Firestone will set up 10 full-scale units across the country. Each plant will be capable of consuming 100,000 tons of scrap tires a year. That's equivalent to about 80 million tires per year for the 10 units, or about two fifths of the tires produced last year.

In the process, shredded tires are fed on a continuous basis to a closed thermal reactor where the tires are broken down into gas, liquid, and char phases. About 45% of the tires become a solid residue, explains Joseph R. Laman, process developer and manager of environmental engineering for Firestone. "The residue can be used as a filtering medium in tertiary sewage treatment, as a particulate in concrete by the plant industry, or as a smokeless fuel, perhaps in the metallurgical field as a coke substitute," Mr. Laman says.

The 55% gas/liquid fraction contains about 50 compounds made up of olefins, aromatics, and naphthenes, Mr. Laman says. "The product mix depends on the reactor temperature and can be varied depending on what markets are nearby. They could be used either as fuel or as feedstocks for chemical operations," he explains. Cost figures will be determined from results with the pilot-plant operations, Firestone says.

In laboratory tests, totally funded by Firestone, at the U.S. Interior Department's Bureau of Mines facility in Pittsburgh, up to 140 gallons of oils and 1500 cu. ft. of gas were obtained per ton of scrap tires distilled. The gas has a heating value of 800 to 1200 B.t.u., which is comparable to the heating value of natural gas. The batch laboratory process used at the Bureau of Mines will be upgraded to an automated, continuous process when scaled up for the pilot plant and full-scale units.

The destructive distillation process could eventually absorb all the tires scrapped in the U.S., Mr. Laman points out. "The disposal of scrap tires of all types is an ever-increasing national problem. Too many of these scrapped tires are being discarded along the highways and accumulated in unsightly trash piles; worse, large numbers are being burned in open-air dumps, thus contributing to rampant air pollution. This cannot be permitted to continue. Firestone intends to do its part to help abate air, water, and solid waste pollution. This new process is just one example of our efforts."

SO HARSH A PENALTY CALLS FOR AN APPEAL

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, citizens throughout the Nation have been aroused by the verdict of a general court-martial upon Pvt. Michael Schwarz. A number of my constituents have called and written to me expressing concern over the decision of the court. The Wichita, Kans., Eagle recently published the following editorial which properly emphasizes the importance of a prompt and thorough review and appeal of the decision. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Eagle editorial:

SO HARSH A PENALTY CALLS FOR AN APPEAL

It was a harsh penalty the seven-man general court martial imposed upon Pvt. Michael Schwarz.

He's the 21-year-old Marine convicted of premeditated murder in the fatal shooting of 12 Vietnamese civilians during a patrol last Feb. 19.

The crime is grievous indeed, and it has been on the conscience of the American people. But there seem to be some mitigating circumstances well worth considering.

While the court found that Schwarz had acted "without justification or excuse" and the trial counsel declared Schwarz's act was "not war. This was murder," defense counsel asserted the prosecution failed to show evidence that Schwarz planned to kill or had actually killed anyone.

His counsel also made the point that Schwarz was not the leader of the patrol when the alleged killings occurred and that he was ordered to fire upon the civilians by his patrol leader.

That brought the court back to the question that has been before military courts since Nuremberg whether a military man has the obligation to obey an unlawful (or an immoral) order.

Found guilty of premeditated murder, Private Schwarz was sentenced to life imprisonment at hard labor. He forfeits all pay and allowances and is to be dishonorably discharged.

All in all, it looks as if the military, caught in an embarrassing and unconscionable act, has cast about and punished the first fall guy it could find. Another young Marine similarly accused has been acquitted upon testifying that he killed no one at all in Vietnam.

Fortunately Private Schwarz has right to appeal, and it is customary in cases of this magnitude to appeal convictions.

If he is indeed guilty of premeditated murder of 12 persons it is a heinous crime. But if, as his counsel alleges, he was acting upon orders, the punishment imposed upon him by the general court martial is harsh and unjust.

The American people, who have assumed the guilt for the slayings, do not need the additional burden of wondering if they have unjustly punished a young man who may have made a gross error but was acting in their service and under orders.

It must be hoped that his case will be appealed and heard promptly.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Public Land Law Review Commission a week ago today, as you know, submitted its comprehensive report to the President and the Congress. The report, with its 400 recommendations compressed in 289 pages of text supplemented by additional pages of preface and appendix, is the result of almost 5 years of concentrated effort by a group with which I have had the honor to serve since the beginning of the 90th Congress in 1967.

The Commission started its decisionmaking process in November 1968. The complex interrelationships of the various subjects treated by the comprehensive review of this Commission made it necessary for us to meet at least once a month thereafter in order to conclude our decisionmaking in the middle of April of this year so that the report could be submitted within the time required by statute.

The Commission's report represents a consensus with a few separate views set forth in specific instances. With respect to only one of the Commission's major recommendations did I feel it necessary to indicate my own separate views; I also have some ideas of my own regarding details of other recommendations. But I estimate that I support probably 95 percent of the proposed modifications of policy, law, and procedure.

All of us have joined in asking that careful study be given of the Commission's recommendations before interested parties start taking positions and pushing for the introduction of legislation. Nonetheless, there have already been words of favor and disfavor emanating from various parts of the country.

Today at Charleston, S.C., at the Fourth Annual Conference of Federal and State Water Officials sponsored by the Water Resources Council, Commission Director Milton Pearl has reemphasized the need for careful review of the entire report because of the "oneness of the report and the interrelationships of its many recommendations." The director further points out that readers of the report will find that "there are common threads of recommended policy that are good for you and me, for all of us, that is, 'we the people,' the general public." With this conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I agree. I also call to your attention the tremendous departures in law that would be affected to provide protection for the environment and give meaning to the multiple use concept if the Commission's recommendations are implemented in principle.

Because Mr. Pearl is an exceptionally perceptive public servant who has done a remarkably effective job with this Commission, this address is timely and important. Because it contains a comprehensive overview of the foundation on which the Commission's detailed recommendations are made, under permission previously granted, I include the text of those remarks at this point in the RECORD:

PROTECTION OF PUBLIC VALUES IN PUBLIC LAND POLICY

(Remarks of Milton A. Pearl)

At noon one week ago today, there was submitted to the President and then shortly thereafter to the Congress the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission.[1] Copies were not available to anyone until a few days earlier when representatives of the news media were briefed.

From the time that the Commission's decisionmaking had been completed in April, we were emphasizing the oneness of the report and the interrelationships of its many recommendations. We urged everyone to study the report thoroughly before making decisions and we particularly urged that all concerned should refrain from singling out any one recommendation or group of recommendations and express their favor or disfavor with them. Despite that admonition, which I repeat here, we have heard from coast to coast many expressions of commendation and denunciation for various parts of the report or, for that matter, the whole report.

Some critics of the report did not even have to wait for it to become available. They knew, or as one critic said, he was "confident", that there would be objectionable features in the report and that they would have to oppose implementation of some, if not all, of the Commission's recommendations. These have been and we hope will continue to be the exceptions. We have confidence that the American people will examine carefully the fabric of public land law recommended by the Commission before deciding how they believe the public land law should be revised.

It is my purpose this noon to help orient you for the type of examination that we advocate. Naturally, there will be a focus on water and water oriented problems. But the solution of the problems associated with water resources cannot be accomplished in a vacuum; it must be accomplished as part of an overall revision of policies underlying the retention and management and disposition of the public lands. We have the opportunity now to adopt new statutes and regulations that will, unlike those in existence, be correlated with each other and have a consistent rationale.

That the current policies are outdated is recognized by all. But it was the inability to agree on how to accomplish revision on a piecemeal, case-by-case basis, that led to the concept of a commission that would undertake a comprehensive review of all aspects of the public lands and their resources. The Public Land Law Review Commission, in discharging this responsibility, has recommended 18 principles and a few common themes as the foundation of future land policy. There follow 387 recommendations focused on individual subjects but based on the underlying premises.

It seems to me that this is essential in the construction of any new public land policy. Without the foundation of basic principles, we could not escape from the chaotic legal jungle of uncertainty in which we now find ourselves. The way to go about examining the soundness of the Commission's recommendations is, therefore, to review the foundation on which the Commission built before trying to look at the specific implementing recommendations. Those who disagree with elements of the foundation should prepare their arguments, which can be discussed in the various meetings to be held in the next 6 months. I urge you not to go to the second step of how to take care of specific problems until you have agreed in your own mind on a set of principles, on the general approach to public land policy.

The Commission's foundation for new public land policy is found in 4 parts of its report: Starting on page 1, there is a short 7-page Program for the Future; then there are Chapters Two, Three, and Four dealing respectively with the questions of To Whom the Public Lands are Important, Planning of Future Public Land Use, and Public Land Policy and the Environment. Everything that follows in the other 16 chapters is designed to carry out the principles set forth in the foundation portions of the report; these foundation principles apply generally to all subjects—unless specifically stated to be exceptions.

The Act creating the Public Land Law Review Commission sets forth a policy that the public lands of the United States shall be retained and managed or disposed of, all in a manner to assure maximum benefit for the general public. When people have had the time to read this report thoroughly, they are going to find that in both the foundation

[1] Available for purchase from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, priced at $4.50.

portions, as well as the individual subject matter chapters, there are common threads of recommended policy that are good for you and me, for all of us, that is, "we the people", the general public.

Early in its deliberations, the Commission decided that there should be a reversal of the policy that the United States should dispose of all of the so-called unappropriated public domain lands, while at the same time, the Commission rejected the idea that Federal ownership of land by itself would be a reason for it to remain forever as property of the United States. This would not meet the test of maximum benefit for the general public.

The Commission's first recommendation is, accordingly, that the policy, still on the statute books, for large-scale disposal of public lands should be revised and future disposals should be of only those lands that will achieve maximum benefit for the general public in non-Federal ownership while retaining in Federal ownership those lands where values must be preserved so that they may be used and enjoyed by all Americans. The report goes on to say "while there may be some modest disposals, we conclude that at this time most public lands would not serve the maximum public interest in private ownership."

The Commission then proceeds to set forth a process by which the selective disposals would be identified and also to spell out the proposed rules and regulations for the management of the bulk of the public lands which would be retained in Federal ownership.

In connection with water resources, the report states, *"in any event, critical watershed lands, designated or classified as such, must be retained in Federal ownership."* Likewise, the Commission recommends that key fish and wildlife habitat zones be retained in Federal ownership.

An extensive review of all lands not previously designated by legislative sanction for specific use should be undertaken, in the Commission's view, in order to determine the type of use that will provide the maximum benefit for the general public. Briefly, in the introductory Program for the Future and in greater detail in Chapter Two, the Commission spells out and recommends for future use its concept of what constitutes the maximum benefit for the general public and how you go about determining it.

The third major point made by the Commission is that Congress has failed to properly define delegations of authority to the executive branch and that it should do so promptly and clearly. As a corollary to this recommendation, it is then suggested that the public land management agencies should be required by statute to promulgate comprehensive rules and regulations, but to do so only after considering all points of view, including protests.

The Commission then recommends the establishment of statutory goals and objectives to provide guidelines for land use planning in a framework designed to extend the multiple-use concept "under the general principle that within a specific unit consideration should be given to all possible uses and the maximum number of compatible uses permitted."

In an area of concern to this group, the Commission found that in both law and regulation watershed protection and management objectives are generally uncertain and often conflicting with the result, among others, that current expenditures are inadequate to achieve minimal program objectives. Accordingly, the Commission recommends that there be a statutory directive for the land management agencies to submit a comprehensive report describing their current watershed protection and management program objectives with information on both how these are carried out and the effect of the practices. With this information in hand, it should be possible to establish statutory goals for watershed protection and management and provide the funds necessary to achieve them.

The Commission then seeks to refine the doctrine of multiple use by recommending that where an area is managed for many uses and it can contribute the maximum benefit through one particular use, that particular use should be recognized as a dominant use and the land should be managed to avoid interference with fulfillment of the dominant use. There is no distinction made between passive uses and active uses. Endorsement of the Wilderness Preservation System is provided and recommendations are made for early identification of new areas that should be set aside as wilderness or parks.

In accepting the report from Chairman Aspinall, President Nixon, who had not had the opportunity of reviewing it and could not, therefore, respond to it, stated: ". . . it is essential to plan now for the use of [public] land, not to do it on simply a case-by-case basis, but to have an overall policy, a strategy rather than simply the tactics dealing with case-by-case matters when they come up." This is the very principle that the Commission, too, had found lacking in present policy and law, although we recognize that the President's means of solving the problem may be quite different from that proposed by the Commission. Multiple-use Acts provide authorization, but no direction of how to resolve conflicts and, therefore, require continual case-by-case settlement.

We have removed from general multiple use over 10 million acres of land for wilderness protection. Another 44 million acres of land must be reviewed for inclusion in the Wilderness System, and the Commission recommends that all unreserved areas be reexamined to see which, if any, additional areas should be protected. These areas and the national parks would be guaranteed against nonconforming intrusions and resource development.

What the Commission then says is to go a step further and identify—under the procedure of thorough planning and public participation—areas whose dominant use should be for fish and wildlife habitat, for watershed protection, for recreation, for grazing domestic livestock, and also for timber among other uses. It is only in these dominant use areas that the secondary uses would in a conflict have to yield to the dominant use. Timber cutting would never be permitted, for example, in critical watershed or key fish and wildlife areas if such commercial activity endangered the dominant use. Is it unfair, the Commission asks, in return for all the no-cutting zones that are established to assure that the growing need for wood products will have some 30 to 40 million acres of high timber production land available from federally owned forests?

After recommending that key fish and wildlife habitat zones should be identified and formally designated for such dominant use, and that such areas be retained in Federal ownership, the Commission observes that such classification will assure continuity of public land programs.

From the very beginning, we sought to focus attention on the enhancement, or at least maintenance, of the environment by calling for the development of certain information and data in the manuscripts of our research program. We programmed a separate Study of Public Land Policy and the Environment towards the end of the research program believing that we could draw upon information in the commodity studies which would be completed by then. The difficulty was, as stated in the Commission's report, that there is an absence of statutory guidelines by which land management agencies can provide for environmental control. Although two recent statutes provide general principles, there are no specifics concerning public land management.

One of the Commission's basic recommendations calls in the strongest terms for the establishment of statutory guidelines to assure that the quality of environment is an essential in every phase of public land management and disposal. To support the general principle, there are 51 specific major and subsidiary recommendations covering every possible aspect of concern for the environment in general and with regard to various uses, including timbering, mining, oil and gas activities, water resource development, fish and wildlife protection, park use, and various miscellaneous uses.

The principle of receiving full value for its lands and resources is next suggested as a major guidepost. Exceptions would include situations where lands and resources are made available to non-Federal public bodies. In return for obtaining full value and being subject to strict control measures, it is recommended that users be assured firm tenure and security of investment with a proviso that interruption of use before the end of a contractual term would qualify him for equitable compensation.

Another basic principle advocated by the Commission is that state and local governments should be compensated for the burdens imposed on them by the retention in Federal ownership of millions of acres of land that heretofore had been considered to be destined to go into private ownership. Finding that the present systems of revenue sharing bear no relationship to the burdens of Federal landownership, the Commission then recommends that there be a system of payments in lieu of taxes subject to qualifications designed to insure equity to the Federal taxpayer. Simply stated, it is advocated that if the national interest dictates retaining large areas of land in Federal ownership, the cost should be borne by the entire country.

After concluding that the current settlement and disposition laws are inadequate, the Commission recommends statutory authority for the sale at full value of public domain lands in those relatively small number of instances where the sale is in the public interest and important public values will not thereby be lost.

Basic recommendations are made to seek the use of public lands to alleviate some of the pressures for the establishment of new urban living areas. The Commission rejected the idea of transplanting large numbers of people to public land areas, but recommends enactment of legislation to provide for large units of land to be made available for the expansion of existing communities or the development of new cities. Pending some experience in the field, it is recommended that Congress consider proposals for new cities on a case-by-case basis.

Specific recommendations on basic principles conclude with proposals to eliminate or reduce differences in policies among public land programs, to include limited disposition of Forest Service lands, consolidation of responsibility for land management programs in both the legislative and executive branches, and, finally, that in all public land decisions, the Federal Government should, as the Commission did, seek to achieve maximum benefit for the general public by taking into consideration the national public, the regional public, the Federal Government as sovereign, the Federal Government as proprietor, the users of public lands and resources, and state and local governmental entities within which the lands are located as being the interests that, in the aggregate, make up the general public.

The Program for the Future ends with certain fundamental premises and beliefs inherent in the underlying principles. Some of these are particularly applicable in the field of water resources, and it is these upon which I will touch.

Maintenance of a strong federalism within a framework of Government functioning in a manner that reflects the principles set forth in the Constitution. To support and strengthen the role of state and local government, the Commission recommends legislative action to do away with the uncertainty caused by the implied reservation doctrine. This would provide the necessary basis for future water resource development planning cooperatively between the United States and the public land states. To carry this out, the Commission specifically recommends that the amounts of surface and subsurface water claimed to have been reserved with the reservation of Federal lands should be formally established subject to procedures to contest each claim. Then, in future land withdrawals and reservations, the Commission recommends that water requirements be expressly reserved.

Protection of individual rights with assurance that each individual citizen is dealt with fairly and equitably. The Commission was concerned that equity be afforded holders of water rights vested under state law, whose rights could be curtailed without compensation through the strict application of the reservation doctrine. However, the Commission here, as in other parts of the report, recognizes the supremacy of the Federal Government. Based on its conclusion that earlier cases did not clearly establish the reservation doctrine as we know it today, the Commission recommends that compensation should be awarded where the reservation doctrine interferes with uses under water rights vested under state law prior to the 1963 United States Supreme Court decision in *Arizona* v. *California,* when the full meaning of the reservation doctrine became known to all.

Better planning will provide increased efficiency in the allocation of resources and the investment of funds. In the separate chapter on planning and throughout the report, emphasis is placed on the need for better planning, coordinated with all concerned. In a specific recommendation. the Commission suggests that there be a statutory requirement for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers in their project justification reports to identify all potential project impacts on other public land values with specific findings and recommendations with respect to such impacts. Similarly, a recommendation is made that the Federal Power Act be amended for a like purpose. We recognize that this recommendation, which was adopted by the Commission before enactment of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 has, to some extent, been touched on by that Act. Implementation will reveal whether the requirements envisioned by the Public Land Law Review Commission are in fact covered by the Environmental Policy Act.

In submitting these recommendations for your consideration, we reiterate what we have been saying for some time now. This is a complex subject which must be viewed in the context of the entire history of our country. Take your time in studying and understanding the interrelationships. In addition to reading this concise report, which covers 289 pages of text and additional preface and appendix material, I urge all concerned to read the History of Public Land Law Development,[2] prepared as part of our research program by Professor Paul Wallace Gates of Cornell University with a chapter by Professor Robert W. Swenson of the University of Utah, even if you cannot read the other 32 manuscripts that comprise our research program. By examining the mistakes of the past, we can avoid pitfalls in the future.

The public land laws need revision. The specifics are not as important as the fact that the work that has been done in the last 5 years can be the starting point—but only if we all work together with a common goal to fulfill the needs of today and tomorrow without hastily condemning or embracing any set of recommendations or seeking to impose preconceived bias. I have confidence that we will work together and that we will succeed.

[2] Available for purchase from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, prices at $8.25.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, because I firmly believe in the American public's "right-to-safety" in the retail products it buys, I have introduced what I consider a landmark consumer protection bill in the Congress with the expressed purpose of eliminating all preventable hazards to health and safety—not as an optional extra, but as a matter of clear right to the consumer.

My bill, H.R. 18209, would create an independent Consumer Product Safety Commission with wide authority to set and enforce national product safety standards—to help protect consumers against dangers to public health, and the risk of serious injury or death, resulting from distribution and sale of unsafe or hazardous retail goods.

Most people assume that the Federal Government already exercises broad regulatory powers in the interest of their safety.

The unfortunate fact is, however, that Federal authority to curb hazards in consumer products is virtually nonexistent.

In supporting the need for this legislation, Mr. Speaker, let me cite a recent in-depth study requested by Congress, which estimated that more than 20,000,000 Americans are injured each year as a result of incidents related to consumer products—four times as many as in highway accidents.

Of the total, 30,000 are killed, 110,000 are permanently disabled, and 600,000 are serious enough to require hospitalization.

The study also listed several major categories of household products it had found to involve unreasonable hazards, including: glass bottles, color TV sets—fire hazards, door and shower glass, fireworks, floor furnaces, "high-rise" bicycles—rated first by physicians on a list of products associated with injuries they treat in their offices, hot-water vaporizers, household chemicals, infant furniture, ladders, powertools, protective headgear, rotary lawnmowers, toys, unvented gas heaters, and wringer washing machines.

In addition to establishing comprehensive national safety standards for consumer products sold through retail stores, H.R. 18209 would authorize the new Product Safety Commission to ban the sale of unsafe articles; require purchaser notification, and recall or replacement of defective items; make onsite inspections of manufacturing plants; and set up a national injury information clearinghouse.

A unique feature of the legislation would be the creation of an independent Consumer Safety Advocate to be appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate—a sort of national consumer "ombudsman"—with responsibility to represent the public interest in all proceedings and activities of the new Commission.

Mr. Speaker, because of the vital importance of this matter to every American, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a recent news release from the National Commission on Product Safety announcing and summarizing the Commission's final report, together with the covering letter of transmittal to the President and the Congress, and the Forward and Summary of Findings and Recommendations contained in the report.

In addition, I include the text of my bill, H.R. 18209, the Consumer Product Safety Act of 1970.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY RELEASES FINAL REPORT

The final report of the National Commission on Product Safety presented today to the President and Congress makes a strong plea for comprehensive Federal safety legislation.

The Commission also urges a permanent separate agency to deal exclusively with product safety.

The two-year study makes definite recommendations in the field of product safety; names 16 categories of products found to be unreasonably hazardous; cites the failings in the voluntary standards-setting system of industry; examines Federal, State and local laws relating to product safety; describes innovative techniques in the reporting of product-related injuries; advocates Federal authority for mandatory safety standards with a wide range of sanctions (civil and criminal).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Highlight of the 15 recommendations by the Commission is the proposal that Congress enact an omnibus Consumer Product Safety Act committing the authority and resources of the Federal government to the elimination of unreasonable product hazards:

Creating an independent Consumer Product Safety Commission as a Federal agency concerned exclusively with the safety of consumer products;

Empowering that new agency to develop and set mandatory consumer product safety standards when necessary;

Empowering the Commission to enforce compliance with Federal safety standards through a broad range of civil and criminal sanctions;

Authorizing the agency to seek an injunction of the sale of consumer products which present unreasonable hazards or which violate Federal safety standards.

Other recommendations suggested for the proposed new agency include that:

The Commission have recall authority for those products which violate Federal standards or which are unreasonably dangerous.

That an Injury Information Clearinghouse be established to collect and analyze data on injuries or deaths associated with products.

That a Consumer Safety Advocate to the Commission be appointed by the President with responsibility to represent only consumers in proceedings before the agency.

That in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce the Consumer Product Safety Commission be authorized to accredit private testing laboratories and that the Commission be empowered to require independent testing of products which present an unreasonable risk.

That existing Small Business Administration programs be expanded to authorize low interest loans to assist small businesses in meeting product safety requirements.

That injured consumers be permitted to file individual or class actions for treble damages in U.S. District Courts against manufacturers who intentionally violate Federal standards.

INDUSTRY SELF-REGULATION

The study states that manufacturers need to build safety into the design and construction of their products and to take all practical steps to anticipate consumer misuse.

The Commission came to the conclusion that self-regulation by trade associations and standards groups and independent testing laboratories was "legally unenforceable and patently inadequate." The report said that the consensus principle, the core of voluntary standards-setting, is not suitable for safety improvement. The panel reported that self-regulation tends to permit the least responsible segment of an industry to retard progress and thus reduce the standard to the lowest common denominator.

The report further stresses that consumers do not have a substantial voice in standards-setting procedures; "that dependence on industry financing and technical experts paid by industry as regular employees, consultants or contractors tend to subordinate national interests to private ends."

The report makes clear that the Commission is not opting for safety standards-setting by the Federal government across the board. It says that the need rather is for broad Federal authority to set safety standards. It is the Commission's belief that strong standards-making authority will stimulate industry to develop adequate voluntary standards without the need for Federal intervention.

UNREASONABLE HAZARDS

In listing 16 product categories found to be unreasonable hazards the Commission used five primary sources of data: public hearings, of which the Commission held 10 in the two years of its existence; a survey of injuries treated by U.S. physicians in April 1969; surveillance of injuries seen in emergency rooms of 14 hospitals, a survey of product liability insurance claims from April to June 1969 and an extensive analysis of data compiled by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the National Safety Council.

Product categories in which some types and models were found to be unreasonable hazards are (listed in alphabetical order): architectural glass; color television sets which have been found prone to fire hazards; fireworks; floor furnaces which are gas-fired and reach searing temperatures; glass bottles; high-rise bicycles; hot water vaporizers; household chemical; infant furniture; ladders; power tools; protective headgear; rotary lawn mowers; toys; unvented gas heaters; wringer washer machines.

The report points out that not all products in all categories are unreasonably hazardous. It further states that "still other categories which may harbor unreasonable hazards were not investigated in sufficient depth by the Commission to warrant a specific finding of unreasonableness."

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAWS

Commission studies of state and local laws reveal confusion. It is possible for manufacturers to sell a hazardous product in other states and cities that they are prohibited from selling in their own. These discrepancies are often as hard on the manufacturer as on the consumer. There is no comprehensive authority within the Federal government to protect the consumer. Too, there is confusion of jurisdiction. Federal safety regulation of a given product may be shared with as many as four agencies, none of which has adequate funding or manpower to do the job.

In the opinion of the Commission "Federal product safety regulation is burdened by unnecessary obstacles, circumscribed investigative powers, inadequate and ill-fitting sanctions; bureaucratic lassitude, timid administration, bargain-basement budgets, distorted priorities and misdirected technical resources."

PRODUCT-RELATED INJURY DATA

The Commission findings borne out by witnesses from industry and consumer groups, relate difficulties in obtaining complete and valid statistical information on product-related injuries. Major data sources have been traditionally the National Health Survey and other units in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare but these statistics are limited.

The Commission experimented with new methods of collecting this much-needed data. The 12-key touch-tone telephone was used to relay data from the emergency room records of 14 hospitals to a GSA computer center in the District of Columbia for processing and retrieval. About 64 percent of the injuries were associated with consumer products. The Commission foresees a national network of hospital emergency rooms to provide such data with statistical samples based on 200 hospitals and 200 physicians as scientifically valid. Rapid electronic analysis of injury reports triggers the selection of cases for full field investigation.

The Commission also conducted a survey of product liability claims closed out by insurance companies during three months of 1969. Some 2,582 claims were reported by 545 companies.

A questionnaire was also sent in 1969 to 79,000 physicians. Of the 12,276 injuries reported by 10,540 doctors, 9,370 related to products. The Commission urges a government bank of injury data based on such sources as epidemiologic studies, death certificates, hospital emergency rooms, physicians reports, consumer complaints, clinical reports and insurance claims.

ECONOMICS OF SAFETY

The cost of safety was extensively explored in studies by the Commission which revealed that the cost of safety is often minimal. The cost of tempered safety glass to reduce the hazards in new glass doors is about $10 per three foot panel above the cost of plain glass.

In its study on rotary lawn mowers, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratories concluded that improvements in design need not significantly alter the present price range except perhaps in the lowest priced models. Safer dishwasher detergents would cost little more.

The Commission has concluded that in many cases the cost of injury far outweighed the cost of safety improvements to the economy. The annual cost to the nation of product-related injuries may exceed 5.5 billion. Some 20 million Americans are injured each year; some 110,000 are permanently disabled and 30,000 are killed.

The Commission, established by Congress in 1967 under Public Law 90–146, has seven commissioners appointed by former President Lyndon B. Johnson in March 1968. To permit the Commission its full two year study its life was extended seven months under legislation signed by President Richard Nixon in October 1969.

Chairman of the Commission is Arnold B. Elkind, a New York attorney. Members include: Emory J. Crofoot, attorney, Portland, Oreg.; Henry A. Hill, President, Riverside Research Laboratory, Haverhill, Mass.; Sidney Margolius, syndicated columnist, New York City; Michael Pertschuk, Chief Counsel, Senate Commerce Committee; Hugh L. Ray, Director, Merchandise and Testing Laboratory, Sears, Roebuck and Company, Chicago, Ill. (retired); and Dana Young, Senior Vice President, Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas. Executive Director is William V. White and General Counsel is Michael R. Lemov.

FINAL REPORT, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY, PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS, JUNE 1970

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON
PRODUCT SAFETY,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1970.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to Section 2(c), Public Law 90–146, I have the honor to transmit herewith the final report of the National Commission on Product Safety containing its findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

By direction of the Commission,

EMORY J. CROFOOT.
SIDNEY MARGOLIS.
HUGH L. RAY.
ARNOLD B. ELKIND,
Chairman.
HENRY AARON HILL.
MICHAEL PERTSCHUK.
DANA YOUNG.

FOREWORD

The National Commission on Product Safety was authorized by Public Law 90–146. The Commission was appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson on March 27, 1968. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations which follow are the end product of the intervening efforts of the seven-man, bipartisan Commission, the staff, and a number of contractors retained by the Commission for insight into specialized fields.

When it authorized the Commission, Congress recognized that modern technology poses a threat to the physical security of consumers. We find the threat to be bona fide and menacing. Moreover, we believe that, without effective governmental intervention, the abundance and variety of unreasonable hazards associated with consumer products cannot be reduced to a level befitting a just and civilized society.

Rhetoric, educational campaigns, piecemeal legislation, and appeals to conscience serve the useful function of mitigating the fallout of injuries induced by our complex technology. But we believe, on the basis of the evidence presented to us, that a concerned government can and should provide a continuing system to assure that our great technological resources are used to protect consumers from unreasonable product risks.

Perhaps a case can be made for the acceptability of willful personal risk-taking by an occasional well-informed consumer, but there is no justification for exposing an entire populace to risks of injury or death which are not necessary and which are not apparent to all. Such hazards must be controlled and limited not at the option of the producer but as a matter of right to the consumer. Many hazards described in this report are unnecessary and can be eliminated without substantially affecting the price to the consumer.

Unfortunately, in the absence of external compulsion it is predictable that there will continue to be an indecent time lag between exposure to a hazard and its elimination. Other advanced nations apparently have discovered this flaw in the output of competitive free enterprise and have made safe products an ongoing governmental objective.

This report proposed means which afford American industry an opportunity to progress voluntarily toward product safety and

which, at the same time, should guarantee a new dynamism to that effort. Our suggested procedures are equitable to the consumer and producer alike. The goal is clear. This Nation's safety standards and practices must have an exemplary quality consistent with the primacy of American technology.

The operative processes responsible for the unacceptable conditions we found are truly impersonal. Producers, sellers, and buyers have been trapped by complex economic forces which have been understood by too few and addressed all too seldom.

A major concern of our recommendations has been to provide government with an adaptive instrumentality for protecting the consumer from product hazards for a reasonable time to come. The historic stream of product safety flows swiftly and erratically. The quality of protection appropriate at a given time depends on technology, the economy, and the temper of our humanitarian concern. If acted upon, this final report will be a beginning to an era of consumer protection rather than an end to our endeavors.

Although this report is directed to the President and Congress, we earnestly hope that consumers, businessmen, and the professional and academic communities will find its contents useful in the common search for methods to protect human life and safety in an environment which seems progressively to magnify the challenge to "live and be well."

By direction of the Commission.

ARNOLD B. ELKIND,
Chairman.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Perspective on product safety

Summary Findings

This Commission has now, within the resources and time allotted, carried out the direction of the President and the Congress to "conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the scope and adequacy of measures now employed to protect consumers against unreasonable risks of injuries which may be caused by hazardous household products."

Congress requested our answers to several critical questions:

(1) What is the measure of exposure of American consumers to unreasonable product hazards?

(2) Which specific categories of products were found to present such hazards?

(3) To what extent does self-regulation by industry afford adequate protection against such hazards?

(4) To what extent do Federal, State, local authorities, and

(5) to what extent does the common law protect the consumer against such hazards?

Our answers to these questions in summary are as follows:

Measure of exposure

Americans—20 million of them—are injured each year in the home as a result of incidents connected with consumer products.[1] Of the total, 110,000 are permanently disabled and 30,000 are killed. A significant number could have been spared if more attention had been paid to hazard reduction. The annual cost to the Nation of product-related injuries may exceed $5.5 billion.

[1] We use the term "consumer products" (instead of "household products" as referred to in our enabling law) because that term best describes our statutory mandate and most products which are not now subject to adequate Federal safety regulation. Consumer products include all retail products used by consumers in or around the household, except foods, drugs, cosmetics, motor vehicles, insecticides, firearms, cigarettes, radiological hazards, and certain flammable fabrics.

The exposure of consumers to unreasonable consumer product hazards is excessive by any standard of measurement.

Unreasonable hazards

Within the following categories of products, we found a number of makes, models, or types harboring unreasonable hazards to the American consumer: architectural glass, color television sets, fireworks, floor furnaces, glass bottles, high-rise bicycles, hot-water vaporizers, household chemicals, infant furniture, ladders, power tools, protective headgear, rotary lawnmowers, toys, unvented gas heaters, and wringer washers. Not all products in each category are unreasonably hazardous. Still other categories which may harbor unreasonable hazards were not investigated in sufficient depth by us to warrant a specific finding that unreasonable hazards exist.

Self-regulation

As related to product safety, self-regulation by trade associations and standards groups, drawing upon the resources of professional associations and independent testing laboratories, is legally unenforceable and patently inadequate.

Competitive forces may require management to subordinate safety factors to cost considerations, styling, and other marketing imperatives.

There is a dearth of factors motivating producers toward safety. Only a few of the largest manufacturers have coherent, articulated safety engineering programs. Manufacturers' efforts to obtain data on injuries and on the costs and benefits of design changes that will reduce unreasonable hazards can be charitably described as sketchy and sporadic.

Industry activities to develop safety standards can provide an important forum for marshaling the technical competence necessary for this work, but their voluntary nature inherently inhibits the development of optimal standards.

The consensus principle, which is at the heart of all voluntary standards making, is not effective for elevating safety standards. It permits the least responsible segment of an industry to retard progress in reducing hazards.

The measure of voluntary consumer protection provided by the certification programs of independent laboratories is substantial, but is theoretically flawed by the laboratory's economic dependence on the goodwill of the manufacturer even if the laboratory is nonprofit.

The protection afforded by various seals of approval is no better than the technical competence, product-testing protocols, and independence of the certifier. When an industry association awards the seal, or when it is awarded in return for paid advertising, the seal may convey a deceptive implication of third-party independence. Consumers appear to attribute to such endorsements a significance beyond their specific meaning.

Protection by Law

Federal law

Consumers assume that the Federal Government excerises broad regulatory authority in the interest of their safety. And yet the short answer to this question is that Federal authority to curb hazards in consumer products is virtually nonexistent.

Federal product safety legislation consists of a series of isolated acts treating specific hazards in narrow product categories. No Government agency possesses general authority to ban products which harbor unreasonable risks or to require that consumer products conform to minimum safety standards.

Such limited Federal authority as does exist is scattered among many agencies. Jurisdiction over a single category of products may be shared by as many as four different departments or agencies. Moreover, where it exists, Federal product safety regulation is burdened by unnecessary procedural obstacles, circumscribed investigative powers, inadequate and ill-fitting sanctions, bureaucratic lassitude, timid administration, bargain-basement budgets, distorted priorities, and misdirected technical resources.

Nevertheless, where there is adequate authority and administrative support, Federal safety standards programs have demonstrated a capacity for substantially upgrading industry safety practices.

The Federal Government operates no injury data center charged with responsibility for the systematic collection, evaluation, and dissemination of data related to product safety. It has no early-warning system to alert responsible officials in business and Government of suspected areas of latent product risk. Data on the number and nature of injuries from consumer products remain far from satisfactory, despite several revealing probes in the data collection field conducted by us.

Federal law now provides no machinery to enjoin a manufacturer from marketing consumer products that are unreasonably dangerous. There is no way to compel the recall of such products for repair or replacement.

No Federal law provides meaningful criminal penalties for manufacturers who knowingly or willfully market consumer products that create an unreasonable danger to life and health.

No Federal agency has authority to order studies or hearings to determine the presence of an unreasonable hazard in most consumer products; to order the development of standards or to issue regulations to reduce the hazard; to enforce such orders; to evaluate safety standards, tests, and standards-making procedures; to monitor compliance with safety standards; to accredit independent laboratories to check compliance; to require that information on product safety be collected and freely exchanged; to support voluntary or State programs to reduce product hazards; or to conduct programs of training and research in product safety.

State and local law

Our studies of State and local laws show a hodgepodge of tragedy-inspired responses to challenges that cannot be met by restricted geographical entities. Local prohibitions against sale of hazardous items cannot be enforced against the retailer across the city line. Manufacturers of hazardous products can make and ship out items that cannot be sold at retail in their own community. Without central leadership, States and municipalities are unable to chart broad spectrum product safety programs. Balkanized jurisdiction plagues some manufacturers with diverse manufacturing specifications that interfere with distribution of their products.

Common law

The common law has not been primarily concerned with prospective enforcement of product safety but with postinjury remedies. There are no reports of consumers successfully restraining the marketing of potentially hazardous products. The costs of such litigation would be beyond the means of citizens or concerned groups.

In the absence of the contingent fee, the injured consumer most often would be unable to seek compensation for damages caused by product-related injuries. He must first be aware of his legal right to sue the producers of the defective product and, second, he must have sustained sufficient damage so that an attorney will find in his cause the promise of an adequate fee. Then, after intolerable delays, the consumer finally has a

day in court in which he may be faced with overcoming an array of practical and legal hurdles.

Despite its humanitarian adaptations to meet the challenge of product-caused injuries, the common law puts no reliable restraint upon product hazards.

Conclusion

Because of the inadequacy of existing controls on product hazards, we find a need for a major Federal role in the development and execution of methods to protect the American consumer.

Paths to Safety

In formulating our recommendations, we elected not to choose between describing general policies, on the one hand, and prescribing specific action, on the other. Since we do not presume to anticipate the wishes of Congress, we determine to state both our general policies and their specific implications. The proposed Consumer Product Safety Act which we respectfully submit with this report is the concrete expression of our recommendations.

Injury factors

There are those who believe that safety, like charity, begins at home in the behavior of the family—steadying ladders, storing knives, supervising children. Others believe that safety begins with the home itself, the environment where hazardous products find their uses—good lighting, well-insulated wiring, slipproof bathtubs and rugs, latched cabinets for medicine and household chemicals. A third view is that safety begins in the factory and involves design, construction, hazard analysis, and quality control.

None of these views is wholly right or wrong. The classical concept of epidemiology counts all three factors: host, environment, and agent. Close examination of the three uncovers many subsidiary factors: hosts of different capacities and habits; differing social, political, and psychological as well as physical environments; and agents acting in combination, additively, or serially.

With due regard for the multiple factors affecting household safety, sound strategy for a safety program is to seek the weak link in a chain of events leading to injury and to break the chain at that point.

After considering the many forces contributing to the toll of injuries in and around the American home, we have concluded that the greatest promise for reducing risks resides in energizing the manufacturer's ingenuity.

We do not mean that manufacturers by themselves can do all that is needed to achieve an optimal safety record. We mean that with Government stimulation they can accomplish more for safety with less effort and expense than any other body—more than educators, the courts, regulatory agencies, or individual consumers.

Manufacturers have it in their power to design, build, and market products in ways that will reduce if not eliminate most unreasonable and unnecessary hazards. Manufacturers are best able to take the longest strides to safety in the least time. The capacity of individual manufacturers to devise safety programs, without undue extra cost, has been demonstrated repeatedly in the course of our short history: in safety glass, double-insulated power tools, baffles on rotary mowers, noncombustible TV transformers, and releases on wringer washers.

Energy factors

We do not imagine that, even without regard to cost, safety programs on the manufacturer's level can eliminate all household hazards. A society which uses energy in the volume and variety of forms prevalent in ours is certain to see traces of that energy go astray. Instead of doing the work intended, the energy can damage property and person. In whatever form—chemical, mechanical, thermal, electrical, nuclear, acoustic—energy which is misdirected cuts, strangles, burns, bruises, fractures, suffocates, poisons, shocks, and ruptures.

Behavioral factors

Danger is a regrettable but unavoidable facet of life. Many persons who like to fly, surf, dive, or speed are proud of their ability to cope with it. Usually, they are keenly conscious of the hazards and take pains to control them.

But everyone, at one time or another, suffers from complacency, a certainty that everything is under control, that injuries happen only to the other fellow. Then, in that moment of carefree confidence, disaster strikes. The mower goes over a grade, slips out of control, and the blades chop at the feet. Many, with utmost care, commit themselves to handling dangerous instruments which, for lack of experience, knowledge, or skill, they cannot manage. An ineradicable minority is careless; they will wear a flammable garment near an open fire; use a power saw without a guard; work a lathe without safety glasses.

Environmental factors

In addition to such behavioral factors, a hazardous environment aggravates the frequency and severity of injuries. Some environmental hazards are sporadic: power surges, extremes of temperature or humidity. The worst hazards are common and chronic.

The majority of American homes contain potential electrical fire and shock hazards: worn or defective wiring, overloaded circuits, or an absence of grounding. Injuries result from dim lighting, uneven floors, irregular steps, slippery surfaces, obstacles, steep inclines, poor drainage, or faulty ventilation. Broken glass and rusty cans litter yards and alleys. Much of a child's play amounts to running a gauntlet of environmental hazards.

Manufacturers' responsibility

Prospects for measurable reform of human behavior are distant. Similarly, there is little hope for an early improvement of the home environment. The limited power of conventional educational methods has been described by our witnesses.

Consequently, while continuing to educate and seeking even better ways, there seems little choice but to concentrate on reducing unreasonable hazards by encouraging additional care in the design and manufacture of products.

The law has tended in recent years to place full responsibility for injuries attributable to defective products upon the manufacturer.

But beyond his liability for damages, a producer owes society-at-large the duty to assure that unnecessary risks of injury are eliminated. He is in the best position to know what are the safest designs, materials, construction methods, and modes of use. Before anyone else, he must explore the boundaries of potential danger from the use of his product. He must be in a position to advise the buyer competently how to use and how to maintain and repair the product.

Technical problems of assuring the quality of a product can be difficult to manage, particularly when demands are high and labor in short supply. When the will to make a product safe is weak, protection for the consumer is even weaker. Among many manufacturers, fortunately, the will to reduce hazards is not weak, but it may be frustrated by competitive forces.

The Government role

Paradoxically, the processes of Government share the onus for our lagging product safety efforts. Rightly or wrongly, antitrust considerations are broadly construed to outlaw agreements by competitors to expunge particular hazards from the marketplace. While exemption from the antitrust laws would create more problems than it would solve, the sincere efforts of many producers to achieve uniform optimum safety for their products can be frustrated without positive governmental involvement.

For the following reasons, we conclude that the Federal Government, both to protect consumers and to strengthen manufacturers' efforts, should enact comprehensive legal measures to reduce hazards:

In the absence of compulsion to reduce risks in consumer products, manufacturers who cut corners on safety have an unfair competitive advantage over responsible manufacturers.

Manufacturers have advised us that they seek Government aid in gathering data which will help to explain injuries and their causes and to suggest priorities for preventing injuries.

Potentially, the cost of meeting safety requirements may require sellers to raise prices above a desirable level or may impose an unwarranted and unacceptable design on a product; accordingly, Government must participate, in behalf of the consumer, in making the quasi-political decision of determining how much risk to safety the public should tolerate under the circumstances.

Voluntary safety standards decided upon by an industry may unfairly penalize some manufacturers, small businessmen particularly, to the advantage of others.

Although safety standards must be written with the assistance of technical personnel who know most about the product, Government can best determine impartially whether a safety standard is sufficient.

When some manufacturers ignore safety standards, only Government can assure compliance. To implement compliance, only Government can require that authorized laboratories certify that products meet safety requirements. Government can assure that programs to inspect products and report injuries will be effectively financed. Government should enjoin actions which carelessly put the consumer in jeopardy. And, when voluntary safety standards are absent or insufficient, Government should insist that industry devise a sufficient standard or develop and issue its own.

Critical Questions

Having concluded that remedial action was essential to reduce product hazards to consumers, we faced certain critical questions:

(1) Should Federal authority be extended to new programs to reduce unreasonable hazards in consumer products and, if so, what form should such authority take?

(2) In view of the frustrations and disappointments characterizing some Federal efforts in behalf of the consumer, what could be done to strengthen such efforts and bolster the position of the consumer in the sometimes intricate regulatory processes?

(3) What role should mandatory safety standards play in reducing product hazards?

We approach these questions without prejudice. In framing judgments, we relied on our own hearings and inquiries as well as the literature of administrative law and Government regulation. On the whole, our approach was pragmatic. We looked at what had been done and at a variety of critiques and proposals as indications of what might be done. And we concluded, with virtual unanimity, that—

Broad responsibility for the safety of consumer products should be vested in a conspicuously independent Federal regulatory agency, a Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

There should be one official appointed by the President as a Consumer Safety Advocate to the Commission's staff, whose primary responsibility is to serve as the consumer's spokesman before the CPSC on all issues within its jurisdiction.

Extensive authority to issue regulations

and develop mandatory safety standards should be granted to the CPSC to anticipate or reduce unreasonable hazards in a wide range of consumer products.

Independent Federal authority

Statutory regulatory programs buried in agencies with broad and diverse missions have, with few exceptions, rarely fulfilled their mission. The specific experience of safety programs relating to hazardous substances, pesticides, and flammable fabrics is discussed later in some detail.

The reasons for their weaknesses include lack of adquate funding and staffing because of competition with other deserving programs within an agency; lack of vigor in enforcing the law caused by an absence of authority and independence in some Federal administrators; and a low priority assigned to programs of low visibility.

Of course, not all Federal safety programs which are part of larger agencies exhibit these symptoms. The broad-based Federal Trade Commission displayed admirable vigor in proceeding against health hazards of cigarettes. The Federal Highway Administration of the Department of Transportation, though lightly staffed and funded, is working effectively to reduce the toll of injuries from automobile accidents.

Notwithstanding these efforts, when a Federal agency must take up substantial and controversial issues of consumer safety and economics, we believe it needs independent status.

Independence can be furthered by appointment of commissioners on a nonpartisan basis, for staggered fixed terms subject to removal only for cause, and by designation of a permanent chairman to serve an entire term in that capacity.

Another reason for our recommendation of an independent Commission stems from our own experience over the past 2 years. Elsewhere in this report, we describe some of the significant safety innovations which have been adopted by industry after issues were raised by this Commission. As a result of our hearings and public exposure, industry took important steps for safety.

Visibility has aided us in communicating public needs to business. We believe that a highly visible Consumer Product Safety Commission will have the potential to deal firmly and at arm's length with the industries it must regulate in behalf of the public.

The high visibility of a vigorous independent commission would also be a constant reminder of the Federal presence and would itself stimulate voluntary improvement of safety practices. The issues before the CPSC should be publicly aired; they are less likely to be smothered in the competition of Federal agencies for public notice. Similarly, CPSC's needs for staff and funds will receive more public attention and consideration by the Congress and by the Bureau of the Budget than those of a section of a branch of a division of a bureau of a service of an office of a department.

Finally, in developing acceptable safety standards for consumer products, it is important that manufacturers confront Government officials who, like themselves, are in command of resources and authority and able to make firm commitments and decisions.

The preference of at least some in the business community for an independent agency over one of the existing agencies in the product safety area was indicated in an informal poll of more than 50 industry officials taken by Underwriters' Laboratories in August 1969. The poll listed 14 proposed governmental safety functions; the group preferred that an independent agency—about which they knew nothing—administer 12, in preference to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commerce Department's National Bureau of Standards.

A Consumer Advocate

Contrary to the common concept that "we are all consumers" and the simple assumption that a public agency always defends the public interest, in reality most if not all public decisions represent a compromise among contending factions.

Recognition of the consumer's need for representation in Government decisionmaking was the motivating force in the creation of the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs in 1963 and for the continuance of that function in the President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

On day-to-day matters of product safety, however, the consumer has no official champion. The assumption that Federal officials represent the general public interest breaks down when, in a bargaining situation, no one bargains for the consumer. Frequently, instead of serving the consumer, the Federal agency merely provides the forum where the consumer is an affected but helpless bystander.

We believe that the highly complex issues which will face the Consumer Product Safety Commission require a specialized Consumer Safety Advocate to make the voice of the consumer heard. When the agency serves as an arbiter, seeking to reconcile contending interests, the Advocate will defend the consumer. By institutionalizing a focus of consumer representation, it may no longer be said that "everybody's business is nobody's business."

The relationship between the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs and the Consumer Safety Advocate of the Commission can be expected to be complementary. The role of the Advocate will, however, be quite different from that of the proposed Consumer Protection Division in the Department of Justice, which has a potential for filing suits to enjoin deceptive practices and intervening in agency proceedings.

In the past, the legal doctrine that participants in adversary proceedings must have a direct economic interest has deprived consumers of "standing" before courts and agencies. This "standing" doctrine, admitting only parties with substantial economic interest, has been broadened recently by several court decisions.

A Consumer Safety Advocate in Commission proceedings will assure consumers of the representation now authorized by the courts and supplement the efforts of nongovernmental advocates, if granted authority and staff sufficient to draw upon the technical resources of other Federal agencies.

We do not propose that he have any jurisdictional authority over the Commission or other Federal regulatory agencies. We propose that, through him, the consumer will be assured the same rights as any other interested group: access to information and the resources for asserting and defending his rights. There is clear justification for an office which will defend public interests against bureaucratic excess or private indifference.

Mandatory standards

In the absence of unreasonable risks, Federal action is unnecessary. Government should avoid needless intervention in private enterprise and the expense of developing redundant standards. At the same time, the existence of Federal authority to set mandatory safety standards may well stimulate improvements in, and compliance with, adequate voluntary standards. We have designed proposed standard-setting provisions to operate only when an identified product hazard is found and then only after a reasonable opportunity has been given to private individuals and consumer and industry groups to develop a draft standard for submission to the CPSC.

When the Commission determines that a product presents an identified hazard to life or health, the task of framing safety standards must be performed promptly but with surehanded judgment. Because informal rulemaking is best suited for the determination of the kinds of issues in the development of standards and to prevent obstruction, the informal procedure rather than a formal hearing is preferable, with judicial review for all interested persons.

In any event, the Commission must be selective, limiting its development and updating of safety standards to categories of consumer goods which contain an unreasonable risk or the threat thereof.

When the need for action is apparent, the writing of safety standards must not drag on for months. A standard must be completed as quickly as governmental and private resources permit. We have provided in the proposed system that the Commission may make an interim product safety standard effective immediately where it finds an imminent risk to safety.

In the event that private sources fail to frame a needed and adequate standard, the CPSC must have its own technical resources and authority to tap personnel and facilities of the Federal Government and private sources to develop mandatory safety standards. Safety standards cannot be deferred until all makers of a product are satisfied; dissatisfied manufacturers will be able to appeal what they consider unjustifiably stringent standards to the CPSC or, ultimately, to the courts.

Digest of Recommendations

It is not the number or kinds of injuries but the fact of injury—the chronic disability, the mental anguish, the burden of medical costs, and the economic waste—that demands remedial action to reduce unreasonable product hazards by the most direct and efficient means.

By way of remedy, our recommendations, stated in full at the conclusion of this report, provide:

1. That the Congress of the United States enact an omnibus Consumer Product Safety Act committing the authority and resources of the Federal government to the elimination of unreasonable product hazards.

2. That an independent Consumer Product Safety Commission be established as a Federal agency concerned exclusively with the safety of consumer products.

3. That the Consumer Product Safety Commission be directed to secure voluntary cooperation of consumers and industry in advancing its programs and that, when necessary to protect consumers from unreasonable risks of death or injury, the Commission be empowered to—

Develop and set mandatory consumer product safety standards;

Enforce compliance with consumer product safety standards through a broad range of civil and criminal sanctions;

Enjoin distribution or sale of consumer products which violate Federal safety standards or which are unreasonably hazardous.

Require notice to consumers of substantially defective products, and recall of products which violate consumer product safety standards or which are unreasonably dangerous.

Make reasonable inspections of manufacturing facilities to implement compliance with safety standards and regulations; and

Conduct public hearings and subpoena witnesses and documents.

4. That the Consumer Product Safety Commission be given the further responsibility to—

Establish an Injury Information Clearinghouse to collect and analyze data on deaths and injuries associated with consumer products;

Disseminate information to the public about hazardous consumer products and practicable means of reducing hazards; and

Cooperate with and assist States and localities in programs germane to consumer product safety.

5. That a Consumer Safety Advocate to the Commission be appointed by the President, with specific responsibility to represent consumer interests before the Commission.

6. That the Consumer Product Safety Commission, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, be authorized to accredit private testing laboratories which are qualified to test and certify compliance with specific product safety standards, and that the Commission be empowered to require independent testing of consumer products which may present an unreasonable risk.

7. That the Federal Trade Commission promulgate trade regulation rules for those who certify or endorse the safety of consumer products.

8. That Federal agencies provide industry and standards-setting groups with relevant technological information which may be utilized to reduce product hazards and that, where proprietary, such information be ruled in the public domain with provision for adequate compensation.

9. That upon enactment of a comprehensive Consumer Product Safety Act a method be developed to permit Federal technical experts other than those with responsibility for evaluating the adequacy of industry standards and testing programs to participate in voluntary safety standards activities.

10. That the Consumer Product Safety Commission be authorized and afforded funds for the construction and operation of a facility suitable for research, development of test methods, and analysis of consumer products for safety considerations.

11. That existing programs of the Small Business Administration be expanded to authorize low interest loans to assist small businesses in meeting requirements of product safety standards.

12. That the Federal Government, through its purchasing and insuring agents, look to established safety standards and, wherever practicable, new safety designs in selecting products for use, and that Federal agencies publicize acquired information about hazards in consumer products.

13. That injured consumers be permitted to file claims for treble damages in the District Courts of the United States against manufacturers who intentionally violate Federal safety standards; that Federal class action procedures be made applicable; and that the principles of strict tort liability be adopted by State and Federal courts to assure fair compensation for injury to consumers in suits at common law.

14. That consumer products for import into the United States be denied entry if they violate Federal safety standards and that export of consumer products which do not meet Federal safety standards be prohibited unless waiver is obtained from a responsible official of the country of destination.

15. That the United States support the development of international consumer product safety standards, and assure fair representation of consumer interests in such proceedings.

H.R. 18209

A bill to protect consumers against unreasonable risk of injury from hazardous products and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this act may be cited as the "Consumer Product Safety Act of 1970."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2(*a*).—The Congress hereby finds:

(1) The public has a right to be protected against risk of death or injury from hazardous consumer products when such hazards can reasonably be eliminated or minimized;

(2) Unacceptable numbers of hazardous consumer products now affect interstate commerce;

(3) The increasing number and complexity of consumer products make it essential to act promptly to avoid unnecessary death and injury in the future;

(4) Complexities of modern consumer products and the diverse nature and abilities of consumers using them frequently result in an inability of users to anticipate hazards and to safeguard themselves adequately;

(5) Voluntary efforts by industry to develop means of preventing the sale of unsafe products, while sometimes contributing to consumer safety, often have not been adequate to protect consumers;

(6) Preservation of free competition precludes enforcement of voluntary product safety standards by private groups;

(7) The production and sale of consumer products generally affects interstate commerce, making control of unreasonable hazards by state and local governments inadequate and often burdensome to manufacturers.

(*b*) The purposes of this Act are:

(1) To protect the public against unreasonable product hazards to their health and safety;

(2) To assist consumers in evaluating the comparative safety of consumer products;

(3) To aid manufacturers of consumer products by encouraging industry to develop uniform safety standards for consumer products and by minimizing conflicting state and local regulations;

(4) To promote research and investigation into the causes and prevention of product-related deaths and injuries.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SEC 3(*a*).—A Commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the Consumer Product Safety Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), consisting of five Commissioners who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be designated by the President as Chairman. The Chairman shall be the principal executive officer of the Commission and, when so designated, shall act as Chairman until the expiration of his term of office. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office but for no other cause.

(*b*) The Commissioners first appointed under this section shall continue in office for terms of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively, from the date of the enactment of this Act, the term of each to be designated by the President at the time of nomination. Their successors shall be appointed each for a term of 5 years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed and until his successor is appointed and has qualified, except that he shall not so continue to serve beyond the expiration of the next session of Congress subsequent to the expiration of said fixed term of office and except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the unexpired term.

(*c*) Not more than three of the Commissioners shall be appointed from the same political party. No person in the employ of, or holding any official relation to, any person, firm, association, or corporation engaged in selling or manufacturing consumer products or owning stock or bonds of substantial value in such a firm, association, or corporation or who is in any other manner pecuniarily interested in such a firm, association, or corporation, or a substantial supplier thereof, shall enter upon the duties of or hold the office of Commissioner. Commissioners shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(*d*) No vacancy in the Commission shall impair the right of the remaining Commissioners to exercise all the powers of the Commission. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The Commission shall have an official seal of which judicial notice shall be taken. The Commission shall annually elect a Vice Chairman to act in the absence or in case of the disability of the Chairman or in case of a vacancy in the office of the Chairman.

(*e*) The Commission shall maintain a principal office and such field offices as it deems necessary and may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agency as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its function anywhere in the United States. A Commissioner who participates in such an inquiry shall not be disqualified from subsequently participating in a decision of the Commission in the same matter.

(*f*) The Commission shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before October 1 of each year a comprehensive report on the administration of this Act for the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall include:

(1) A thorough appraisal, including statistical analyses, estimates, and long-term projections, of the incidence of injury and effects to the population resulting from consumer products, with a breakdown, insofar as practicable, among the various sources of such injury.

(2) A list of consumer product safety standards in effect in such year, with identification of standards newly added during such year;

(3) An evaluation of the degree of observance of consumer product safety standards, including a list of enforcement actions, court decisions, and compromises of alleged violations, by location and company name;

(4) A summary of outstanding problems confronting the administration of this Act in order of priority;

(5) An analysis and evaluation of consumer product safety research activities completed and in progress as a result of government and/or private sponsorship and technological progress achieved during such year;

(6) A list, with a brief statement of the issues, of completed or pending judicial actions under this Act;

(7) The extent to which technical information was disseminated to the scientific and commercial communities and consumer information was made available to the public;

(8) The extent of cooperation between Commission officials and representatives of industry and other interested parties in the implementation of this Act, including a log or summary of meetings held between Commission officials and representatives of industry and other interested parties; and

(9) An appraisal of significant actions of state and local governments relating to the responsibilities of the Commission.

(*g*) The report required by subsection (*f*) shall contain such recommendations for additional legislation as the Commission deems necessary to promote cooperation among the several states in the improvement of consumer product safety and to strengthen national consumer safety efforts.

(*h*) The Commission shall appoint an Executive Director, a General Counsel, a Director of Engineering Sciences, a Director of Epidemiology, a Director of Information, and such other officers and employees as are necessary in the execution of its functions. Commission employees, other than those specifically enumerated in the preceding sentence, shall be subject to the provisions of Title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

CONSUMER SAFETY ADVOCATE

SEC. 4.—There shall be an independent safety advocate to the Commission, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 7 years. The independent safety advocate shall be known as the Consumer Safety Advocate, shall represent the interests of consumers before the Commission, and shall have the following additional authority and responsibility:

(a) To receive and act upon complaints from the public, Congress, or the Executive agencies regarding actions or inactions by the Commission;

(b) To evaluate, where appropriate, proposed or existing standards, proposed orders and regulations, hazards and potential hazards, and to hire and contract for such personnel which will enable such evaluation;

(c) To obtain information from the Commission concerning any proposed, pending, or completed standard, regulation or other proceeding;

(d) To appear before the Commission, at his discretion, in any proceeding as a party, or witness;

(e) To recommend modification of any proposed regulation, order or standard;

(f) To request the development of a regulation or standard by the Commission;

(g) To request commencement of other proceedings by the Commission;

(h) To appeal to any appropriate court of the United States any order, regulation, or standard issued by the Commission;

(i) To issue public statements with respect to any matter within his responsibilities under subsections (a) through (h).

INJURY INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE

SEC. 5(a).—The Commission shall establish and operate an Injury Information Clearinghouse to collect, investigate, analyze, and disseminate information relating to the causes and prevention of product-related injuries to consumers. The Commission may, under the provisions of Section 31, utilize the facilities and personnel of state and local governments to collect, investigate, analyze, and disseminate such data.

(b) The Commission, in cooperation with appropriate federal agencies, shall conduct additional continuing studies and investigations of deaths, injuries, diseases, other health impairments, and economic losses resulting from accidents involving consumer products as it deems necessary.

(c) Independently or in cooperation with appropriate public and private agencies, the Commission is authorized to:

(1) Conduct research and investigation into the safety of consumer products;

(2) Conduct studies on improvement of consumer products;

(3) Test consumer products and develop product safety test methods and testing devices;

(4) Offer training in product safety investigation and test methods; and

(5) Assist public and private organizations, administratively and technically, in the development of safety standards and test methods.

(d) The Commission is authorized to carry out the functions described in this section by making grants or entering into contracts for the conduct of such functions with governmental entities, private organizations or individuals.

(e) The Commission shall employ personnel of scientific and technical competence adequate to implement the provisions of this Act.

(f) Whenever the federal contribution for any information, research, or development activity authorized by this Act is more than minimal, the Commission shall include in any contract, grant, or other arrangement for such research or development activity, or in rules or regulations applicable to such information function, provisions effective to insure that all information, uses, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing herein shall be construed to deprive the owner of any background patent of any right which he may have thereunder.

(g) The Commission is authorized to plan, design, construct and operate a facility or facilities suitable for reserach, development and testing of consumer products pursuant to the purposes of this Act.

COMMISSION PRIORITIES

SEC. 6.—The Commission shall annually evaluate information obtained by it for the purpose of establishing an order of priorities for its informational, educational, and regulatory activities. After such evaluation the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register a list of the categories of consumer products which it believes warrant primary attention, with the reasons therefor. The Commission may from time to time add to, delete from, or modify such list of priorities. The failure to include any category of products in such list of priorities shall not preclude Commission action with respect thereto.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY STANDARDS

SEC. 7.—The Commission shall have authority to promulgate consumer product safety standards or other regulations for consumer product safety including:

(a) Any requirement as to performance, composition, contents, design, construction, finish, packaging, or otherwise relating to any consumer product or any component part thereof, as is reasonably necessary to prevent or reduce risk of death or personal injury.

(b) Any requirement that any consumer product or any component part thereof be marked with or accompanied by clear and adequate warnings or instructions, or form of warnings or instructions, as is reasonably necessary to prevent or reduce risk of death or personal injury.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY STANDARDS—PROCEEDINGS BY COMMISSION

SEC. 8(a).—Whenever the Commission finds that a consumer product safety standard or other regulation authorized by Section 7 is necessary to prevent or reduce risk of death or personal injury to the public from an identified product hazard, the Commission shall commence a proceeding for the development of such a standard or regulation.

(b) A proceeding for the development of such a standard or regulation shall be commenced by the publication of a notice in the *Federal Register*.

The notice shall state:

(1) The nature of an identified product hazard found by the Commission;

(2) That the Commission has determined a consumer product safety standard or regulation is necessary to prevent or reduce unreasonable risk of death or personal injury to the public from such hazard; and

(3) That any person or organization which is competent and willing to develop a proposed standard or regulation to prevent or reduce such hazard is invited to advise the Commission within 30 days of the date of such notice.

(c) If, within such period, a person or organization offers to develop such a proposed standard or regulation and the Commission determines that such person or organization:

(1) Is technically competent to undertake such a project; and

(2) If an organization operates pursuant to fair procedures, including: (i) reasonable notice to and adequate participation by all interested parties including consumers, (ii) due process to all participants, (iii) maintenance of adequate records of deliberations which are available to the public, (iv) a requirement that all dissenting views on proposed standards be recorded and furnished to the Commission, and (v) such other procedures as the Commission deems necessary,

—the Commission shall suspend its proceeding for the development of a consumer product safety standard for not more than 180 days and authorize such person or organization to develop a proposed standard or regulation. The Commission, for good cause shown, may extend such suspension for such additional period as it finds in the public interest and shall publish its reasons for such determination. During such suspension the Commission may authorize its staff to develop proposals for a standard or regulation, or contract with third parties for such development.

(d) If, within such period, a proposed consumer product safety standard or regulation is developed by such person or organization, the Commission shall resume its proceeding and shall take such proposed standard or regulation into consideration, along with the views of its staff, prior to publishing a proposed consumer product safety standard or regulation in the *Federal Register*. A consumer product safety standard or regulation shall thereafter be published within 60 days of submission of such proposed standard unless the Commission, for good cause shown, finds an extension of such period is in the public interest and publishes its reasons for such determination. Such standard or regulation shall include a finding that the Commission determines it is reasonably necessary to prevent or reduce unreasonable risk of death or personal injury to the public from the hazard described.

(e) If no person or organization offers and is authorized by the Commission to develop such a proposed consumer product safety standard or regulation, the Commission shall publish a consumer product safety standard or regulation within 180 days of the publication of the notice commencing the proceeding unless the Commission, for good cause shown, finds an extension of such period is in the public interest and publishes its reasons for such determination. Such standard or regulation shall include a finding that the Commission determines it is reasonably necessary to prevent or reduce unreasonable risk of death or personal injury to the public from the hazard described.

(f) Each consumer product safety standard or regulation shall specify the date such standard or regulation is to take effect not exceeding 90 days from the date issued, unless the Commission finds, for good cause shown, that a later effective date is in the public interest and publishes its reasons for such finding.

(g) The Commission may by order amend or revoke any consumer product safety standard or regulation established under this section. Such order shall specify the date on which such amendment or revocation is to take effect which shall not exceed 90 days from the date the order is issued unless the Commission finds for good cause shown that a later effective date is in the public interest and publishes its reasons for such finding. Where an amendment involves a material change in a standard or regulation subsections (a)–(e) of this section shall apply.

(h) In issuing a consumer product safety standard pursuant to this section, (1) the Commission shall not issue any standard unless there is an expression in the standard itself of the hazard which the standard is designed to prevent or reduce; (2) shall whenever possible promulgate performance standards; and (3) shall consider relevant available product data including the results of research, development, testing, and investigation activities conducted generally and pursuant to this Act.

(i) Section 553 of Title 5, United States Code, shall apply to all proceedings for the purpose of establishing, amending, or re-

voking a consumer product safety standard or other regulation pursuant to this Act.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY STANDARDS—IMMINENT HAZARDS

SEC. 9.—Whenver the Commission makes the findings specified in Section 8(*a*) and, in addition, at any time finds (1) that such identified product hazard presents an imminent risk to public health or safety and (2) the consumer product in question is already being distributed, or is about to be distributed in interstate commerce, the Commission may issue an interim consumer product safety standard or regulation and make such standard or regulation effective immediately or within such time as the Commission deems necessary in the public interest. The Commission shall specify such findings in a *Federal Register* notice promulgating such interim standard or regulation, and such findings shall be subject to judicial review pursuant to Section 28. In any such review proceeding an interim standard or regulation of the Commission shall be sustained unless the party asserting its invalidity establishes by clear and convincing proof that it is arbitrary. In the event the Commission issues an interim consumer product safety standard or other regulation, it shall commence and complete a proceeding under Section 8 with reasonable promptness.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY STANDARDS—PETITION BY INTERESTED PARTY

SEC. 10(*a*).—Any consumer or other interested party may petition the Commission to commence a proceeding for the issuance, amendment, or revocation of a consumer product safety standard or other regulation.

(*b*) Such petition shall be filed in the principal office of the Commission and shall set forth:

(1) Facts which it is claimed establish the existence of an identified product hazard;

(2) Facts which it is claimed establish that a consumer product safety standard or other regulation or an amendment or revocation thereof is necessary; and

(3) The terms of any such consumer product safety standard or other regulation or amendment thereof which it is claimed should be issued by the Commission.

(*c*) The Commission may, in its discretion, hold a public hearing or may conduct such investigation or proceeding as it deems appropriate in order to determine whether or not such petition should be granted.

(*d*) If the Commission grants such petition, it shall promptly commence an appropriate proceeding for the issuance of a consumer product safety standard, or other regulation or, pursuant to Section 14, declare such product a banned hazardous product or take such other action as it deems appropriate. If the Commission denies such petition it shall publish its reasons for such denial.

NEW PRODUCTS

SEC. 11(*a*).—The Commission shall have authority to promulgate standards and procedures for the purpose of insuring that new consumer products are adequately designed and tested to minimize unreasonable risk of death or personal injury to the public.

(*b*) For purposes of this section, a "new consumer product" is a consumer product which incorporates a design, material, or form of energy exchange which (1) has not previously been used substantially in consumer products and (2) as to which there exists a lack of information adequate to determine the safety of such product in use by consumers.

SUITS BY COMMISSION

SEC. 12(*a*).—Whenever the Commission shall have reason to believe that a make, model, or type of consumer product incorporating an identified product hazard is being marketed or is about to be marketed, it is authorized to commence an action for temporary and permanent injunctive relief with respect to such consumer product in an appropriate federal district court.

(*b*) Such a proceeding by the Commission shall be commenced by the filing of a complaint setting forth the facts which establish that the marketing of such consumer product presents or may present an unreasonable risk of death or personal injury to the public and the nature of injunctive relief which the Commission believes is necessary with respect thereto.

(*c*) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over such actions commenced by the Commission.

(*d*) The Commission may commence such actions in any district court in the United States in a district where any act, omission, or transaction constituting the alleged violation occurred, or is threatened, or in such court for the district wherein the defendant is found or transacts business. In such cases, process may be served in any other district in which the defendant is an inhabitant or wherever the defendant may be found.

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

SEC. 13(*a*).—If the court determines that the risk is unreasonable and the Commission is entitled to relief pursuant to Section 12 hereof, it may (i) enter an appropriate order enjoining the marketing of such consumer product, and (ii) enter an appropriate order directing the defendant or defendants to establish such procedures with respect to such consumer product as are necessary to avoid unreasonable risk of death or personal injury to the public in the future.

(*b*) Those procedures which may be the subject of an affirmative order of the court pursuant to this section may include:

(i) Collection and retention of information on the identity of purchasers and claims of injury or hazards;

(ii) collection and retention of information on product performance and servicing, to the extent it relates to safety;

(iii) procedures for adequate product design and performance;

(iv) procedures for adequate conduct of testing and inspection;

(v) inclusion of necessary warnings and instructions with consumer products; and

(vi) procedures for adequate quality control.

BANNED HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS

SEC. 14(*a*).—Whenever the Commission finds:

(1) That a consumer product incorporating an identical product hazard is being marketed, or is about to be marketed, and such consumer product presents an unreasonable risk of death or personal injury to the public; and

(2) Notwithstanding any cautionary labeling, regulation, or safety standard as is or may be required under this Act, the degree or nature of the hazard involved in the use of the consumer product is such that protection of the public health and safety can be adequately served only by keeping such product out of the channels of interstate commerce

—the Commission may, by regulation pursuant to Section 553 of Title 5, United States Code, declare such product a banned hazardous product.

(*b*) If, before or during a proceeding pursuant to subparagraph (a) of this section, the Commission finds that because of an identified product hazard, distribution of a consumer product affecting interstate commerce presents an imminent hazard to the public health, and by order published in the *Federal Register* it gives notice of such finding, such consumer product shall be deemed to be a banned hazardous product for the purposes of this Act until the proceeding has been completed. If not yet initiated when such an order is published, such a proceeding shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness.

(*c*) Orders pursuant to this section shall be subject to judicial review pursuant to Section 28. In any such review proceeding an order pursuant to subsection (*b*) shall be sustained unless the party asserting its invalidity establishes by clear and convincing proof that the order is arbitrary.

Product Safety Advisory Council

SEC. 15(*a*).—The Commission shall establish a Product Safety Advisory Council which it may consult before prescribing a consumer product safety standard or other regulation. The Council shall be appointed by the Commission and shall be composed of fifteen members, each of whom shall be qualified by training and experience in one or more of the fields applicable to the safety of products within the jurisdiction of the Commission. The Council shall be constituted as follows:

(1) Five members shall be selected from governmental agencies including federal, state, and local governments;

(2) Five members shall be selected from consumer product industries including at least one representative of small business;

(3) Five members shall be selected from among consumer organizations, community organizations, and recognized consumer leaders.

(*b*) The Council may propose product safety standards or other regulations to the Commission for its consideration and may function through subcommittees of its members. All proceedings of the Council shall be public, and a record of each proceeding shall be available for public inspection.

(*c*) Members of the Council who are not officers or employees of the United States and members of any ad hoc advisory committees created pursuant to subsection (*d*) shall, while attending meetings or conferences of the Council or while otherwise engaged in the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Commission, not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by Section 5703 of Title 5, United States Code. Payments under this subsection shall not render members of the Council officers or employees of the United States for any purpose.

(*d*) The Commission is authorized to establish, in addition to the aforesaid Product Safety Advisory Council, such ad hoc advisory committees as it deems necessary to advise it with respect to any safety standard or other regulation considered by it under this Act. Where practicable, such ad hoc committees shall be composed of representatives of differing interests in the same proportions specified in subsection(*a*) hereof. Such ad hoc committees shall terminate upon termination of the proceeding with respect to such standard or regulation. All proceedings shall be public, and a record of each proceeding shall be available for public inspection.

Notification of Defects; Repair or Replacement of Hazardous Products

SEC. 16(*a*).—Every manufacturer of consumer products who discovers or acquires information tending to show that:

(1) A consumer product produced, assembled or imported by him contains a defect which creates a substantial risk of personal injury to the public; or

(2) A consumer product produced, assembled or imported by him on or after the effective date of an applicable standard or regulation prescribed pursuant to Sections 8, 9, or 14 fails to comply with such standard or regulation,

—shall immediately notify the Commission of such defect or failure to comply if such product has left the place of manufacture and shall, except as authorized by paragraph (*c*), with reasonable promptness furnish

notification of such defect or failure to comply to the persons specified in subsection (*d*) of this section.

(*b*) The Commission is authorized to promulgate regulations defining "defect which creates a substantial risk of personal injury to the public" pursuant to this section.

(*c*) If, in the opinion of such manufacturer the defect or failure to comply (i) is not such as to create a substantial risk of personal injury, or (ii) a special limited form of notice is appropriate, or (iii) the Commission and not the manufacturer should furnish and pay for the notification specified, he may, at the time of giving notice to the Commission of such defect or failure to comply, apply to the Commission for a partial or complete exemption from the requirement of notice specified in subsection (*d*). If such application states grounds for such exemption, the Commission may afford such manufacturer an opportunity to present his views in support of the application, the burden of proof being on the manufacturer. Where the Commission determines it is in the public interest it may publish notice of such application in the *Federal Register* and afford interested parties, including consumers, an opportunity to comment thereon. If, after such presentation, the Commission for good cause shown finds (1) that such defect or failure to comply is not such as to create a substantial risk of injury and (2) that exemption would be in the public interest, it may exempt such manufacturer from the requirement of notice to the persons specified in subsection (*d*) of this section or from the requirements of repair, refund, or replacement imposed by subsection (*h*) of this section, provided, that it shall publish its reasons for such findings in the *Federal Register*. If, after such presentation the Commission, for good cause shown, finds that a special limited form of notice is appropriate or that it is in the public interest that the Commission furnish the notification specified, it may grant such partial or complete exemption from subsection (*d*) and shall publish its reasons for such finding in the *Federal Register*.

(*d*) The notification, other than to the Commission, required by subparagraph (*a*) of this section shall be accomplished:

(1) by certified mail to the first purchaser of such product for purposes other than resale and to any subsequent transferee of such product where known to the manufacturer, and

(2) by certified mail or other more expeditious means to the dealers or distributors of such manufacturer to whom such product was delivered.

(*e*) The notification required by subparagraph (*a*) of this section shall contain a clear description of such defect or failure to comply, an evaluation of the hazard reasonably related thereto, and a statement of the measures to be taken to correct such defect. In the case of a notification to a person referred to in subsection (*d*) (1) of this section, the notification shall also advise the person of his rights under subsection (*h*) of this section.

(*f*) Every manufacturer of consumer products shall furnish to the Commission a true copy of all notices, bulletins, and other communications to dealers or distributors of such manufacturer or to purchasers, or subsequent transferees, of consumer products of such manufacturer regarding any such defect in such product or any failure to comply with a standard, regulation, or order applicable to such product. The Commission shall disclose to the public so much of the information contained in such notices or other information in its possession as it deems will assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act, but it shall not discolse any information which contains or relates to a trade secret unless it determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(*g*) If through testing, inspection, investigation, research or examination of reports carried out pursuant to this Act the Commission determines that any consumer product:

(1) fails to comply with an applicable standard or regulation prescribed pursuant to Section 8, 9 or 14; or

(2) contains a defect which creates a substantial risk of personal injury to the public, and if the Commission determines that notification or other remedies provided under the section are appropriate, it shall notify the manufacturer of the product of such defect or failure to comply. The notice shall contain the findings of the Commission and shall include a synopsis of the information upon which the findings are based. Unless the Commission determines that delay will unreasonably harm the public health and safety, it shall afford such manufacturer an opportunity to present his views to establish that there is no failure of compliance or that the alleged defect does not exist or does not create a substantial risk of personal injury. Where the Commission determines it is in the public interest, it may publish notice of such proceeding in the *Federal Register* and afford interested parties, including consumers, an opportunity to comment thereon. If after such presentation by the manufacturer the Commission determines that such product does not comply with an applicable standard or regulation, or that it contains a defect which creates a substantial risk of personal injury, the Commission may direct the manufacturer to furnish the notification specified in subsection (*e*) of this section to the persons specified in subparagraph (*d*) of this section. The Commission may in its discretion use the sanctions provided by Sections 25, 26, or 27 of this Act with or without utilizing the procedures specified in this section.

(*h*) If any consumer product is found under subparagraph (*a*) or (*g*) to fail to comply with an applicable standard or regulation or to have a defect which creates a substantial risk of personal injury, and the notification specified in subsection (*e*) is required to be furnished on account of such failure or defect, the manufacturer of such product shall,

(1) without charge, bring such product into conformity with such standard or regulation, or remedy such defect and provide reimbursement for any expenses, including transportation expenses incurred in connection with having such product brought into conformity or having such defect remedied, or

(2) replace such product with a like or equivalent product which complies with each applicable standard, regulation or order under this Act and which has no defect relating to the safety of its use, or

(3) refund the purchase price of such product upon tender of the product by the owner.

The manufacturer shall take the action required by this subsection in such manner and with respect to such persons as the Commission shall by order prescribe.

PRODUCT CERTIFICATION AND LABELING

Sec. 17(*a*).—Every manufacturer of a product subject to a consumer product safety or regulation issued under Section 8 or 9 shall furnish to the distributor or dealer at the time of delivery of such product a certification that such product conforms to all applicable safety standards and shall specify such standards. Such certification shall be based on a test of such specific product set forth in such standard or regulation or upon a reasonable testing program and shall state the name of the manufacturer and date and place of manufacture.

(*b*) The Commission may by rule or regulation prescribe reasonable tests or testing programs for consumer products pursuant to this section.

(*c*) The Commission may by rule or regulation require the use and prescribe the form and content of labels which, where practicable, may be required by the Commission to be permanently affixed to any consumer product and which shall furnish to the extent practicable the information specified in this section.

(*d*) The Commission may order that any product subject to a consumer product safety standard or regulation pursuant to Section 8 shall be subject to a reasonable testing program operated by an independent third-party qualified to perform such program and that an appropriate mark so certifying appear on the product. Where a product is subject to such an order, the certification under subparagraph (*a*) of this section shall so state and shall state the name of the party operating such testing program. The Commission may, by regulation, prescribe procedures for such programs and requirements with respect to reporting of compliance with applicable regulations and standards by independent third-parties conducting such certification programs.

(*e*) The Commission may, with the advice of the Secretary of Commerce, designate parties who are qualified to operate such independent third-party certification programs.

INSPECTION AND RECORD KEEPING

Sec. 18(*a*).—The Commission is authorized to conduct such inspection and investigation as may be necessary to implement this Act and regulations and standards as may be prescribed pursuant hereto. It shall furnish the Attorney General and, when appropriate, the Secretary of the Treasury, any information obtained indicating noncompliance (except noncompliance with Sec. 19(*b*) of this Act) for appropriate enforcement action.

(*b*) For purposes of implementation of orders, regulations, or standards promulgated under this Act, officers or employees duly designated by the Commission, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice from the Commission to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized:

(1) To enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which consumer products or component parts thereof are manufactured, assembled, or held for introduction into interstate commerce or are held for sale after such introduction; and

(2) To inspect, at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner those areas of such factory, warehouse or establishment where such products are produced or stored and which may relate to the safety of such products. Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness.

(*c*) Every manufacturer of consumer products or component parts thereof shall establish and maintain such records, make such reports, and provide such information as the Commission may reasonably by regulation require. Establishment and maintenance of records of purchasers of products, product design, testing, quality control, defects and claims for five (5) years, shall not be deemed unreasonable. Upon request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Commission, every such manufacturer shall permit the inspection of appropriate books, records, and papers relevant to determining whether such manufacturer has acted or is acting in compliance with this Act and regulations and standards prescribed pursuant hereto.

(*d*) The Commission or its representatives shall not disclose any information reported to, or otherwise obtained by it pursuant to this section which contains or relates to a trade secret unless it determines that it is

necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such information may be disclosed to other officers or employees of the United States concerned with carrying out this Act or, when relevant in any administrative or judicial proceeding under this Act. Nothing in this section shall authorize the withholding of information by the Commission or by any officer or employee under his control from the duly authorized Committees of Congress.

ADDITIONAL POWERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 19(*a*).—The Commission, or any two members thereof as authorized by the Commission, may conduct hearings anywhere in the United States or otherwise secure data and expressions of opinion pertinent to the safety of consumer products. The Commission shall publish notice of any proposed hearing in the *Federal Register* and shall afford a reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present relevant testimony and data.

(*b*) The Commission shall also have the power:

(1) To require, by special or general orders, corporations, business firms, and individuals to submit in writing such reports and answers to questions as the Commission may prescribe; such submission shall be made within such reasonable period and under oath or otherwise as the Commission may determine:

(2) To administer oaths;

(3) To require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all documentary evidence relating to the execution of its duties;

(4) In the case of disobedience to a subpoena or order issued under this subsection, to invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring compliance with such subpoena or order;

(5) In any proceeding or investigation to order testimony to be taken by deposition before any person who is designated by the Commission and has the power to administer oaths and, in such instances, to compel testimony and the production of evidence in the same manner as authorized under paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection; and

(6) To pay witnesses the same fees and mileage as are paid in like circumstances in the courts of the United States.

(*c*) Any district court in the United States within the jurisdiction of which any inquiry is carried on may, upon petition by counsel for the Commission, in case of refusal to obey a subpoena or order of the Commission issued under subsection (*b*) of this section, issue an order requiring compliance therewith; and any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as contempt thereof.

(*d*) When the Commission finds that publication of any information obtained by it is in the public interest and would not give an unfair competitive advantage to any person, it is authorized to publish such information in the form and manner deemed best adapted for public use, except that data and information which relates to a trade secret, shall be held confidential and shall not be disclosed, unless the Commission determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(*e*) Every manufacturer of consumer products or component parts thereof shall provide to the Commission such performance and technical data related to performance and safety as may be required to carry out the purposes of the Act. The Commission is authorized to require the manufacturer to give such notification of such performance and technical data at the time of original purchase to prospective purchasers and to the first purchaser of such product, for purposes other than resale, as it determines necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(*f*) The Commission is authorized to obtain without charge from any manufacturer of consumer products written authorization to distributors and retailers to obtain a reasonable number of such products for purposes of determining compliance of such products with the provisions of this Act.

(*g*) The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts with governmental entities, private organizations or individuals for the conduct of activities authorized by this Act.

(*h*) The Commission is authorized to establish such policies, criteria, and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to administration of this Act and its functions hereunder. Unless otherwise specified the provisions of Title 5, United States Code, Section 553 shall apply to such proceeding.

COOPERATION WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 20.—The Commission is authorized to obtain from any federal department or agency such statistics, data, program reports, and other materials as it may deem necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. Each such department or agency is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such materials to it. The Commission and the heads of other departments and agencies engaged in administering programs related to product safety shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and consult in order to insure fully coordinated efforts.

IMPORTED PRODUCTS

SEC. 21(*a*).—Any consumer product offered for importation into the United States which fails to comply with an applicable standard or regulation prescribed under this Act, which is not accompanied by a certification in the form prescribed by Section 17, or which contains a defect which creates an unreasonable risk of personal injury to the public shall be refused admission to the United States.

(*b*) The Secretary of the Treasury shall obtain without charge and deliver to the Commission, upon the latter's request, a reasonable number of samples of consumer products being offered for import. The owner or consignee of such product may have a hearing before the Commission with respect to admission of such imports into the United States. If it appears from examination of such samples or otherwise that a product fails to comply with the provisions of this Act, unless subsection (*c*) of this section applies and is complied with,

(1) such product shall be refused admission, and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause destruction of such product unless it is exported, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, within 90 days after notice to the importer or consignee.

(*c*) If it appears to the Commission that any consumer product refused admission pursuant to subsection (*a*) of this section can be brought into compliance with applicable regulations, standards, or orders, final determination as to the admission of such product may be deferred, and the Commission may permit the applicant to perform such operations to bring such product into conformity. The Commission may by regulation prescribe the means of compliance with this subsection, including execution of a sufficient bond for payment of damages and expenses incurred with respect to the imported product.

(*d*) It shall be the duty of every manufacturer offering a consumer product for importation to the United States to designate in writing an agent upon whom service of all administrative and judicial process may be made and to file such designation with the Commission. Such designation shall be public and may from time to time be changed by like writing similarly filed. Service of all administrative and judicial processes, notices, orders, decisions, and requirements may be made upon said manufacturer by service upon such designated agent with like effect as if made personally upon said manufacturer. In default of such designation, the Commission or any court of the United States may effect service of process upon such manufacturer by posting such process, notice, order, requirement, or decision in the office of the Executive Director of the Commission.

(*e*) No consumer product shall be imported into the United States unless the manufacturer of such product complies with the inspection and record keeping requirements of this Act and the Commission's regulations with respect thereto.

EXPORTED PRODUCTS

SEC. 22.—Regulations, orders, and standards issued by the Commission under this Act shall apply to consumer products intended for export unless the manufacturer of any consumer product subject thereto obtains and files with the Commission a certification by the responsible official of the country to which export is intended stating that the safety provisions of such regulations, orders, or standards are waived.

ANTITRUST LAWS

SEC. 23.—Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to exempt from the antitrust laws of the United States any conduct that would otherwise be unlawful under such laws.

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 24(*a*).—It shall be unlawful for any person to:

(1) Manufacture for sale, sell, offer for sale, assemble, introduce or deliver for introduction in interstate commerce, or import into the United States any consumer product which is not in conformity with an applicable regulation or standard prescribed pursuant to this Act, if such product was manufactured after the effective date of such regulation or standard;

(2) Manufacture for sale, sell, offer for sale, assemble, introduce or deliver for introduction in interstate commerce, or import into the United States any consumer product which has been declared a banned hazardous product by the Commission;

(3) Fail or refuse to permit access to or copying of records, or fail or refuse to make reports or provide information, or fail or refuse to permit entry or inspection, as required under this Act;

(4) Fail to furnish a notification of any defect as required by Section 16, unless exempted from the requirements of that section by order of the Commission;

(5) Fail to comply with the requirements of Section 16(*h*) with respect to repair, replacement, or refund of certain consumer products;

(6) Fail to furnish a certificate required by Section 17 or issue a false certificate if such person in the exercise of due care has reason to know that such certificate is false or misleading in any material respect.

(*b*) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of Section (*a*) shall not apply to any person who, prior to the first purchase of such consumer product, holds a certificate issued by the manufacturer or importer of such consumer products to the effect that such consumer product conforms to all applicable federal regulations and safety standards, unless such person knows that such consumer product does not conform.

CIVIL PENALTIES

SEC. 25(*a*).—Any person who violates Section 24 of this Act shall be subject to a civil penalty not to exceed $2,000 for each such violation. A violation of Section 24(*a*)(1), (2), (4), (5) and (6) shall constitute a separate violation with respect to each consumer product involved, except that the maximum civil penalty shall not exceed $500,000 for any related series of violations. A violation of

Section 24(a)(3) shall constitute a separate violation with respect to each failure or refusal to allow or perform an act required thereby. If such violation is a continuing one, each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense, except that the maximum civil penalty shall not exceed $500,000 for any related series of violations.

(b) Any such civil penalty may be compromised by the Commission. In determining the amount of such penalty or whether it should be remitted or mitigated and in what amount, the appropriateness of such penalty to the size of the business of the person charged and the gravity of the violation shall be considered. The amount of such penalty when finally determined, or the amount agreed on compromise, may be deducted from any sums owing by the United States to the person charged.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES

SEC. 26.—Any person who knowingly or willfully violates Section 24 of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $50,000 or be imprisoned not more than 180 days or both, in the discretion of the court, provided that nothing herein shall limit other provisions of this Act.

Whenever any corporation knowingly or willfully violates Section 24 of this Act, any individual director, officer, or agent of such corporation who knowingly or willfully authorized, ordered, or performed any of the acts or practices constituting in whole or in part such violation shall be subject to such penalties, in addition to the corporation.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 27(a).—The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of Section 24 of this Act. Such actions may be brought in any district court of the United States for a district wherein any act, omission or transaction constituting the violation occurred, or in such court for the district wherein the defendant is found or transacts business. In such cases process may be served in any other district in which the defendant is an inhabitant or wherever the defendant may be found.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of Section 24, except when such products are disposed of by returning them to the distributor or manufacturer from whom they were obtained.

(c) Any consumer product that fails to conform to an applicable consumer product safety standard or regulation or which has been declared a banned hazardous product pursuant to Section 14 of this Act, when introduced into or while in interstate commerce or while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce shall be liable to be proceeded against on libel of information and condemned in any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such consumer product is found. Proceedings in cases instituted under the authority of this section shall conform as nearly as possible to proceedings in rem in admiralty. Whenever such proceedings involving identical consumer products are pending in two or more jurisdictions they shall be consolidated for trial by order of any such court upon application seasonably made by any party in interest upon notice to all other parties in interest.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 28(a).—In a case of actual controversy over the validity of any Commission order

(1) Issuing, amending, or revoking a consumer product safety standard or regulation pursuant to Section 8 or 9, or

(2) Declaring a product to be a banned hazardous product under Section 14, or

(3) Granting or denying an exemption under Section 16, or

(4) Issuing, amending, or revoking any other final regulation or order under this Act,

any person who will be adversely affected by such regulation or order, including any consumer or group of consumers, may at any time prior to the 60th day after such order is issued file a petition with the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business for judicial review of such order. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commission. The Commission thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings upon which it based its order, as provided in Section 2112 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

(b) If the petitioner applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shows to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Commission, the court may order such additional evidence (and evidence in rebuttal thereof) to be taken before the Commission, or to be adduced upon a hearing, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings by reason of the additional evidence so taken and shall file such modified or new findings, and its recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order, with the return of such additional evidence.

(c) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in subsection (a) of this section, the court shall have the jurisdiction to review the order in accordance with Sections 701–706 of Title 5 of the United States Code and to grant appropriate relief as provided in such sections.

(d) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such order of the Commission shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in Section 1254 of Title 28 of the United States Code.

(e) The remedies provided for in this section shall be in addition to and not in substitution for any other remedies provided by law.

(f) A certified copy of the transcript of the record and proceedings under this section shall be furnished by the Commission to any interested party at his request, upon payment of the costs thereof, and shall be admissible in any civil, criminal, exclusion of imports or other proceeding arising under or in respect of this title, irrespective of whether proceedings with respect to the order have previously been initiated or become final under subsection (a). The Commission may by regulation provide for furnishing such transcripts without charge to interested persons unable to pay costs therefor, where in the public interest.

PRIVATE REMEDIES

SEC. 29(a).—Compliance with consumer product safety standards, regulations, or orders under this Act shall not relieve any person from liability at common law or under state law to any other person.

(b) Evidence that an entire finished product complies with regulations or standards issued by the Commission shall be inadmissible in any private litigation except an action to recover treble damages pursuant to Section 30.

(c) The failure of the Commission to take any action or commence a proceeding with respect to the safety of a consumer product shall not be admissible in evidence in litigation at common law or under state law relating to such consumer product.

(d) Accident and investigation reports made under this Act by any officer, employee, or agent of the Commission shall be available for use in any civil, criminal or other judicial proceeding arising out of such accident. Any such officer, employee, or agent may be required to testify in such proceedings as to the facts developed in such investigations. Any such report shall be made available to the public in a manner which need not identify injured persons. All reports on research projects, demonstration projects, and other related activities shall be public information.

SUITS FOR TREBLE DAMAGES BY PERSONS INJURED

SEC. 30.—Any person who shall be injured by reason of any knowing or willful violation of a consumer product safety standard, regulation, or order issued by the Commission may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

SEC. 31(a).—The Commission shall promote federal-state cooperation for the purpose of reducing or eliminating unreasonable risk of injury to the public from identified product hazards. In implementing such program the Commission may:

(i) Accept from any state or local authorities engaged in activities relating to health, safety, or consumer protection assistance in such functions as injury data collection, investigation, and educational programs, as well as other assistance in the administration and enforcement of this Act which it may request and which such states or localities may be able and willing to provide and, if so agreed, may pay in advance or otherwise for the reasonable cost of such assistance, and

(ii) Commission any qualified officer or employee of any state or local agency as an officer of the Commission for the purpose of conducting examinations, investigations, and inspections.

(b) In determining whether such proposed state and local programs are appropriate in implementing the purposes of this Act the Commission shall give favorable consideration to programs which establish separate state and local agencies to consolidate functions relating to product safety and other consumer protection activities.

EFFECT ON STATE STANDARDS

SEC. 32(a).—Whenever a consumer product safety standard or regulation established under this Act is in effect, no state or political subdivision of a state shall have any authority either to establish or to continue in effect any safety standard or regulation applicable to the same aspect of performance of such consumer product which is not identical to the federal standard.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the Federal government or the government of any state or political subdivision thereof from establishing a safety requirement applicable to a consumer product for its own use if such requirement imposes a higher standard of performance than that required to comply with the otherwise applicable federal standard.

(c) The Commission may, upon application of a state or political subdivision thereof, exempt such application from the the provisions of subsection (a) where a proposed standard or regulation (1) imposes a higher level of performance than the federal standard, (2) is required by compelling local conditions, and (3) does not unduly burden interstate commerce.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 33(a).—"Commission" means the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

(b) "Consumer product" means any product, or component part, which affects interstate commerce and is customarily produced or distributed for sale (i) to a consumer for use in or around a household or residence, or (ii) for the personal use, consumption, or enjoyment of a consumer. Such term does not include hazards associated with such products to the extent such hazards are subject to duly promulgated regulations under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), the Flammable Fabrics Act (15 U.S.C. 1191 et seq.), the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135 et seq.) and the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act (42 U.S.C. 262 et seq.).

(c) "Identified product hazard" means a hazard associated with a consumer product which presents or may present an unreasonable risk of death or personal injury to the public and which the Commission describes in a regulation, standard, order, or complaint issued pursuant to this Act. The Commission may, in determining whether a hazard is an "identified product hazard," consider, among other factors frequency or potential frequency of injury, severity or potential severity of injury, number of products in use, potential for hazard reduction, awareness of hazard by consumers, increase of hazard with age of product, and hazard to nonusers, if it deems such factors applicable to its determination.

(d) "Consumer product safety standard" means a minimum safety standard relating to a consumer product, promulgated by the Commission pursuant to Sections 8 or 9 of this Act for the purpose of preventing or reducing risk of death or personal injury from an identified product hazard. A consumer product safety standard establishes the minimum acceptable safety level for a consumer product. Compliance with a consumer product safety standard may or may not be evidence of adequate care to avoid death or personal injury caused by a specific consumer product.

(e) "Manufacturer" means any person that manufactures or assembles consumer products or imports or distributes consumer products manufactured or assembled elsewhere.

(f) "Person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other form of business enterprise.

(g) "State" includes a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rica, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

(h) "Interstate commerce" means commerce between any place in a state and any place in another state, or between places in the same state through another state.

(i) "Importation" includes reimportation of consumer products manufactured or processed, in whole or in part, in the United States.

(j) Use of the singular includes the plural wherever appropriate.

INTERPRETATION AND SEPARABILITY

SEC. 34.—The provisions of this Act shall be held to be in addition to and not in substitution for or limitation of the provisions of any other law. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to any other person or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 35.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act the following sums:

$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971;

$7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and

$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

The foregoing sums do not apply to facilities to be constructed pursuant to Section 5(g) of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 36.—This Act shall take effect on the 60th day following the date of its enactment.

JERRY FORD—A PROFILE

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, 6 years ago, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I had the privilege of managing a campaign to elevate Representative GERALD R. FORD to the position of Republican leader in the House of Representatives.

The campaign was successful. Shortly after JERRY FORD took charge of Republicans in the House, his hometown newspaper, the Grand Rapids Press, published one of the finest personality profiles I have ever seen. As a close friend, I have the opportunity to know JERRY very well; but many people are not acquainted with the warm life story of this outstanding American.

As JERRY FORD marks his 6th year as Republican leader in the House of Representatives, I ask unanimous consent that this story, as it appeared in the Grand Rapids Press of January 10, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

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

JERRY FORD: A REAL-LIFE AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY

(By Neil Munro)

Jerry Ford is one of those rare politicians who has lived the Great American Success Story.

First he was the product of a broken home; then a football star. He graduated with honors after working his way through school. When World War II started he joined the Navy. A civilian again, he threw himself into community projects and ended up being named by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce as "one of the 10 most outstanding young men" in the nation.

He got a law degree at Yale, and 16 years ago, when he was only 35, he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives after beating the odds and well-entrenched incumbent.

People who have known him along the way—even his political opponents—like him.

And now he's the House Republican minority leader. How does a man go about leading that kind of life?

For Gerald R. Ford it began July 14, 1913, in Omaha, Neb., where he was christened Leslie King. But his mother divorced Mr. King. She moved to Michigan and married Gerald R. Ford, who adopted the infant and gave him his name. He was raised by Gerald R. Ford, remembered in Grand Rapids as a successful paint manufacturer, a highly respected civic leader, a chairman of the Republican county committee and a "kind man."

The Fords later had three more sons, Tom and Richard, now president and vice president of the paint company, and James, an optometrist. Tom, 45, was elected to the Michigan House of Representatives last November after being active in municipal government for years.

When Jerry Ford entered South High School in Grand Rapids he went out for football and was all-city center in his junior and senior years. He even made all-state in 1930 when he was captain of the team that won the state high school championship. It was at South High School that Jerry Ford started being called a "hard worker" and "a leader." P. L. "Pop" Churm, who was one of his teachers, remembers: "He was a leader then, what you would call a regular he-man." His football coach, Cliff Gettings, still counts Ford as a personal friend and loves to talk about the 1930 championship team. "Having Jerry Ford on the team was just like having a coach on field," Gettings said.

Later Jerry Ford played four years of football at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. Two of those teams were conference champions, and he was named "most promising" as a freshman player and "most valuable" as a senior in 1935. But he never made All-American. He had the back luck to be a center at the same time that the famed center Jack Blott was at the university. Blott was the All-American.

In his high school days when work was scarce and Ford needed the money, a restaurant owner named Bill Skougis gave him a job because he was a top athlete. Ford got $2 a day and his noon meal for waiting on customers and washing dishes.

As a freshman at the university, Ford still needed money. So the football coaches lined up another job waiting on tables in the interns' dining room at the university hospital. In his sophomore and junior years he washed dishes to earn his money at Delta Kappa Epsilon, his fraternity. "I can still wash dishes faster than most people. The work was good for me," he says now.

Besides washing dishes, he worked summers filling and labeling paint cans in his father's factory, Ford Paint & Varnish Co. Later it was a highly successful business, but the going was rough in the depresssion and there was little money left over for Jerry's college expenses. For nearly three years he sold a pint of blood a month for $25 as a professional donor. "That money came in mighty handy," he recalls.

Football helped him again when he was offered an assistant coaching job at Yale University. He passed up chances to play professional football with the Detroit Lions and Green Bay Packers and packed his bag for Yale. And in 1941 he received his law degree there.

But before he had a chance to practice much law in Grand Rapids he was in the Navy. Forty-seven months later, in 1946, he left active duty as a lieutenant commander. On his uniform were a Pacific-Asiatic ribbon with seven battle stars and a Philippine liberation ribbon with two battle stars. He had served as assistant navigator of the U.S.S. Monterey, an aircraft carrier.

Ford had started thinking about politics while he was in the Navy, and when he got out he had "the time and inclination to get my feet wet."

One of his inspirations was Sen. Arthur H. Vandenberg of Grand Rapids, who made history as a top Republican spokesman in the formation of the bipartisan foreign policy of the post-World War II era.

Ford's first effort was as a member of the Home Front Group which wrestled local control of the Republican party from financier Frank D. McKay, who had bossed it for years on the state and local levels.

Then he took on another oldtimer, Bartel J. "Barney" Jonkman, a U.S. representative who had let his political fences sag. Ford beat him in the 1948 primary and went on to

win over his Democratic opponent, Fred Barr, in a landslide. He has had nothing but landslides since. Victory totals have ranged from 60 to 67 per cent of the vote. It was in 1948 that Ford and another freshman congressman, John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, often strolled together to the House chambers and struck up a lasting friendship.

Sixteen years later, Ford was a member of the commission that investigated the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. He is now writing a book about the investigation.

Now he and his wife, Betty, whom he married just before he was elected, live in a four-bedroom brick colonial-style home in Alexandria, Va. That's where their children are growing up. They are Mike, 14; John, 12; Steve, 8, and Susan, 7. But Ford, still a lover of sports and the outdoors, vacations with them on the beaches and ski slopes of West Michigan.

And he hasn't let his political fences sag. He has the reputation in Grand Rapids of being a man who does his political homework and knows the problems of his constitutents in surrounding Kent and Ionia Counties of Michigan's Fifth Congressional District.

Ford annually makes the rounds in his mobile-home office. People who have traveled with him say he has the ability to convince every visitor that his problem is the only one Ford has to worry about in Washington, and he does it without being glib or glad-handing.

Ford is one congressman who has not grown rich in public office. He recently revealed his income, a congressman's $30,000 salary, and his assets, a mortgaged house in Virginia, a duplex in Grand Rapids (1624 Sherman St. SE) he rents as an investment and a few thousand dollars in stocks including some in the Ford Paint & Varnish Co. The Sherman St. home is also his voting address. It is in the suburban city of East Grand Rapids. Though he is a lawyer, Ford has not belonged to a law firm or practiced in years.

When the weather in Virginia is right, Ford starts his days with a vigorous swim in his new pool. He still tries to keep as close to his football playing shape as a man of 51 can, and he likes to get in a round of golf now and then. But he also enjoys a drink and his pipe.

Back in Grand Rapids, his latest political opponent, William G. Reamon, says, "Jerry always campaigns on a high plane; no personalities. If you want to be represented by a conservative, I don't know where you'd find a better man, one with more integrity, than Jerry Ford."

DIPLOMATIC KIDNAPING

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years we have been appalled at the flagrant violations of diplomatic immunity committed in order to achieve domestic political goals in certain countries. Helpless governments have been forced to play the role of accessory after the fact to a form of international crime they would never themselves commit, a crime considered for centuries not only totally outside the realm of the justifiable, but the gravest of threats to world peace. Accordingly, on June 10, I submitted a resolution urging the President to seek an international agreement dealing with the problem. Last week Secretary Rogers, addressing the OAS, requested such an agreement. The Latin representatives deplored these crimes. They even condemned them. But they considered the right of political asylum paramount and not secondary to diplomatic immunity so as to warrant a security arrangement.

I allow it is a close question, but in the long run it must be decided in favor of diplomatic immunity. If a state visitor were snatched from his welcoming motorcade and held prisoner by a revolutionary group in this country until a few prisoners were flown to a nation which would receive and release them, we and the world would be outraged. And why less so for an ambassador? An ambassador is virtually the personal symbolic presence of the sovereign he represents. He does not take on an assignment expecting to play musical chairs at the whim of some local dissidents, or to have his person, family, staff or property held hostage for any purpose. His person, staff, family, and property are to be held sacrosanct by any government which receives his credentials.

World bodies such as the UN celebrating its 25th anniversary and the OAS have demonstrated a remarkable facility for deploring. When they can agree to control what they deplore we will have entered a new age. My resolution, which I am resubmitting today with over 30 cosponsors, presents at least an opportunity to consider certain reasonable controls.

HONOR AMERICA DAY

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if it were not for long-standing commitments I would enjoy nothing more than to remain in our Nation's Capital this coming July Fourth weekend for what may well be one of the most impressive, inspiring, and well-attended patriotic programs Washington has in its history witnessed.

I refer, of course, to "Honor America Day" to be held this Saturday, July 4, for which Americans of all political persuasion and from across the political spectrum will gather here under Old Glory to honor this great American Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that troubles this Nation today and there are many conditions plaguing and situations attending the United States which practically and morally must be remedied and alleviated. However, as President Nixon pointed out in his speech in St. Louis this past week, there is a lot about America for which we can be proud, a great deal about America which is right, much in America which is good and it does no physical harm while it can be spiritually uplifting to consider, stress and dwell upon these aspects of our life from time to time.

This, in essence, is what will be done in Washington this weekend in the true spirit of freedom which is the very essence of the real meaning of Independence Day.

A splendid program has been planned for the occasion. National Chairman Bob Hope and the Reverend Billy Graham have done an outstanding job of lining up talent and events for the hundreds of thousands of persons who are expected to gather here.

Those who have a part in the planning and preparation of Honor America Day are to be commended for putting together a program that is not only appealing but appropriate to the true spirit of freedom and independence of July the Fourth.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE PARK PLAZA NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE IN THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, N. MEX.

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill to establish the Park Plaza National Historic Site in the city of Las Vegas, N. Mex., I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that this site has very great historic significance to my State, to the western region, and to the Nation as a whole.

The westward expansion of the United States in the middle of the last century is one of the most exciting chapters in American history. Kit Carson, the mountain men, the Mexican border war, the Santa Fe Trail—all evoke memories of courage, drama, and frontier hardship that are a part of our national heritage. The acquisition of New Mexico from the Republic of Mexico marked a dramatic step forward in the sea-to-sea formation of the Union. The historic site created by this bill will serve to perpetuate a structure that was the scene of an important part of that drama.

During the Texas revolution and Mexican War, General Kearny led the invading army of the west over the Santa Fe Trail to New Mexico. The first town of importance he reached was Las Vegas.

On August 15, 1846, General Kearny lowered the Mexican flag from the flagpole atop a building on the Las Vegas Plaza and raised the Stars and Stripes, thereupon proclaiming New Mexico to be a part of the United States of America.

That building, though altered over the years, still stands. And the plaza still exists. Since it was from this spot that our State was officially proclaimed an area of the United States, the building and the plaza have a unique and patriotic significance to our people, and we believe this significance should be recognized and made an official part of our national heritage.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S CAMBODIA ACTION

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 months, there has been a great debate over President Nixon's incursions into Cambodia to protect American lives. The impression has been given that the academic community is unanimously opposed to the President's actions.

Recently, Prof. Charles Moser, of the George Washington University's Slavic Department, circulated a statement to many members of the academic community throughout the United States. This statement generally endorsed the President's actions and stated that under the circumstances which faced President Nixon, he had no alternative but to take this action. Over 360 professors from colleges and universities around the Nation have endorsed Professor Moser's statement.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Professor Moser's statement and list of professors endorsing this statement.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT'S CAMBODIA ACTION

At a press conference called in Washington, D.C., on May 12, 1970, by a group of 15 professors from colleges and universities in the Washington area, the following statement was released by Charles A. Moser, of the George Washington University:

"The members of this group of academic people from several institutions of higher learning in the Washington area (most of whom have met today for the first time) represent various disciplines ranging from chemistry to Asian studies. Some have specialized knowledge of southeast Asia; some have not. Some have visited southeast Asia; some have not. Not all view the situation in southeast Asia in the same way. But all agree that, given the situation in which President Nixon found himself in that part of the world, his decision to move against the long-protected sanctuaries in Cambodia—and at the same time relieve some of the pressure being exerted on the unprepared Cambodian army by the North Vietnamese invaders—was an extremely reasonable one, and deserves the support of reasonable men. Unfortunately, there has been a strong element of irrationality in the reaction to the Cambodian decision now sweeping American campuses. By our presence here today we affirm publicly our support for the President's move, which will almost certainly save the lives of many American and South Vietnamese troops. We also appeal for a more rational discussion of the issue of Southeast Asia than has generally taken place up to now."

In the past month the above statement has been circulated by mail to a number of campuses and adherences solicited. As of June 23 approximately 360 professors from campuses across the nation had signified their support for this statement. Their names are appended. Each of them speaks as an individual, and not as a representative of his particular educational institution.

PROFESSORS ADHERING TO CAMBODIA STATEMENT OF MAY 12, 1970

Carol Nevin Abromaitis (English), Loyola College, Baltimore, Md.; Paul L. Adams (History), Robert Wesleyan College, North Chili, N.Y.; Arthur W. Adamson (Chemistry), Univ. of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal.; John M. Aden (English), Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.; Donald M. Albanito (Law), Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.; Domenico S. Aliberti (Foreign Languages), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; Frank B. Allen (Mathematics), Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.; Paul Warren Allen (Music), North Central College, Naperville, Ill.; Marcello Alonso (Physics), Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Robert V. Andelson (Philosophy), Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Leonard E. Anderson (Business Administration), Olivet Nazarene Colleg, Kankakee, Ill.; Nancy S. Apgar (Music), Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; James D. Atkinson (Government), Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; G. Baer (German), University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado; Bruce A. Baker (Psychology), Northern Virginia Community College, Annandale, Va.; Byron B. Banta (History), Missouri Valley College, Marshall, Mo.; Norman H. Barlow (French), Duke University, Durham, N.C.; E. R. Barrett (Biology), Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Anna M. Battin (Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Laurence S. Baun, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Colin F. Baxter (History), Furman University, Greenville, S.C.; James Bearden (Dean of Students), Southwestern College, Phoenix, Ariz.; Kenneth R. Beardslee (Economics, Business), Spring Arbor College, Spring Arbor, Mich.; Ruth V. Veighley (Education), Southwestern College, Phoenix, Ariz.

Thomas A. Beineke (Chemistry), Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.; Hugh Y. Bernard (Law Librarian), The Geo. Washington University, Washington, D.C.; Thomas E. Berry (Russian), University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Robert G. Bidwell (Law Librarian), The Geo. Washington Univ., Washington, D.C.; Stephen T. Bihari (Languages, History), Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio; Robert H. Billings (Humanities), Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington, Cal.; N. E. Bingham (Science Education), University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.; Sigmund S. Birkenmayer (Slavic), Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park, Pa.; Carl W. Bitzer (Mathematics), Univ. of North Carolina, Greensboro, N.C.; David K. Blanchar (Music), Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S.D.; Arthur Blocher (retired, Music, Geology), St. Bede's College, Amboy, Ill.; Richard C. Bothner (Biology), St. Bonaventure University, Olean, N.Y.; Anthony T. Bouscaren (International Relations), Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N.Y.; Donald W. Boyd (Industrial & Management Engineering), Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana; Frank M. Boyd, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.

M. E. Bradford (English), University of Dallas, Irving, Texas; Donald D. Brand (Geography), University of Texas, Austin, Texas; Henrik Bredenberg (English), Miami-Dade Junior College, Miami, Fla.; Dennis Brennen (Economics), Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.; Jose Bufill (Spanish), George Mason College, Fairfax, Va.; Robert G. Caldwell (Criminology), University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Eloise A. Cameron (Librarian), St. Petersburg Jr. College, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Carl Campbell (Education), Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, Pa.; William G. Campbell (Music Education), Southeastern Louisiana College, New Orleans. Lawrence N. Canjar (Engineering), Univ. of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.; Nathan F. Cardarelli (Physics), University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.

George F. Carter (Geography), Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas; Henry W. Casper, S. J. (History), Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.; Karl Cerny (Government), Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; David S. Chamberlain (English), Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; R. L. Chambliss, Jr. (Agricultural Economics), Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.; Allan D. Charles (History), University of South Carolina, Union, S.C.; W. J. Cieslewicz (Russian), Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo.; John A. Clark (Mechanical Engineering), Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; William G. Clark (English and Rhetoric), Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Byron E. Colby (Veterinary and Animal Sciences), Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.; Roy Colby, Northern Colorado State College, Greeley, Colo.; James M. Cole (Education), Appalachian State University, Boone, N.C.; Victor Colombini (Geography), Ohio State University, Lima, Ohio.

Leonard Colwell, Montgomery College, Rockville, Md.; Carlisle C. Cooper (Fine Arts), Ventura College, Ventura, Cal.; Brutus Coste (International Relations), Fairleigh Dickinson Univ., Teaneck, N.J.; Lionel Crocker (Speech Communication), Denison University, Grandville, Ohio; V. A. Cyphers (Physical Education), Univ. of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo.; Maurice Czikann-Zichy (Economics), Immaculata College, Immaculata, Pa.; Robert W. Dally, Jr. (Foreign Languages), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; Frank J. D'Amico (Spanish Studies), Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa; Wesley A. Darley (English), Southwestern College, Phoenix, Ariz.; Anthony F. Dastoli (Business Administration), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; R. E. Davis (Chemistry), Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; Stanley R. Davison (History), Western Montana College, Dillon, Mont.; Ray DeBoer (Speech Communication), Univ. of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo.; Franklin Debrot (Philosophy), College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minn.; Gilda M. DeCapita (Nursing), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio.

Fred W. Decker (Meteorology), Oregon State University, Corvallis, Ore.; Robert Owen Decker (History), Central Connecticut State College, New Britain, Conn.; Philip B. Dedrick (Art History), Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.; E. T. Deiderich (Business Administration), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; Ann Demaitre (French), University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Melvin W. Denner (Ecology), Indiana State University, Evansville, Ind.; William C. Dennis (History), Denison University, Granville, Ohio; Donald Devine (Government and Politics), Univ. of Maryland, College Park, Md. Albert L. Diket (History), Nicholls State College, Thibodaux, La.; James Dornan (Political Science), Catholic University, Washington, D.C.; Neil S. Douglas, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Rurik Dudin (Slavic), Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Joseph Dunner (Political Science), Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.; Chester Earle (Government), American University, Washington, D.C.; Valerie Earle (Government), Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

John P. East (Political Science), East Carolina University, Greenville, N.C.; Atticus F. Edwards (Government), Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Texas (ret.); Harold Edwards (Business Management), Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.; Francis H. Eterovich (Social and Political Philosophy), De Paul University, Chicago, Ill.; E. Mark Evans (Asst. Dean), School of Business Administration, Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; C. N. Evanson (History, emeritus) Luther College, Decorah, Iowa; John R. Fawcett Jr. (Education), Univ. of Mississippi, University Miss.; Samuel J. Fisher (Foreign Languages), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; William Fleming (Political Science), Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.; B. Floyd Flickinger (American Studies), Institute of Allegheny Life and Culture, Baltimore, Md.; Walter H. Flynn Jr. (History and Political Science), Fairleigh Dickinson Univ., Teaneck, N.J.

Frank A. Fortunato (Business Administra-

tion), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; Bennett B. Foster (Forestry), Univ. of New Hampshire, Durham, N.H.; Ludmila A. Foster (Russian), Duke University, Durham, N.C.; Norma Foster (English), Southwestern College, Phoenix, Ariz.; Beauvais Fox Jr. (Mechanical Engineering), Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Duncan P. Francis (English), University of Houston, Houston, Texas; Beryl C. Franklin, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Joseph L. Frascona (Business Law), University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Keener C. Frazer (Political Science), Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.; Richard Freiman (Mathematics), Univ. of Maryland Baltimore County, Baltimore, Md.; Saul S. Friedman (History), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Paul D. Garn (Chemistry), University of Akron, Arkon, Ohio; Louis C. Gasper (Economics), University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.; Stanley N. Gaunt (Animal Genetics), Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.

Miodrag Georgevich (Political Science), Northern Michigan Univ., Marquette, Mich.; Gordon D. Gill (Biology), Northern Michigan Univ., Marquette, Mich.; Edward H. Glas, Farleigh Dickinson University, Madison, N.J.; G. G. Goble (Civil Engineering), Case Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, Ohio; Henry W. Gould (Mathematics), West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.; T. Franklin Grady Jr. (Psychology), Jamestown College, Jamestown, N.D.; Robert Graham (French), University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo.; William L. Graham (Dentistry), Univ. of West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.; William E. Gran (Physics), Univ. of Arkansas at Little Rock, Little Rock, Ark.; Mark Graubard (Natural Sciences), University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; J. B. Graves Jr. (Classics), University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.; John L. Grim (Business Administration), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; J. R. Gump (Physical Science), Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, Mich.; Vincent J. Gutierrez (Director of Housing), Northland College, Ashland, Wis.; W. J. Gutknecht (Business Administration), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio.

Mary Haight (Music), Univ. of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo.; George D. Haimbaugh Jr. (International Law), Univ. of South Carolina School of Law, Columbia, S.C.; Gerald L. Hamel (Business Administration), St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa; W. M. Hammack (Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Oscar J. Hammen (History), University of Montana, Missoula, Mont.; Sigmund Hammer (Geophysics), Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Hudson B. Hastings (Economics), Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (retired); Richard S. Haugh (Liberal Arts), Academy of Aeronautics, Flushing, N.Y.; Bevan O. Haycock (Spanish), New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, N.M.; William C. Heiss, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo.; Julia S. Henkel (Literature), Grand Rapids Baptist College, Grand Rapids, Mich.; David C. Henley (Journalism), Univ. of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.; Will Herberg (Philosophy), Drew University, Madison, N.J.; Arthur R. Hercz (Radar & Optics), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Marian Hernandes (Political Science), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio.

Mr. and Mrs. Kurt Heydle (Foreign Langs.), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; R. S. Hill (Political Theory), Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio; Dorothy Hille (Business Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; T. B. Holliday (Physics), Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.; David C. Holly (International Relations), Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Va.; Leland W. Hooker (Forestry), Michigan Technological Univ., Houghton, Mich. (ret.); Stephen M. Horak (History), Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Ill.; Donald W. Howe Jr. (Physics), Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass.; Richard H. Howe (Physics), Denison University, Granville, Ohio; Charles C. Hower (Classics), North Central College, Naperville, Ill.; K. D. Hramov (Slavic), Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; P. Huanj (History), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Bettie W. Hudgens (Speech), Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala.; Daniel H. Hundley (Industrial Engineering), Washington Univ., St. Louis, Mo. (ret.); Joseph T. Hudson (History), Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, Mich.

James H. Hutson (American History), College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Va.; Phillip L. Hutson (History), Western Illinois University, Macomb, Ill.; Oscar Ibele (Political Science), Kent State University, Kent, Ohio; Leo V. Imperi (Music), Marshall University, Huntington, W. Va.; David S. Ives (Foreign Languages), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Walter Jacobs (Government and Politics), Univ. of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Harry V. Jaffa (Political Philosophy), Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Cal.; William R. Jamieson (Music), Univ. of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo.; Stephen A. Janto, O.F.M. (History), Siena College, Loudonville, N.Y.; Heinz Javett (Finance), Pace College, New York, N.Y.; Jack K. Jeanes (Biophysics), Univ. of Dallas, Irving, Texas; Russell A. Johnson (Business Administration), Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Va.

C. Clyde Jones (Business Administration), Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.; Raphael G. Kazmann (Civil Engineering), Louisiana State Univ., Baton Rouge, La.; Daniel T. Kee, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Donald L. Kemmerer (Economic History), Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; William R. Kintner (International Relations), Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; W. C. Kitzerow (Philosophy), Morton College, Cicero, Ill.; Nikolaos G. Kondylis (Management Science), Boston University, Boston, Mass.; Richard D. Kreske (Geography), Univ. of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.; W. S. Krogdahl (Astronomy), University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.; Magnus J. Krynski (Slavic), Duke University, Durham, N.C.; George Kulchysky (History), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Terence N. LaManna (Sociology), St. Lawrence University, Canton, N.Y.; Carl H. Lande (Politics and Government), Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; Peter P. Lapiken (Slavic), University of Montana, Missoula, Mont.; Richard J. Lease (Police Science), New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces, N.M.

Louis J. Lekai (History), University of Dallas, Irving, Texas; Edward F. Leonard (History), Iona College, New Rochelle, N.Y.; Z. John Levay (Psychiatry, Psychology), Catonsville Community College, Catonsville, Md.; R. S. Little (Geography), West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.; George B. Livesay (Academic Dean), Southwestern College, Phoenix, Ariz.; Paul C. Llewellyn (Chemistry), College of Marin, Kentfield, Cal.; Kurt London (International Relations), The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; R. M. Longyear (Music), University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.; Lawrence Looby, Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Robert E. Lutz (Chemistry), University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.; Norman Luxenburg (Russian Studies), Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Warren J. Luzadder (Engineering Graphics), Purdue Univ., West Lafayette, Ind.; Russell Maatman (Chemistry), Dordt College, Sioux Center, Iowa; Lester J. McCann (Biology), College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.; James McClellan (Government), Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Va.

Athel McCombs (Rhetoric), Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Ill.; Stanley J. McCord (German), University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Joseph C. McElhannon (History), Baylor University, Waco, Texas; Bob McHenry (Political Science), Montgomery College, Rockville, Md.; Keith McKean (Political Science), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Stephen R. Maloney (English), College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.; Harvey C. Mansfield Jr., (Political Science), Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Carmen L. Marinella (Business Management), Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington, Cal.; William Oliver Martin (Philosophy), University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.; Perry Mason (History—Political Science), Harding College, Searcy, Ark.; Franz Michael (History), The Geo. Washington University, Washington, D.C.; Walter Mierzejewski (Mathematics), Southeastern Massachusetts Univ., Dartmouth, Mass.

Mihailo Mihailovic (Slavic), Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa; Gustavus H. Miller (Romance Languages), Duke University, Durham, N.C.; Harold J. Miller (Industrial Education), University of California, Santa Barbara, Cal. (ret.); Howard H. Miller (Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Jessie L. Miller (Political Science), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Kenneth E. Miller (Political Science), Youngstown University, Youngstown Ohio; Murray L. Miller (Public Education), Illinois State Univ., Normal, Ill.; Veronica Miller (Philosophy), Belmont Abbey College, Belmont, N.C.; William W. Miller III, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Julio A. Mira (Mathematics), Fort Lauderdale Univ., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Herman Moench (Electrical Engineering), Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute, Ind.; Robert O. Moninger (Music), Iowa City Comm. Schools, Iowa City, Iowa; Berry L. Moore Jr. (Medicine), University of Arkansas, El Dorado, Ark.

Casper J. Moore Jr. (Business Administration), youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; Maurice Moore (English), University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.; Richard R. Moore (American Studies), Del Mar College, Corpus Christi, Texas; Arthur H. Moser (Classics), University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.; Charles A. Moser (Slavic), The Geo. Washington University, Washington, D.C.; Dwight D. Murphey (Business Law), Wichita State University, Wichita, Kans.; Thomas W. Murphy (Political Philosophy), Midwestern Univ., Wichita Falls, Texas; Mitko Nedeff (Foreign Languages), DLIWC, Presidio of Monterey, Cal.; David F. Neu (Mathematics), Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Wash.; William W. Norris, Jr., Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Jim Northcutt (Agriculture), Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas; John R. Norton (History), St. John's University, New York, N.Y.; Nicholas Nyaradi (International Studies), Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.; William A. Nye (Finance), San Diego State College, San Diego, Cal.; Francis W. O'Brien (Government), Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.; Cyril J. O'Donnell (Business Policy), University of California, Los Angeles, Cal.; Richard O'Keeffe (Library), George Mason College, Fairfax, Va.; Kenneth V. Olson (Science Education), Univ. of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo.; Sean O'Reilly (Nuerology), Geo. Washington Univ. Medical School, Washington, D.C.; N. Oulianoff (Slavic), Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

George R. Overby (Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Tate C. Page (Education), Western Kentucky Univ., Bowling Green, Ky.; Edith Painter (Psychology), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Henry Paolucci (Political Science), St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y.; Nicholas Paraska (Dean, Technical and Community College), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; John D. Pendleton (Agronomy), Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.; Howard Penniman (Government), George-

town University, Washington, D.C.; Theodore Perros (Chemistry), The Geo. Washington University, Washington, D.C.; Arthur W. Peterson (Agricultural Economics), Washington State Univ., Pullman, Wash.; Vladimir Petrov (International Relations), The G. Washington Univ., Washington, D.C.; William Petrych (Business Administration), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; Virginia Phillips (Business Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Jaroslaw Piekalkiewicz (Political Science), Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; Dan. H. Pletta (Engineering Mechanics), Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.

Andras H. Pogany (Library), Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J.; H. C. Porter (Soils), Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.; Victor J. Posphishil (Religious Studies), Manhattan College, Bronx, N.Y.; B. E. Prince, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Wade A. Provo (Foreign Languages), Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.; Joseph M. Puggelli (Slavic), Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park, Pa.; Sergei G. Pushkarev (History), Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; L. D. Prewitt (Business Administration), Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa; Grace Quinn (Mathematics), American University, Washington, D.C.; Hugh C. Rawls (Biology), Eastern Illinois Univ., Charleston, Ill.; John S. Reed (Sociology), University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.; E. T. Reilly (Business Administration), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Winn Richardson (Library Science), Univ. of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo.; B. L. Ricks, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Dan S. Rinn (Near Eastern Studies), Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

David E. Robbins (History), Roberts Wesleyan College, North Chili, N.Y.; Kenneth H. Rogers (French), University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.; Rosemary Rogers (Religion), Catholic University, Washington, D.C.; Momcilo Rosic (Modern Langs.), Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.; Donald J. Ross (Biology), Fairfield University, Fairfield, Conn.; David N. Rowe (Far Eastern Affairs), Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Edward J. Rozek (Soviet Affairs), Univ. of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Grant Rush (Education), Madison College, Harrisonburg, Va.; Laurence W. Sain (Industrial Education), Northern Michigan Univ., Marquette, Mich.; Egon W. Samuels (Economics), University of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md.; Sylvia G. Sanders (Political Science), East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas; Ellis Sandoz (Political Science), East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas; Anatol K. Sapronow (Russian), Barnard College, New York, N.Y.; Barbara Sargent (French), University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; George Sargent (Musicology), University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Leonard H. Scane (Real Estate), Roosevelt Univ., Chicago, Ill. (ret.); G. H. Scharnhard (Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Joseph Schiebel (History), Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Theodore F. Schramm, Southwestern College, Phoenix, Ariz.; Paul Schumacher (Political Science), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; E. E. Schneider (Business Administration), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Harold K. Schneider (Anthropology), Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.; Donald E. Scott (Electrical Engineering), Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.; Walter M. Shackelford (Education), LaGrange College, LaGrange, Ga.; L. Shapovaloff (Russian), University of Montana, Missoula, Mont.; J. Frank Sharp (Operations Research), New York University, New York, N.Y.; Olga Shaskevich (Russian), New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, N.Mex.; Kenneth M. Shaver (Business Law), Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.; Bernard W. Sheehan (History), Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; Wayne L. Shick (Architecture), University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

William A. Shipman (Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Robert W. Shoemaker (American Civilization), North Central College, Naperville, Ill.; Andrew L. Simon (Civil Engineering), University of Akron, Akron, Ohio; C. Gregg Singer (History), Catawba College, Salisbury, N.C.; Alevtina Sokolov (Slavic), Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Vladimir Sokolov-Samarin (Slavic), Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Allan Spitz (International Relations), Michigan State Univ., East Lansing, Mich.; James Steele (Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Gail Stephenson (English), Lee College, Baytown, Texas; O. Carlos Stoetzer (History), Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y.; William J. Sullivan (Slavic Linguistics), Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; William Swan (Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Patrick Tarrant (French), Illinois State University, Normal, Ill.; John A. A. ter Haar (German), Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Armand J. Thieblot, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

G. G. Thielman (Political Science), Georgia State University, Atlanta, Ga.; LeRoy D. Thomas (Bible Dept.), Southwestern College, Phoenix, Ariz.; R. Dale Thomas, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; Richard Thornton (History), The Geo. Washington University, Washington, D.C.; John Tierney (Political Science), Catholic University, Washington, D.C.; T. H. Tsuan (Asian Studies), Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J.; Janice B. Turner (Molecular Spectroscopy), Augusta College, Augusta, Ga.; Mae Turner (Business Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Emmett Tyrrell Jr. (History), Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; Howard E. Updyke (English), Roberts Wesleyan College, Rochester, N.Y.; Justus M. van der Kroef (Asian Studies), Univ. of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Conn.; John van Laer (Psychology), Hunter College, New York, N.Y.; Mario A. Veccio (Foreign Languages), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Eliseo Vivas (Philosophy), Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.; Laszlo von Gorgey (International Relations), Univ. of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

Vukan Vuchic (Engineering), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Peter Vujacic (Physics), La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dwight Walkins (Education), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Daniel A. Walsh Jr. (Business Law), St. Francis College, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Robert E. Ward (Foreign Languages), Youngstown University, Youngstown, Ohio; Dale E. Warner (Chemistry), University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colo.; William E. Warner (Industrial Arts Education), Ohio State Univ., Columbus, O. (ret.); Arthur A. Weeks (Dean, School of Law), Samford Univ., Birmingham, Ala; Edward C. Whatley Sr., Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, La.; James B. Whisker (Political Science), West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.

John P. White (Political Science), Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz.; E. P. Wigner (Physics), Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.; Oliver B. Wilber (History), Southwestern College, Phoenix, Ariz.; Ross Wilhelm (Business Economics), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; William H. Wilkening (German), University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; John R. Williams (Political Science), West Virginia Univ., Morgantown, W. Va.; Joseph E. Wisan (History), City College of New York, New York, N.Y. (ret.); Herbert A. Woodbury (Language and Literature), Monticello College, Godfrey, Ill.; Wallace E. Woods (President), Southwestern College, Phoenix, Ariz.; Ilija M. Yoksimovich (Political Science), Shaw University, Raleigh, N.C.; Iraj Zandi (Engineering), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Jerome E. Zetts (Business Administration), Youngstown Univ., Youngstown, Ohio; Joseph M. Calderon (History), Anne Arundel Community College, Arnold, Md.; Z. Michael Szaz, American Institute on Problems of European Unity, Inc., Washington, D.C.

CRACKS IN THE F–14 PROGRAM

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I was disturbed but not surprised by the June 29, 1970, report in the Wall Street Journal that cracks have been discovered in the F–14A wing-box lugs. While these cracks do not seem to be, at this time, major technological problems, they are indications of future troubles for the F–14. I therefore would like to mention two points that I made last year.

First, I still seriously question the wisdom of developing the "A" model of the F–14. My information indicates that the 14–A will not be equal to the Soviet aircraft which we can expect to face in the mid- and late-1970's. Nevertheless, the Navy is still planning to buy 67 of these inferior F–14A's at a total cost of at least $1.4 billion.

Second, once again we are undertaking a very complex technical production program without adequate testing and evaluation. This is the same approach that brought us such technical fiascoes as the Cheyenne helicopter and the F–111's. Navy Secretary Chafee claims that the amount of simultaneous development and production work for the F–14 program "has been reduced to a minimum." This is not true.

First, the Air Force has less simultaneous development for the F–15 than the Navy has for the F–14. Second, the Navy, to achieve the appearance of less simultaneous development, has greatly compressed the time scheduled for flight-testing. The flight-test schedule is much less than for previous planes. The Navy in its short testing schedule is trying to do a great many things in a very short time. The compressed test schedule and the location of these tests suggest, that when problems develop—and they will—the Navy will not have time to adjust to them and we will be in very extensive simultaneous development and production. There does not seem to be any test to determine if this plane is in fact the air-superiority fighter this country needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NAVY F–14A WING-BOX LUGS CRACK, RAISING FEARS OF CONGRESSIONAL ATTACK ON NEW JET

(By Richard J. Levine)

WASHINGTON.—The Navy's F–14A jet fighter, still in development, has encountered an apparently simple-to-solve technical problem that military men worry could still give the program an unfair black eye.

The reason for their concern is that the problem, detected early this month but never made public, involves the plane's movable or swing wing. This is the same design feature that has plagued the Air Force's ill-fated F–111 fighter bomber—though Navy men are quick to say the F–14's problem isn't related to those of the F–111.

Built by Grumman Corp., the F–14 would be the first new carrier-based fighter in a decade and would substitute for the Navy's canceled version of the F–111. The F–14 is designed primarily as an air-superiority fighter that could provide air defense of the Navy's fleet and also hit ground targets.

The problem detected during fatigue test on June 2 was cracks in two of four appendages, or "lugs," welded to the wing box—the device that supports the F–14's wings and permits them to pivot in flight. The crack in the first lugs, Navy officials say, was responsible for the second crack.

GOAL WAS 12,000 HOURS

The cracks occurred at the equivalent of 9,000 hours of flight time, or 1½ times the anticipated operational life of the aircraft. Thus, says Navy Capt. L. E. Ames, the F–14 project manager, the lugs "probably never would have broken in flight." However, the Navy's goal during the test of the wingback "pivot area" was 12,000 hours.

The Navy said the cracks occurred because the lugs were too thin. The decision was made to increase the thickness of the first lugs by a quarter-inch and the other by an eighth-inch to give them added strength. It "certainly wasn't a tough engineering problem" to solve, Capt. Ames says.

The thicker lugs will add only three to four pounds to the F–14's weight, which the Navy happily observed is within 1% of specifications. One major reason for abandoning the F–111 Navy program was that the plane proved too heavy for shipboard use.

A Grumman official describes the cracks as a "disappointing thing" but "not any catastrophe." And Navy officials estimate the only delay will be a setback of about two weeks in the test schedule for the wingback. The first F–14 is due to fly next January, with some Navy men hopeful that flight can be pushed up a month.

ADDED COST UNDER $500,000

The added cost to the Government of inserting and testing the new lugs, which are already on hand, will be "less than $500,000," a Navy official asserts, well "within the current estimated cost of the plane."

Through the current fiscal year, which ends tomorrow, Congress has approved $666 million for F–14 research and development. The Navy currently estimates that production of 722 planes, including the 12 test models already funded, will cost over $7 billion.

However, despite the discovery of the cracks in early testing before a complete plane was built and the apparent ease with which the Navy and the contractor hope to make corrections, military men seem a bit uneasy that the problem could create trouble on Capitol Hill.

The Navy could quickly report it to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees in both the Senate and the House apparently without arousing any alarm. But in the current hostile atmosphere for the military, some Pentagon critics in Congress might seize upon the public disclosure of the cracks to attack and perhaps attempt to slow the F–14 program.

Lawmakers are anxious to avoid repeating mistakes made in the F–111 program, and some have felt the Navy has been inclined to move too quickly into production with the F–14. The Defense Department requested $517 million in fiscal 1971 to produce 26 planes.

SLOW START ON OUTPUT

For its part, the Navy believes the extensive and early testing of the F–14 and the relatively slow start on production (in calendar 1971, it plans to take delivery of only one F–14 a month) are ample protection against serious and costly problems after production has begun.

Earlier this year, Navy Secretary Chafee told Congress that "one can never be certain that some unforeseen event will not occur in development." However, he stressed, the amount of simultaneous development and production work in the F–14 program "has been reduced to a minimum."

"A vigorous test program to assure that critical components are tested prior to flight has been instigated," he assured legislators. "For example, the F–14 wing box and pivot fitting will complete static and fatigue tests prior to the first flight, whereas the F–111 pivot fatigue tests were not completed until more than two years after first flight."

General Dynamics Corp.'s F–111, grounded last December after a wing collapsed in flight, has had extensive wing problems. Cracks were discovered in the wing box itself and then cracks showed up in the pivot area of the wing. The extensive testing and refitting required will run into millions of dollars, the Air Force has said.

The F–14 uses many of the same weapons and electronics, plus the engine scheduled for the canceled Navy F–111. The F–111 was built by Grumman as a subcontractor for General Dynamics.

But before the current problem was discovered, Capt. Ames said the F–14's wing box was "made of a different material (light, costly titanium) using different processes and it's of a different design." He added in Congressional testimony: "We have no reason to think that there is any similarity between the F–111 wing box problem and F–14 at all."

BROTHERS FOREVER

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1970, His Excellency, Mr. E. M. Debrah, the Ambassador of Ghana to the United States, delivered the commencement address entitled "Brothers Forever" at Clark College, in Atlanta, Ga., Mr. Debrah declared that African brothers and sisters throughout the world must join together to construct and not to destroy. The 1970's must be the decade where blacks "get to know each other thoroughly, understand our limitations and appreciate our strength; and avoid learning of each other through the medium of third parties."

I commend Ambassador Debrah on his most stimulating address and am happy to include it in the RECORD at this point:

BROTHERS FOREVER

Mr. President, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, Brothers and Sisters, to come to Atlanta is a cherished pilgrimage! For the very first time I visited Atlanta was to join millions of Black people all over the world in mourning and laying to rest our dear and revered hero, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Physically King is no more; but he lives in the hearts of all Black people, and his example and inspiration continue to guide them to the mountain top. The Prime Minister of Ghana, Dr. K. A. Busia recently had occasion to reflect on the significance and relevance of Dr. Martin Luther King's struggle and death. "To some", he said, "who pride themselves on their realism, it seemed naive and futile that he should have placed his faith in love, on non-violence and to have carried out his campaign in the conviction that it is possible through dialogue and intercourse to change people's minds and hearts, to arouse their consciences to correct injustice, inequity and inhumanity, and to seek concord in place of discord.

Yet the lesson of his life is clear. It is this: that in all that we seek or do, we must not set the lower thing in its narrow accomplishment above the higher thing in its shattered majesty; we must not lower our aim so that we may enjoy the complacency of popular but transient acclaim. To be inspired by the faith and vision that human relations can be improved through intercourse and dialogue and love, and to give one's life in that cause is to display the kind of heroism in which life's supreme mystery is hidden."

And as I look at the faces of the men and women, students of Atlanta's Universities, I recall Du Bois who once taught in Atlanta: "Teach thinkers to think—a needed knowledge in a day of loose and careless logic, and they whose lot is gravest must have the most careful training to think alright. If these things are so, how foolish to ask what is the best education for one, or seven or sixty million souls? Shall we teach them trades, or train them in the liberal arts? Neither and both. We are training not isolated men but a living group of men, nay a group within a group. And the final product of our training must be neither a psychologist nor a brickmason—but a man." Today we pay tribute to the hundreds of black men living and dead, famous and unknown, who have helped in training black sons and daughters to be true men and women.

Four weeks ago, I wrote a letter to Dr. Brantley informing him of my visit to Ghana to attend a Seminar of Ghanaian Heads of Diplomatic Missions. I promised to be back in time for this Commencement Exercise. When the Seminar began, it became obvious that it would not end before the 4th of June. The Government of Ghana, however, considered my participation in this Commencement Exercise of such importance that it readily permitted me to interrupt my attendance at the Seminar in order to be with you.

It took this step because it is of the view that no stone should be left unturned to foster and deepen meaningful relations between brothers on the two continents though divided, by time, by space and by environment. For it is becoming fashionable in certain quarters to believe that "Since Africans and Black Americans have been separated for nearly four hundred years, they do not have much in common". People refer to the different nationalities of Black peoples—Ghanians, Nigerians, Congolese, Americans, Haitians, Jamaicans etc: the colours of their passports—green, black, red; their various delegations at the United Nations and other international bodies; their now established cultural and social orientations, and conclude that surely the claim to one people in this day and age must be a myth. Each group within its national boundaries has its own immediate and set problems to which it is seeking immediate and compelling solutions not necessarily in harmony with those of other black people elsewhere. Each nationality would not hesitate to stress its immediate and selfish interest to the exclusion of all others, if it considers this relevant. Once again it is concluded: brotherhood is as real as ice cream lasts in a hot oven.

I recall that when the African countries assembled in Ethiopia in 1963 to form the Organisation of African Unity, the same discouraging voices were heard. What has the Congo in common with Sierra Leone; what bonds of brotherhood unites Zambia and Mauritania or Ghana with Gabon? Haven't they all been ruled by different colonial masters who had taught them to think of England, France, Belgium rather than of each

other? And haven't they been quarrelling recently among themselves? An Organisation stressing brotherhood among Africans—impossible.

And yet it took only three days of deliberations for the 32 African countries represented to emphasize their one-ness, their aspirations, and objectives, and their one determination to create better lives for the African people. In the preamble to the Charter of the O.A.U., they declared that they were "inspired by a common determination to promote understanding among our peoples and co-operation among our States, in response to the aspirations of our peoples for brotherhood and solidarity, in a larger unity transcending ethnic and national difference; they were desirous that all African States should henceforth unite so that the welfare and well-being of their peoples can be assured. They resolved to reinforce the links between our States by strengthening common institutions." Where brothers are determined to emphasize their common oneness, they are always able to do so. The detractors were proved wrong.

We may refer also to the example of the Commonwealth, formerly known as the British Commonwealth, which comprises more than twenty-four nations who were at one time or the other colonies of Britain. The Commonwealth institution grew up because these colonies, made up originally of people who all imigrated from Great Britain desired to maintain their common allegiance and emphasise their common origins. Independence did not weaken their resolve to maintain their common links. They found a formula to enable them to do so. This formula, expressed in the Statute of Westminster in 1931 laid down that "Dominions are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, and in no way subordinate to one another in their domestic affairs though united by a common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations". The Statute enabled them, while maintaining their sovereignty and while in no way subordinate to one another, to emphasise their oneness of origin and hence their desire to be linked to one another.

Today one hears of efforts to create a union of French speaking peoples, because its advocates say that the French language is more than a language; it is a culture, it is a life by itself, and therefore those who speak it must identify themselves as a group. And do not forget that different people of different nationalities, of creeds, of colours and of different environments speak French. It is not the differences which matter to them; it is that which unites them—the language—which must be emphasized.

If a language which is not indigenous but borrowed can be the source from which derives the unity of diverse groups, what greater claim do we, Blacks in America and Africa, not have in emphasising our oneness because of our common and unique African ancestry and heritage? We do not have to be of one nationality to do this; we do not all have to live in one particular spot of the world to do this; we do not have to speak one language in order to do this; we do not above all have to reject our present-day cultures to do this. The idea of our blackness, the idea of our common ancestry, the idea of our Africanness, the history of our sorrows and our sufferings—these are valid reasons for our claim to be brothers and to seek to live as such. It is superior to that bond of brotherhood which makes the Jew wherever he may be, whatever his present day nationality, American, British or French, whatever colour he may be, whatever language he may speak to feel a commitment to Israel and to exert an influence on behalf of that State. We have, we believe, a superior claim to forge a unity of our peoples because of our African-ness and our blackness.

Our common ancestry is no theorem to prove. When Columbus discovered the Americas in 1492, there were no blacks on the continent. All the blackmen were living at home in Africa. The story of the parting of the ways began with the infamous slave trade when blackmen were forcibly removed from Africa, and sold to work on the plantations of North America like beasts of burden. Dunbar estimates that by the 19th Century around fifteen million blacks were imported into the Americas. When one considers the great numbers that must have been killed while resisting capture, the additional numbers that died during the middle passage and the millions that were successfully brought over, the aggregate approaches staggering proportions. John Hope Franklin notes, "Africa which culturally was within some measurable distance of Europe at the beginning of the 15th Century received the worst possible influence from her Christian neighbors to the north, and under these adverse circumstances, she began a recession that in time was to be accelerated by the imperialistic enslavement that was to be thrust on her in the 19th Century".

Emancipation brought the brother who was carried into America legal freedom; but did not release him from the disabilities which he suffered as a slave. It was only through a relentless fight, through overcoming beastly humiliations and indignities, even in fact, through paying with his very life that he has been able to achieve the measure of progress that is his today. He never had it handed over to him on a silver platter. He had to fight all the way. I sat motionless through the film: "King, from Montgomery to Memphis". In the brief period of about two hours it summed up the privations which the Blackman has gone through in America and the majesty of his achievement. He needs support to break down the barriers completely. And brothers in Africa are ready to help.

At the meeting of the Organization of African Unity in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in May 1963 all the African peoples expressed their concern at the present race relations all over the world in a special resolution on Apartheid and Racial Discrimination:

"The Summit Conference of Independent African States meeting in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia from 22 May to 25 May 1963 expresses the deep concern aroused in all African peoples and governments by the measures of racial discrimination taken against communities of African origin living outside the continent and particularly in the United States of America: Expresses appreciation for the efforts of the Federal Government of the United States of America to put an end to these intolerable malpractices which are likely seriously to deteriorate relations between the African peoples and governments on the one hand and the people and government of the U.S.A. on the other."

Note that the Resolution was dealing with Apartheid and Racial Discrimination in South Africa. The meeting was expressing its "conviction of the imperious and urgent necessity of co-ordinating and intensifying their efforts to put an end to the South African Government's criminal policy of Apartheid and wipe out racial discrimination in all its form. You might describe this as reacting to an African problem. But the Africans did not consider their duty done if they did not identify themselves with their brothers in America who in many cases were undergoing the same type of humiliating conditions as in the repugnant Republic of South Africa. They expressed their deep concern; they gave a warning that unless conditions change this might affect gravely relations between the African Governments on one hand and the U.S. Government on the other. No one can say that the Africans do not care about what happens to all Blacks in the U.S. They do care and they have said so. They believe, in the words of Ed Smith, that "for the blackman to be really free, he must have the world's respect for his identity as a blackman—an identity that can be forcefully stated only when blackmen everywhere take on each other's struggle for their own. There is only one fight to be fought and it can't be won if Troop A doesn't know what the hell Troop B is doing, or doesn't care".

The brother who remained in Africa suffered that imperialistic slavery called colonialism. The national resources of his land were all exploited to enrich the colonial masters. He was kept from the decision making in his country; he was educated only as part of the colonial basic infrastructure to produce cheap clerical labour, to be tally clerk, helplessly recording the wealth which was being moved out of his country.

Of course he had no meaningful political rights, and was often drafted to fight wars whose origins he was not made aware of and whose spoils of victory he was not made to share. But above all he was indoctrinated to believe that whatever was indigenous was inferior, and the only path to progress and self-fulfillment was through that of the colonial master. He thus came to believe that the essentials of life consisted in adopting the trappings of the colonial masters' external civilization. He is today paying the price by operating economies heavily based on imports from abroad, and thus finding himself beholden to an outsider. He carried out a stormy, often bloody struggle in order to obtain political independence from the colonial master and to rid himself of his two-ness. Nor he is trying to achieve economic sufficiency at great cost because of the strong pull of the colonial influence, and because of early misapplication of energy and resources. But he is determined to succeed. He needs support to succeed.

It is in an effort to relieve each other's burden that Blackmen over the centuries have been trying to reach out to one another. John A. Davis, the historian, notes that shortly before the Civil War, American Black leaders began to seek the joint regeneration of the blacks in Africa and in America through an identification with Africa and through educational, religious, and even business ventures in Africa.

In recent days, we remember the first World Congress of Negro writers in 1956 organised by French speaking West Africans and sponsored by Presence Africaine in which blacks of this country and Africa participated. We recall with pride the First World Festival of Negro Arts in Dakar in 1966 which demonstrated to the World the Negro Contribution to culture not only in Africa but also on other continents where his presence has effected what is described as a "sea change". Not surprisingly men and women from the United States, Haiti, Brazil and Trinidad and Tobago joined with 22 African nations in sending musicians, dancers, writers, artists, art exhibitions, and plays to emphasise one thing: our Africanness and our blackness.

It is gratifying to note that today every effort is being made by all black Americans to reach out and identify themselves with their African origins. Gone are the days when American blacks as a group were not enthusiastic in their desire for knowledge about Africa and things African. Africa no longer seems to relate to a position of inferiority in American life.

This identification has taken several forms. To some it has taken the form of wearing African costumes, for example, the dashiki; and sporting the Afro hair-cut. The importance of these aspects of the identification process should never be minimised. They have a very important message for us.

There was a time when the black girl tried to press her hair to look like that of the caucasian. Painful hours were endured beneath the hot comb in order to appear "to

belong". Everything was done to conceal or change the kinky woolly hair. The Afro haircut not only called a halt to this unnecessary agony but more important gave notice that the era of the meaningless imitation was over, and that has dawned a new era of the recognition of the black man of his God-given graces. It was the most outstanding break with the helplessness of the past; rejecting that Southern thinking that God created men unequal: with whites intelligent and destined to lead; while the others were given strong backs and a meek disposition so that they could labour more effectively. The Afro hair-cut is the victory sign of the rebirth of Black confidence, a confidence not confined as in previous days to a few intellectuals, but this time spreading out to all the peoples, however humble. But it is only a first step in the right direction.

I was happy to see that the Afro wig has caught on in Africa and these women who must resort to wearing wigs as a matter of convenience are now happy to wear a wig and at the same time look African.

For others the process takes the form of working closely and on a personal basis with some African leaders to promote a particular brand of political philosophy. Naturally it does not make for friendly relations when some brothers in the United States refer to Black African leaders who are not their friends as a bunch of clowns, or threaten to go to their black countries "to straighten things out". Some of the extreme and wild statements emanating from certain unfortunate quarters to the effect that Black America must help to restore certain individual leaders who have been deposed or rejected by their own peoples not only distress brother Africans, but gives them the impression that this segment is more interested in promoting the ambitions of individual for selfish reasons rather than working for cooperation among brothers, or helping to promote sound economic, political and social progress in Africa.

The advocates of such philosophies must be rejected because they play into the hands of the enemies of the Blackmen, and cause divisions among brothers where there should be co-operation, harmony and a mutual striving for a common good. Don't let us be taken in by cheap, shallow, meaningless and empty sloganeering. Let us join to construct, not to destroy.

Still for others the process takes the form of a romantic and missionary journey to Africa, to an El Dorado—the dream city of delight, which at times ends in disappointment owing to lack of information and knowledge about the difficulties which today beset the continent.

As we begin the decade of the 70s it behooves us to give a proper sense of direction to our African-ness to build on the successes of the past and avoid its disappointing failures. To be able to do so it is imperative that we get to know each other thoroughly, understand our limitations and appreciate our strength; and avoid learning of each other through the medium of third parties. This is where institutions such as Clark have a great part to play. It is a sad fact that the youths of Africa and Black America know very little of each other. Our Universities have very little contact; our faculties are only partially aware of each others progress and achievements. Africa knows about the big white Universities and little of the black Universities. The black Universities in America have no meaningful relations with the black Colleges in Africa.

So this is the starting point of our continued modern involvement; let us call for a mutual involvement of our Institutions of higher learning. Let us institute programme of exchanging students and faculty. Let us organise every four or five years a Conference of all Black Universities all over the world to study areas of co-operation and promote joint-research. This is not advocating an isolation of black Universities. It is merely calling attention to the need for repairing certain past deficiencies which have been to the detriment of the Black people. I hear that there are large numbers of black millionaires in Atlanta: I trust some of them will get together to endow a fund to make the coming-together of our Universities, hence of our youth, possible.

It is fortunate for Africa that twenty million of the population of America hails from Africa. For Africa needs the support of America in solving certain problems particularly in the fields of decolonisation in Southern Africa and bringing an end to the abominable practice of apartheid in South Africa.

For those who have no idea of how apartheid operates just listen to this:

"In the fifty-three years that have passed since Union, the South African Parliament has produced the most appalling collection of racist laws to be found in any single country anywhere in the world. The cumulative effect and the increasing ferocity with which they have been enforced during the past sixteen years have given to apartheid the basic characteristics, if not the exact dimensions, of slavery. But to the African, for whom the policy has meant humiliation and degradation, starvation, disease and death, jail, beatings, torture and hangings, the difference is academic".

For years the African countries have been calling for positive action against apartheid. They have appealed to the conscience of the world through the United Nations; they have cut their trading, social and political relations with South Africa because they cannot co-exist with a country which believes that black is inferior. But they have not succeeded in getting the great powers to join in the boycott of South Africa because they place their own material prosperity before attainment of equality and dignity for the Blackman in South Africa. Your help is needed to convince your Government about the criminality of apartheid and the need to join in the boycott of that Republic. Last week, the British Government urged the British Sports Council to cancel a tour of the South African Cricket Team in England because the public conscience was aroused against apartheid in sports. I trust no South African will have the audacity to take part in any sports in the U.S. as long as our ace tennis player Arthur Ashe is unable to play there. The U.S. Declaration of Independence, in the second paragraph begins, "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." We take our stand against Apartheid and racial discrimination on the Declaration of Independence, a corner stone document of this Republic.

At the beginning of the decade of the Seventies the following picture of Africa seen by the Economic Commission for Africa, in spite of the phenomenal progress made in the 60s on the continent still has considerable relevance.

"In terms of income per head, Africa has some of the very poorest countries in the world. It has a population of over 300 million which will more than double in the next few decades. Yet in the last few years an increasing proportion of its basic food supplies has come from the outside world. Forty-three per cent of the population is under 15 and needs an education in keeping with the development requirements of the continent. Africa is the least industrialized of the world's regions; and the necessary expansion of African markets implies a great improvement in transport and communications to avoid, for example, the present need for a cable from Monrovia to Freetown to go through London and New York. Efficient industrialization also requires co-operation among small and hitherto isolated countries. Moreover, given the structure of African economies, industrialization dictates an increase in imports in a situation in which world market conditions for many of Africa's primary exports are not good. In Africa as elsewhere, economic advance depends critically upon the mobilization of science and technology; which is still in its infancy on the continent".

We have been carrying the full burden of our economic development and we have no intentions of unloading this burden on anyone. But as a result of the neglect of centuries, the problems we face are immense and we have in no way seen the end of the long tunnel. In a detailed blue print presented to the Dag Hammerskjold Seminar in 1964 the target of African economic development was set as follows:

"An annual growth rate of 7 per cent of total output. From 1964 to 2000 a sevenfold increase in the output of agriculture; forty-fold of industry; sixteen-fold in the total of goods and services, and about twenty-fold in University enrollment. A rise in real income per head from $100 in 1960 to $260 in 1980, and $700 by 2000. Capital formation of some $215 billion between 1960 and 1980 and $900 billion between 1980 and 2000. External aid of $40–$50 billion between 1960 and 1980."

We expect the U.S. and the developing world to co-operate with us to achieve this target.

I would wish you to reflect that at the end of the War the U.S. gave as much as $14 billion much of it in outward grants as Marshall aid fund to help to rebuild Europe. Today the funds are said to be drying up when the assistance is to go to your brothers in Africa, and this is where I believe that you have a duty to see that the Foreign Aid Programme which is after all a small part of the U.S. budget is maintained.

What part do you want to play in African development, my brother, my sister. Shall we look only to other people for our help while our rich brothers and sister turn away? Do you want to share in the process of nation building, sharing our sorrows and enjoying our successes? Then tell your Government, your Congressmen, your Senators about your brothers' needs. But it is not on the Government alone we must rely. We must rely on ourselves. The great Dr. Robinson organised Operation Crossroads to Africa in an effort to get American youth involved in the progress and development of Africa at the grass roots level. Isn't time to expand Operation Crossroads to enable the vacationing doctor, the scientist, the mathematician, the investment counsellor instead of spending idle moments on the beach, to spend their vacation in Africa helping to run a small hospital, advising local businessmen about their investments, teaching physics and chemistry in a far-off-school taking part in research into local health problems. Let us today institute a Second Programme "Operation Brothers Forever" to help recruit skilled volunteers to go to Africa for short periods to give freely of their services to where it is needed most. Let the rich businessmen and industrialists whose money sits in a Bank consider investing this in Africa as their contribution to the fatherland's development. Their investments will be protected and their profits can be repatriated. But above all they will have the satisfaction of having joined in building something new.

A final exhortation to our Graduating Class.

I began by referring to the fact that I returned from Ghana a few days ago. It took Christopher Columbus who discovered America seven weeks to cross the Atlantic from August 3 to October 12, 1492, from Palos in Spain to San Salvador in the Bahamas. It however took me seven hours to cross the same Atlantic from Dakar, Senegal to New York in America—Seven hours instead of seven weeks! Thanks to technology and science, the Atlantic which once divided the

peoples of the old World from the new today unites them, and our planet which consisted of different worlds because of our lack of communication has today become one world. It is illustrative of this fact that in many American Schools today, there are enrolled not only students from the U.S. but from other lands. They have joined together not only to learn the arts and the sciences but also the art of living together as one people in one world. But our world is not only one world because technology and circumstances have made it possible for different peoples to communicate with one another, but it has become one world because of society's concern for the welfare of all its members. We are all trying to break down the barriers between the rich and the poor, between the haves and the have nots; and between the sick and the healthy. Our world consists primarily in seeking the welfare of the individual wherever he may be. Your charge as you leave school today is to seek out the poor and assist him.

In your tasks through life, you will often come across the rich, who though demanding, occasionally return to shower worldly gifts for your attention and your devotion. But more often than not your services will be rendered to a poor destitute person, who has nothing to give you but thanks from a grateful heart. Today the poor continue to complain because we are too fast moving to a world where unless you know somebody you remain expendable. The queues are long and the demands heavy. Therefore there is the tendency for us all to listen and help those who are in a position to pay us back directly or through their associates.

Christ found a similar situation in the course of his Ministry on earth. He visited the pool of Bethesda and there he found a man who had been lying by the pool for thirty-eight years, longer than most of the students here have lived on earth; and yet when the angel of the Lord stirred the waters, when the waters were charged with healing powers, there was no one to throw him into it because he had no relatives. Christ cared for this man. He healed him. The community from which you come is among the poorest in the United States. Your clients will be among the most deprived and the most neglected. They will be helpless, often they will not even know the courtesy of saying thank you, because all their lives they have had little to be thankful for. This will be your constituency: those who have thrown up their hands in despair because the world has come to consider them of little account and of little consequence. Can you hear him? Please listen to his prayer in his own grammar and in his own idiom:

"God, if you is a father
We sure need you
'Cause we is down
And need to get up.

And they is lots of sick people
Who needs you, too!

And why does they have to be sick
And have no job
And have a worker
To check them?

And why don't you
Do something about it?

We don't say that to be smart, God
Only 'cause we want
To get things fixed up
If we can."

And you are God's instruments to get them fixed up.

Another poor man recalls that

"Things don't go so well for us, God,
Too much meanness around
And too many people sick
Maybe from pot
Or booze
Or just don't caring
Hope you do."

You are God's instruments to the caring. We blacks all over the world are complaining and with considerable justification of the neglect we have suffered for years. Someone had always had to make the decisions for us. Decisions often of life and death. Today we are confident that we can make the decisions. The first challenge is for us to demonstrate beyond all doubts that we care for the underprivileged in our society, that we are concerned for these without influence and without a voice, that we are the hands of the lame and the cripple, the voice of the dumb. Then can we say that we should be entrusted with the destiny of our peoples because we have shown that we care indeed.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an eloquent address entitled "Freedom's Challenge," delivered by young Mr. Luther F. Cobb, of Nashville, Tenn., be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

I heard this exemplary young man deliver the address in Memphis last week before a State convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It seemed to me to be worthy of prominent attention.

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

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

The freedom of every citizen of the United States hinges upon the conduct of the United States in the next few years in world and domestic affairs—and this conduct depends directly upon the attitudes and actions of the American people. We, as concerned young people, should examine the challenges presented to us by our heritage and our present world, and act responsibly to meet these challenges.

The United States faces crises both at home and abroad. In Southeast Asia we fight against the encroachment of the Communist menace as it attempts to close in upon millions of helpless people. The challenge which faces Americans is not to shirk the responsibility forced upon us by our role as world leader, nor to let a vocal few dissuade us of the rightness of the cause to defend freedom, militarily if necessary, against aggression by outside powers.

At home, disagreement, often violent, grows in frequency and scope. Many Americans, fulfilling the basic right of freedom to express their opinions, protest against domestic conditions of poverty, hunger, and discrimination; as well as conditions abroad. The challenge which exists here is not to allow a reaction against vocalism to result in the abolition of our time-honored freedom, but to combat a false opinion with the truth, knowing that the minds of rational men will make the final choice for the right. We must not allow ourselves to be drawn to the militant radicalism of either the right or the left, but to chart the rational course between, insuring the continuation of the right to settle public issues by open public discussion.

We as concerned citizens and future leaders of America, must, however, avoid the pitfalls that lie in wait for the unwary. Rather than being emotionally drawn to one side or the other of an issue, we should weigh carefully all the arguments, both pro and con, before reaching a conclusion. We should always be willing to discuss and reason, keeping an ever-open mind to the opinions of others.

We must also realize that inevitably with freedom come grave responsibilities—both for the preservation and reasonable use of our liberties. We should realize that freedom does not imply a license to hurt or take advantage of others, but a mandate to help them. Also imperative is the realization that we must always bear the consequences of our own actions; accordingly we should never in the heat of emotion abolish an institution without providing for a replacement which will insure a more effective system. Our democratic government is the end product of thousands of years of human experience, and is undoubtedly the best form of government on earth today—allowing for individual freedom to guide one's own destiny. Naturally, democracy, like any institution, has defects—there was never a human creation which did not. However, as Alfred E. Smith said, "All the ills of democracy can be cured by more democracy." In addition, it is important to remember in the midst of attacks upon our government that, for any improvement to be made, a more effective system must be devised. So far, none has.

As citizens, then, of a free country, we must shoulder the responsibility to keep it free. Perhaps the greatest challenge of democracy is that it cannot remain as a viable institution unless its citizens are willing to keep it so. The sacrifices in war and peace of years ago cannot stand by us today—democracy requires a constant sacrifice for the perpetuation of its immeasurable benefits. If we become indolent and apathetic, our country, the paragon of freedom, will slide backwards into decay and absolutism as did ancient Rome in a similar situation. Thus, as citizens, we must be impelled to become involved in our future; to take a voice in our government and a part in its maintenance; to stand firmly for what is right and to work to promote that which is right; and to proudly accept the challenge of freedom in our world.

DANGER TO UNIVERSITIES

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I noted with alarm the increasing demoralization of the university. The symbiotic relationship of extremists on the right and left is threatening to end higher education in this country by destroying the concept of free inquiry in the university. The progress of this destruction is apparent—anti-intellectual polemics on one side bringing on repression from the opposite extreme.

One of our leading university administrators, Dr. Kenneth Pitzer, president of Stanford University, resigned last week. Dr. Pitzer is but one more casualty in this "war" which is polarizing our population and threatening to end free intellectual inquiry.

I enclose the Associated Press bulletin on Dr. Pitzer's resignation and an excellent editorial from the June 28 edition of the New York Times interpreting the dire consequences of the campus crisis.

SCHOOL CHIEF QUITS OVER WAR, TURMOIL

STANFORD, CALIF.—Kenneth S. Pitzer has resigned as president of Stanford University, blaming campus turmoil centering on the war in Southeast Asia.

Pitzer said that when he took over a year and a half ago "I did so with the expectation that significant progress could be made in healing some of the deep divisions which beset our country, especially over Vietnam. Instead, these divisions have deepened."

Pitzer, 56, said he was stepping down because campus turbulence, including 13 spring semester outbreaks in which police were called, had "made it increasingly difficult to obtain the very broad and active support from all those groups who together are responsible for the well-being of the university."

His resignation is effective Aug. 31.

Accepting the resignation, W. Parmer Fuller III, president of the Stanford Board of Trustees, said:

"His feelings that the heavy burdens of administration in these days of crisis are incompatible with the basic interests of the scholar and educator is indeed understandable."

Three members of the four-man Stanford Council of Student Body Presidents, Patrick C. Shea, Robert Grant and Adam Levin, issued a joint statement saying:

"He dedicated himself to trying for a fuller understanding between all segments of the university community. We are deeply sorry to see him go."

Pitzer took office on Dec. 1, 1968, after seven years as president of Rice University.

While attending a dinner at a campus housing unit last April 1 he was splashed with red paint by someone wearing a mask. Later the yard of his home was invaded by demonstrators who painted anti-war slogans on a patio wall.

During the campus unrest last spring 40 arrests were made. The most serious outbreaks were April 29 and 30 following the sending of American troops into Cambodia. At least 65 persons, mainly police, were injured those two nights.

Fuller said an acting president would be appointed "in the near future."

[From the New York Times, June 28, 1970]

DANGER TO THE UNIVERSITIES

The resignation of Dr. Kenneth Pitzer from the presidency of Stanford University, after serving in that office only nineteen months, is symbolic of the campus crisis across the nation. Mr. Pitzer pinned his decision to step down on the widening of "the gulf between the campus community and society at large" and on pressures which "distract or disrupt the educational process." Radical students at Stanford as elsewhere have made a shambles not only of campus property but of the academic community's confidence in its ability to govern itself.

Stanford is illustrative of a nationwide danger. Violent student forays and revolutionary rhetoric have made it increasingly difficult for liberal forces to oppose and contain the counter-pressures of enraged communities, alumni and legislatures. Financial support is falling off disastrously. The monetary costs of "trashing," arson and other forms of vandalism only cripple further the hard-pressed universities, already forced by deficits to curtail services to students, scholarship and research. In addition to hurting their own educational opportunities, the extremist students are doing nothing to strengthen the base of university opposition to the war; and they are doing much to weaken the universities' capacity to prepare for the transition to an economy of peace under the protective cover of civic order and civil liberties.

The faculty cannot escape all blame for the campus disarray. Faculty members' confusion and frequent failure to stand up to coercive demands undermine students' respect for their teachers' integrity. Administrators are left virtually powerless, driven against their will to rely on the police to prevent chaos, destruction and injury. At a time when the police are also radicalized and angry, here is an invitation to tragedy.

No less disastrous is the temptation on the part of despairing trustees to seek out "law and order" candidates to fill university presidencies which, as Mr. Pitzer said regretfully, no longer leave time for academic concerns and educational reforms. The trustees of the State University of New York at Buffalo appear to have chosen that course last week.

The extremist fringe welcomes this precisely because it—like the radical right—hopes to gain power from polarization. For the universities and the country, these are the politics of madness. To submit to them raises the specter that, even after the country has found its way out of Indochina, it may have lost its way back home to America.

Nothing short of a determined coalition of the forces of reason and moderation—among liberals and conservatives alike—against coercive Left and repressive Right can save the universities from a decline that has already assumed serious proportions. Liberty cannot survive in an atmosphere of fanaticism or disorder.

THE REGULATION OF UTILITY CONSUMERS IN MISSOURI

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, during the past several months various newspapers have informed their readers about an important subject that is not taught in school. These papers have reported on the activities of State utility commissions.

The decisions of these commissions have great impact on the budget of every family. The commissions are charged with regulating the rates and service of electric, gas, and telephone companies. The commissions also regulate, in varying degrees, transportation matters, including safety. In some States, these commissions also are charged with responsibility for the regulation of insurance companies.

Last year, Roland Page, of the St. Petersburg Times, wrote a series of articles on the Florida Public Service Commission. They appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 7, pages 9215–9224, and also in part 6A, page 1511, of the hearings last year on S. 607, the utility consumers' counsel bill.

Dick Fackler, of the Alton, Ill., Evening Telegraph, also wrote a series last year on the Illinois Commerce Commission. It appears in part 4, p. 880 of the hearings on S. 607.

Beginning March 22, 1970, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published a six-part series on the Missouri Public Service Commission, written by Al Delugach. He tells a story similar to that reported in Florida and Illinois.

Many people in Missouri, he says, are not even aware that the commission exists.

They do not know how close it is to the industries it regulates.

The commission has an inadequate staff. As their workload increased, the funds available to them were diminished, despite utility assessments supposedly designed to fund regulatory functions.

In contrast, the utilities have batteries of experts, emitting "voluminous and squid-like clouds of data."

Since 1951, 10 of the 12 former Missouri commissioners have represented utilities before their former colleagues. The spoils system permeates down to the lowest ranks. Patronage appointees, responsible for enforcement of safety regulations, fail to do their job.

Said the commission's chief enforcement officer after he resigned in disgust:

I had no choice over whom I got. It got to be a political rest home. Most of them would sit at home and draw their salary and expense accounts, while a few did all the work.

Mr. President, I congratulate the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for contributing to the thin but expanding literature on State utility commissions. I trust that in this case the reporter who has gained familiarity with the regulatory system will not be "promoted" to a job in which he has no opportunity to share his knowledge with the readers, as has happened in other instances, in several parts of the country, during the past 2 years.

The investor-owned electric utilities embarked this year on a national advertising campaign directed principally at broadcasting and publishing media. This advertising campaign is designed to deceive the public and the press, as I pointed out in my remarks of March 31. This is all the more reason why media which believe in the public's right to know should be concerned. I refer especially to the large broadcasting and publishing empires which have the means to make truly independent investigatory reports, and which can afford to lose the utility advertisements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Post-Dispatch series and a related editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 22, 1970]

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION CRITICIZED OVER RATE HIKES

(By Al Delugach)

Telephone, electric, gas and water users of St. Louis and St. Louis County are paying $30,000,000 more this year to the state-regulated monopolies that supply these vital services.

That is this area's share in an unprecedented avalanche of rate increases granted by the Missouri Public Service Commission. State-wide, utility bills have been boosted about $57,000,000 a year since last May, and $8,500,000 more in requests is pending.

To critics, the bumper harvest of utility increases is a testament to permissiveness and ineptitude in the state agency designated by law as the public's protector against monopolistic excess.

Defenders of the commission see the multi-million dollar increases as an unavoidable result of ballooning interest rates and other inflationary costs.

The pocketbook of just about every St. Louisan is affected directly by the higher utility bills. Anyone who picks up a phone, flips on a light switch or takes a bath is doing so at a substantially higher cost than last year.

But most citizens are unaware of the pivotal role of the Public Service Commission in these rate increases. Many persons do not know that the commission exists.

Among those more familiar with it, including some former staff personnel, there are grave misgivings about the protection given the public interest.

In addition to utility rates, a major area of concern is the feeble state of the commission's safety enforcement on the highways—an area involving the politically potent trucking industry.

These matters have been laid like a dead cat, at the doorstep of Gov. Warren E. Hearnes and his hand-picked commission chairman, William R. Clark.

The commission is a regulatory body composed of five commissioners appointed by the Governor to six-year, staggered terms. As is customary under a Democratic administration, three are Democrats and two are Republicans. All are lawyers. They are paid $20,000 a year in the full-time positions in which they theoretically have life-and-death authority over the utilities and public transportation.

In practice, a Post-Dispatch study has found, the commission exercises its checkrein benignly.

In addition, its staff constantly is crippled by turnover. Some employees leave for higher salaries in private business. Others are fired for incompetence, for political reasons or for running afoul of the quick-tempered chairman. An unusual degree of nervousness among staff members has been observed by reporters visiting commission headquarters.

The commission is quasi-judicial and the commissioners are addressed as "Judge" by those who appear before them. There are about 140 employes. About a third consists of a professional staff of lawyers, accountants and engineers. The rest are inspectors, investigators and clerical workers.

The commission's general counsel is charged by law with advocating the public's position in rate cases before the commissioners. In this he can call on the assistance of the rest of the staff.

In contrast with the resources of the regulated groups, the professional staff is outmanned and outgunned by the giant utilities.

For instance, in Missouri in 1967 the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. had 780 employes in accounting and 184 in the chief engineer's office, compared with the commission's 24 and 14.

Before last year the present commission staff never had tried a full-scale utility rate case. In the Union Electric case, commission officials said their accountants made errors that threw the commission's figures off by about $7,000,000. It was embarrassing and some people got fired over it.

The utilities have large and expert staffs and a corps of top flight lawyers, including former commission members and lawyers.

But even in a rare case in which expensive outside expertise was used recently in behalf of the public, the commissioners still granted a single utility an increase that was about $20,000,000 more than the general counsel recommended as reasonable and fair. The opinions of the public's experts largely were disregarded by the commissioners.

That was the Southwestern Bell case, in which the commission permitted last October a $30,689,409-a-year state-wide rate increase. It is believed to be the highest in Missouri history for a utility.

The decision was not justified by the facts presented, declared the chief of the legal staff representing the Federal Government in rate cases before regulatory bodies in every state.

And an academician classed as an expert witness—a veteran of 40 cases involving the monolithic Bell System—said recently that he was dumfounded by the outcome.

Their statements, even after discounting any partisan leanings, pose a strong challenge to the credibility of the commission's ruling.

The Bell case is merely an outsized example of what appears to be a basic fact of life in public utility rate making: Despite a complexity described as "bordering on metaphysics," the arcane ritual finally gets down to grab-bag judgments.

Hearings develop a voluminous and squidlike cloud of data, from behind which the commissioners emerge with their decisions. The regulators have such discretionary power that they can select figures within a latitude so broad as to defy successful challenge from the consumer. The only practical appeal, experience has shown, is by the utilities.

Who is the commission?

Clark, 48 years old, a Hearnes stalwart in Boone County during the crucial 1964 Democratic primary, was rewarded with the chairmanship when it became vacant in April 1965. He had a private law practice in Columbia and, as have most other commissioners through the years, came to the commission without experience in utility matters.

He has been described as an exceptionally strong, even a dictatorial chairman by those who have worked under him. Clark is said to be close, socially as well as politically, to the Governor and to Lt. Gov. William Morris. Clark is a colorful personality of earthy vocabulary and a gravely, twanging voice.

He got some adverse publicity in September 1966 when he reportedly interfered with two state conservation agents in their duty at Lake of the Ozarks.

One of the agents said that Clark became belligerent when they asked identification from two youths, guests of his at a lodge, who were fishing without a permit. The youths were fined. The agent said that he did not arrest Clark on instructions from superiors in Jefferson City.

Although he has not been short of ill-wishers, Clark has avoided any further public furor. A decorated World War II fighter pilot, Clark said he still flies. In fact, he said he has "burned out a couple of engines" on jet aircraft since being named to the commission. One was borrowed from an individual and the other was chartered for commission use, he said. Clark said these episodes apparently account for recurring reports, which he flatly denies, that he has borrowed or flown in aircraft of regulated utilities.

The rest of the commission is staid by comparison. The other members are Charles J. Fain, 50, a Republican from Branson, who served in the Legislature with Hearnes; Marvin E. Jones, 48, a Democrat from Dexter; Howard Elliott Jr., 36, a Republican from St. Louis County, whose father served with Hearnes in the Legislature, and Willard C. Reine, 34, a Democrat from East Prairie, who is a former law partner of Hearnes.

Gov. Hearnes appointed Fain on Oct. 1, 1965; Jones and Elliott on April 15, 1967, and Reine on April 16, 1968. Reine was reappointed to a full six-year term last April.

The commission granted every major, privately owned utility here substantial rate boosts in the last half of 1969. It was a year in which the commission was deluged from all over the state with the biggest array of rate cases in memory.

Union Electric was authorized to increase its Missouri rates by $10,236,738 a year. Laclede Gas got a $4,550,000 increase. The St. Louis County Water Co. was authorized a $2,604,375 hike.

A crucial decision by regulatory agencies is what rate of return to permit. This is a percentage figure applied to a utility's rate base as determined by the regulators. The factors that go into these figures are highly technical and hearings last for weeks in major cases.

What often is not realized by the public is the magnitude of revenue generated by a tiny change in the rate of return. An increase of one tenth of 1 per cent on a $500,000,000 rate base, for example, will increase income by $500,000 a year.

The Missouri commission boosted rates of return in 1969 to higher levels than it had allowed for years.

Previously, the rates of net original cost had been set in the area of 6.5 per cent, although revenues of some companies brought the actual return above 7 per cent. None of the excess collected was refunded to customers, there being no provision in law for the commission to order such rebates.

Last May the commission gave the St. Louis County Water Co. a 7.14 per cent rate of return.

Laclede Gas, in a settlement stipulated by the commission's staff and the company in August, was permitted a 7.76 per cent rate of return on the staff's figures.

Southwestern Bell was allowed 7.98 per cent, the highest ever awarded by the commission, in October.

Union Electric was authorized 7.23 per cent several weeks later, and the company announced in January that it would seek another increase some time this year.

In a letter to Gov. Hearnes in January transmitting the commission's 1968–69 annual report, Clark said that 25 cases had been before it in the 12-month fiscal period, compared with two or three in a typical year.

The letter stated that in 10 of the 16 cases already decided the rates granted were lower than those requested.

It continued: "Consumers accustomed to stable utility bills have expressed concern over these rate increases. The rate increases granted were needed to facilitate continual growth and the provision of service under changing cost conditions."

The letter said also the stability in utility rates that customers had come to expect was due to technological innovations and population growth, which offset less extreme increases in costs. Continuing inflation, however, brought the utilities a reduction in net revenues, the letter said.

It pointed out that the prime interest rate climbed from 5 per cent in 1965 to the present 8.5 per cent.

"Utilities no longer able to cope with the rising costs of capital, labor and materials requested relief through increased rates," it said. "In these rate cases the commission assures a balance of consumer and utility interest by carefully analyzing all available data prior to making a decision."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 23, 1970]

CRITICS ASSAIL BELL RATE HIKE

(By Al Delugach)

The Missouri Public Service Commission has a file drawer full of hearing transcripts, lawyers' briefs and exhibits that comprise the official record in the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. rate case.

In a report and order dated last Oct. 2, the commission unanimously set out its decision granting the utility a $30,689,409 increase in its intrastate rates in Missouri.

The order details "findings of fact" and "conclusions of law" in concise, nonexplanatory fashion.

An impressive document, a layman might conclude, with many a head shake over recondite details.

A one-word summary of the reaction of a nonlayman, Curtis L. Wagner Jr., chief of the regulatory law division of the Army's Judge Advocate General, Washington, is: Poppycock.

Wagner heads a staff of lawyers who go before state regulatory bodies and defend against what they consider to be excessive rate increases. Because the Federal Government probably is the biggest customer for telephone service, one of the legal staff's major interests is the Bell System.

Bell, with assets of 45 billion dollars, is the world's largest private business. Some experts have expressed doubts whether federal, much

less state regulators, can cope with the complex enterprise.

Wagner contends that the Missouri commission departed radically from accepted regulatory practice and its own policy in the Southwestern Bell case.

In a motion for rehearing, which was denied with no reason cited, Wagner made a scathing attack on the official rationale of the decision.

"The commission's order is defective in that its findings of fact and conclusions of law are merely statements without any justification whatsoever to substantiate them," the motion said. "Allowance of questionable items has been made without explanation, and derivation of fair value is purely illusory."

It continued that, although the commission had consistently disallowed provisions for plants under construction and plants held for future use, the order included them in the amounts of $26,666,765 and $460,069, "with no rationale for this drastic departure from accepted regulatory practice."

An academician who testified for the public in the Southwestern Bell case, Prof. Lionel Thatcher of the University of Wisconsin, said recently:

"I have testified in 26 different states and before federal agencies. I've been in more than 40 cases against the Bell System, and I have never been quite so surprised by a decision. I can't understand the ground on which it was done."

The nearly 8 per cent rate of return is markedly higher than other states have been giving, he said. Prof. Thatcher expressed shock that this came on top of an "inflated" rate base in which the company was given "practically everything it wanted."

Jeremiah Finnegan, the commission's general counsel, expressed keen disappointment and surprise about the decision. He said that the staff had never put on a better case as the public's advocate.

The backbone of his case was testimony by Prof. Thatcher, who was paid $6000 for his study, and a Kansas City certified public accountant, Stanley C. Whiteaker, whose firm was paid $40,000 for auditing Southwestern Bell for the rate case.

On the basis of resulting figures and Prof. Thatcher's conclusions about the company's cost of capital and other key factors, the staff recommended a rate of return between 7.24 and 7.54 per cent and a revenue increase of between $8,000,000 and $12,000,000.

The commissioners granted a 7.98 per cent rate of return and a rate hike of $30,689,409, which is about three times the staff's recommendation.

Aside from the rate of return, the commission allowed the company a much higher original cost rate base—$618,000,000—than the staff had calculated. The staff set the base, by adjusting the company figures to exclude certain items, at $591,000,000. The company calculated the rate base at $621,000,000.

The difference was chiefly in the $26,666,765 the commission allowed for a controversial item in the test year: plant under construction.

The staff's experts argued that this would permit Bell to earn a double return on some of its property. Telephone users would be paying also a return on property for future subscribers, they contended.

Southwestern Bell said that it was seeking only the difference between the 6.5 per cent interest charged during construction and the rate of return that would be allowed.

In his rehearing motion, the Government attorney stressed that Missouri law provided that utilities be allowed a reasonable return on property "actually used in the public service." This, he said, placed "immovable restrictions" on the manner in which the commission might decide this issue.

The telephone company relied on a Missouri Supreme Court's construction of the law ordering that the commission should base its determinant of a proper rate on all relevant factors. This would certainly include a plant under construction, the Bell lawyer said.

In 1967 the Federal Communications Commission disallowed the plant under construction provisions from the Bell System's rate base in interstate operation. But several months later it reversed itself.

The California Public Utilities Commission, one of the few state agencies with a reputation for strictness in dealing with the utilities, denied the Bell System a return on a plant under construction.

To the company's argument that investors expect a return on all dollars they supply to an enterprise, whether or not the funds have been committed to productive activity, the California commission stated:

"Only in a warm climate in which regulated utilities bask is such a contention possible. In the chilly climate of vigorous competitive enterprise, return comes from revenues, and revenues are impossible until a plant is completed . . ."

A relatively small item, but one that illustrates the Missouri commission's wide disregard of staff recommendations in the Bell case, involved $75,000 allocated as the company's Missouri share of an exhibit at the 1968 Hemisfair in San Antonio.

The commission staff wanted to eliminate it from operating revenues because it was a nonrecurring expense and therefore not allowable under standard accounting procedures.

Wagner's motion said the commission's allowance of the item "escapes comprehension," as there was nothing in the record to show any possible benefit to the Missouri rate payer.

It should be noted that rate making in Missouri became more complicated after the 1957 Missouri Supreme Court ruling that required the commission to stop basing the rate of return solely on original cost, but to consider replacement value and all other relevant factors.

As a result the record is encumbered with vast amounts of testimony about things that are later ignored. Experts on all sides observe that the key determination is still the rate of return on original cost.

The Government motion pointed up the will-of-the-wisp nature of some of the facts that are established in complex proceedings but which do not have a bearing on the outcome.

Wagner, noting the fair value figure the order placed on Southwestern Bell's intrastate Missouri property, said: "One is left to ponder upon what this figure is based, or whether it was merely pulled out of the air."

William R. Clark, commission chairman, conceded that the commissioners, after much toil, arrived at the total number of revenue dollars to be allowed and then tailored the other factors of the rate equation to fit that cloth.

He said that it was either a matter of going over 8 per cent as a rate of return, which would be hard to present to the public, or a higher rate base.

"It's putting numbers together after you get a ball park figure on the end result," Clark continued.

He said that the denial of the Government's rehearing motion opened the way for appeal to the state courts, continuing: "Quite frankly, I was surprised they didn't appeal on a couple of things."

Wagner said he believed that the Government had a good chance to overturn the decision on appeal, but for many reasons decided not to go to court. One reason is that some of the Government agencies represented believed the cost would be greater than the potential savings at stake.

Even if the appeal were successful, Wagner said, the court would send it back to the commission for reconsideration.

He noted that most successful appeals were by utilities. It is easier, he explained, to make a case that the commission has been arbitrary and capricious in not allowing a fair return than it is to prove the same thing in regard to setting rates too high.

Courts have held many times that they cannot substitute their judgment for that of the commissions, he said.

St. Louis, St. Louis County and the Missouri Hotel and Motel Association did not appeal the Southwestern Bell decision, although as intervenors in the case they had the legal right.

The commission's general counsel, which provided the only outside expertise in the case on behalf of the consumer, is prohibited from appealing a commission rate decision. That is because state law provides the counsel shall represent the commissioners after they have reached a decision.

This leaves the consumer without the most effective recourse from a ruling he might feel is excessively generous to a utility.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 24, 1970]

STATE CUTBACKS WEAKENED OPPOSITION TO RATE HIKES

(By Al Delugach)

Just when the Missouri Public Service Commission was inundated with a record load of utility rate increases, the State Legislature slashed the modest staff of lawyers representing the public in those cases. The budget for hiring outside experts was also cut, from $100,000 to $10,000.

The effect was to weaken preparation of the cases in opposition to requests of utilities, which ended up with $57,000,000 in rate increases state-wide last year.

It is ironic that the commission budget does not come out of the state's general revenue but from assessing the regulated industries.

William R. Clark, commission chairman, who is known for hard-nosed, effective lobbying for legislation of interest to him, did not intervene actively with the appropriations committees handling the budget last year.

He did have occasion, though, to testify in a United States Senate committee hearing in Washington against a bill to create an office of Utility Consumers' Counsel.

The counsel would have represented the public before state, as well as federal regulatory agencies.

This is not needed, because state commissions already adequately protect the public interest, according to Clark and the other members of a delegation from the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners.

Clark, as well as the other Missouri commission members, Democarts and Republicans alike, stress this credo:

The public interest does not lie solely in the cheapest rates. The utilities must have adequate return to expand and to provide quality service. The interests of the consumer and the industry must be balanced.

A former commission staff member commented privately that Clark appeared to be interested in healthy industry for Missouri. "This is okay," the man said, "but I am more interested in the public. I feel the utilities can look out for themselves."

He observed that the general counsel fell far short of having the manpower to do a comparable job.

In recent interviews none of the commissioners showed great concern about the reduction of the staff of their general counsel, Jeremiah Finnegan.

Finnegan, a lawyer in his early 30s, was appointed by Gov. Warren E. Hearnes to a

six-year term in April 1967 after two years as assistant counsel and two years in the state attorney general's office. Among his statutory duties is representing the public in rate cases.

Finnegan, going into an awesome array of rate cases in early 1969, had two assistants. He said he got permission from the Governor for another and hired him from the commission's staff of hearing examiners.

The state comptroller approved the shifting of funds from a vacancy in the commission's engineering staff to provide necessary salary. Finnegan said, "however, that he discovered after making the change that it should have had approval of the legislative committee on fiscal affairs.

The committee denied his request and the assistant was sent back to the hearing examiner staff.

There was tougher sledding ahead. Finnegan tried to get funds for a third assistant. The House Appropriations Committee not only did not approve this, it eliminated one of his two assistants and reduced the salary of the other from $16,000 to $12,600 a year.

Finnegan says he does not know why his staff was singled out for this treatment.

The assistant's job was later restored in an omnibus bill reported out of committee, but the Legislature's session ended last June before the bill could be put to a vote.

As a stopgap measure, Finnegan has been using a lawyer on loan from the hearing examiner staff.

His first assistant left the staff and the one whose salary was cut is preparing to enter private law practice April 1. This illustrates, among other things, the pattern of constant attrition of experienced personnel.

Chairman Clark said he had been away, recuperating from an operation, when the budget hearings were held in February 1969. He said the vice chairman, Marvin Jones, appeared before the House Budget Committee for the commission.

Jones said he was told that even though the commission was not financed from general revenue it would be treated as though it were.

Clark said recently that he had resubmitted a budget that would restore all positions and salary, as well as providing $150,000 for hiring outside experts, for next fiscal year.

"I assume that whatever defects there were because of the bare-bones budget will be corrected," he said.

Clark's minimal efforts last year on behalf of the budget were in sharp contrast to his campaign several years ago to beef up the staff and salaries under his reorganization plan.

He has been widely praised for building up the staff by about 50 per cent since he was appointed five years ago. Through his efforts the commissions' budget was nearly tripled to the present $1,883,774 a year, and the maximum assessment on utilities was increased from eight hundredths of 1 per cent to 25 hundredths of 1 per cent of intrastate revenue.

When he was appointed in April 1965, Clark told the Post-Dispatch that the commission should use everything at its disposal "so as not to be overpowered by one of these giant corporations." He mentioned Southwestern Bell in this context specifically.

Later that year Clark spoke sternly of forcing rate reductions against utilities, including Southwestern Bell, that were found to be earning at a substantially higher rate than authorized.

In December 1965 the commission accepted without a public hearing the telephone company's proposal to reduce rates by about $3,500,000. A hearing in 1966 ended with the commission's acceptance in November of Southwestern Bell's plan to revise rates upward while eliminating many charges within the St. Louis area.

Clark was instrumental in warding off efforts by St. Louis County to get a single telephone rate for the metropolitan area. Commissioner Charles Fain made a strong formal dissent in the decision. In last year's Southwestern Bell rate case, Clark angrily rejected a county request that the commission reopen that same issue on its own. He commented that Southwestern Bell had spent $10,000,000 on the Wide Area Service Plan that finally went into operation in January 1969.

It is surprising to some observers that the commission's three Democrats and two Republicans have arrived regularly at unanimous decisions in utility rate cases, including the $30,000,000 award to Southwestern Bell.

Fain said, "It was a compromise among five people."

The other Republican, Howard Elliott Jr., commented also on the element of compromise in the Southwestern Bell and other rate cases.

"As long as you can reach a consensus within reasonable bonds it is probably better than going in three or four different directions," he said. "Frankly, I wouldn't compromise on a point of principle, but so much of it is judgment. Consensus has a place."

Elliott himself presided in the Bell hearing and had the duty of steering the preparation of the commission's report and order.

Clark said the commissioners spent many hours in executive session, discussing the issues in the telephone case.

At one point he explained the huge difference between the staff's recommendation and the commissioners' decision by saying that the general counsel should press for the lowest rate, because the company was going to be seeking the maximum.

"The commissioners have to consider that modern plant facilities must be available to provide adequate service," Clark said.

He observed also that these are times of "the highest interest rate in my lifetime, maybe in the country's history."

Clark commented at another point, "You've got to remember, the staff last year were virgins. They had never tried a rate increase before. You ask why there were disparities. Maybe because of mistakes. They certainly made them. There is no substitute for experience."

Later the chairman commented that different lawyers handled parts of the case for the general counsel. He added:

"It's so complicated that the boys do well to take one part and ask cross-examination questions on that. It takes the overall picture to know if you're right or not."

Clark could have added that the commissioners had no more experience in rate cases than the general counsel and staff prior to last year's deluge.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 25, 1970]

CONSUMER INFLUENCE ON RATES IS SLIGHT

(By Al Delugach)

The voice of the consumer is seldom heard inside the offices of the state agency that has sway over the rates and service of the gas, electric, water and telephone companies.

One of the rare exceptions occurred last Nov. 13, when a delegation of aroused petitioners from St. Charles and Jefferson counties went to Public Service Commission headquarters in Jefferson City.

The visitors were leaders of a revolt against one small part of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's $30,689,409 state-wide rate increase, approved last October by the commission.

Between the group's petition drive and its appearance in the capital, the phone company whipped up a new rate proposal just for the two counties. The company lopped off $20 of the $30-a-month, 90 per cent increase on toll-free business lines between the St. Louis area and St. Charles under so-called foreign-exchange service.

The group went to Jefferson City anyway. The leaders said that commission chairman William R. Clark was hostile and stalked out of a heated meeting with them, refusing to discuss the case. He said he would not talk about a subject that might later be brought before the commission in formal proceedings.

After they departed, a commission spokesman told a reporter that the new rate had been approved the preceding day. Roy J. Fassel, a St. Charles businessman and one of the petitioners' leaders, said no one on the commission staff had mentioned the approval to his group.

Although the new rate mollified the St. Charles and Jefferson county subscribers, Fassel maintains it should have been statewide.

"What they did," he said, "was to buy off the St. Charles and Jefferson county people."

Fassel contends also that the commission should require utilities to notify customers of rate-schedule changes while there is time for them to file objections. Most persons learn the details only after the rates are put into effect, he said.

Clark says such procedure would be too expensive.

The commission has been receiving an increasing number of service complaints against one utility or another. But in the area of rates, the consumer is hardly ever in evidence, even when public hearings are held.

His interests are represented by the commission's general counsel. The counsel's effort often has been weakened by staff inexperience and insufficient time for preparation.

Consumers have some additional representation in rate cases by local governments such as municipalities and counties.

But even the big ones, such as St. Louis and Kansas City, do not spend the tens of thousands of dollars that it takes to hire expert witnesses. Their contribution consists largely of cross-examining utility witnesses. This amounts to little more than moral support of the general counsel.

Herman Barken, who has long represented St. Louis County in rate cases, said, "It would cost the county $100,000 a year to get experts and do a complete job in protecting the consumer interest."

Barken, an associate county counselor, said that for the same reason, the county does not avail itself of the right of appeal to the courts on commission rate decisions.

The City of St. Louis routinely intervenes in rate cases affecting this area, but its thrust has not been notably in favor of the consumer of late. Downtown business interests and political considerations reportedly caused the city's opposition in last year's rate cases to be diluted.

"We have a dilemma," David Heminway, an associate city counselor, told the Post-Disptach recently, "We can't go up there legitimately and take a position to stick the company."

Referring to the old St. Louis Public Service Co., which long was the private owner of the transit system here, Heminway said, "The Public Service Co. proved that the consumer doesn't benefit if a company goes broke."

William Bosse, St. Louis public utilities engineer, who testifies for the city in rate cases, is new to the field. He gave a revealing picture of the city's role.

"John Q. Citizen thinks the city represents him as a homeowner," he said. "This is not true. The city represents all citizens, including businesses, homeowners and the utilities themselves."

He said the city's lawyers drilled this concept into him in the course of last year's rate cases.

"I tended to represent the consumer," Bosse said. "The lawyers knocked it out of me."

Kansas City did not even intervene in the Southwestern Bell case last year. Neither did the St. Louis County Municipal League. Not too many years ago, both were strong and vocal participants in rate cases.

If consumer representation before the commission is feeble, the converse is true of the industries being regulated.

The utilities employ the finest lawyers, expert witnesses and staff preparation that money can buy. Utilities are permitted to recover these expenses in the rates it charges the consumer. They have what critics see as virtually a cost-plus contract with the public.

In a Ph. D. dissertation based on intensive study of the commission and published by the University of Missouri in August 1968, Joseph Ingles observed that the commission's general counsel is further handicapped by the experience of those representing the regulated industries.

His study showed that in 1968 there were 10 former commissioners reappearing before the commission on behalf of utility clients.

Since 1951, the commission has lost 15 commissioners. Two of them died in office and a third died shortly after leaving office. Of the 12 others, Ingles reported, only two did not later practice before the commission. One, Donal Guffey, who resigned in April 1968 with a year left in his term, is now general counsel for Gas Service Co. of Kansas City.

A number of lawyers, formerly on the commission's staff also have represented regulated industries before the commission, the Post-Dispatch found.

There is no law preventing this activity. Some commissioners have said they consider it a natural course to go into practice in a field in which they have developed special knowledge.

Observers note that in the field of regulatory law the utilities offer almost all the opportunities.

Whether the prospects of future employment influence the attitudes of commissioners and general counsel in their duties is a topic of concern.

Representatives of utilities have day-to-day contact with the commissioners and staff at the commission's offices. This presents continual opportunity for presenting the utilities' views and plans.

Sometimes this extends into the social realm, ranging from restaurants in Jefferson City to hospitality rooms at conventions of the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners.

Last year, when the flock of major rate-increase requests were pending before the Missouri commission, a key staff member attended a public-utilities seminar at Michigan State University.

He was a constant social companion there of a representative of Southwestern Bell, another participant told the Post-Dispatch.

Without implying improper motives, it can be seen that with such opportunities the regulated industries have an advantage over the consumer in building common interest and friendly feelings with those who help regulate them. This is the ambiance in which the commission functions.

Ingles, now on the political science faculty at the University of Maryland, reported being told by commission personnel in 1967 that it was not uncommon for representatives of some regulated group to provide commissioners and leading staff personnel with small gifts on special occasions, such as Christmas.

They mentioned such items as barbecue utensils, cigarettes, whisky, baskets of fruit, candy, turkeys and tickets to sports events.

Chairman Clark, appointed in 1965, told the Post-Dispatch recently that he banned Christmas parties and gifts when he took office. He said that this policy was the idea of Gov. Warren E. Hearnes and that it still stood.

"You are not going to buy anybody with a barlow knife," Clark said. "At least, I hope not. But what are people going to think? It makes a bad appearance."

Asked about acceptance of wining-and-dining hospitality, Clark said, "We frown on it."

He said he knew of no commissioner who attended social events sponsored by regulated companies. However, he said, they are occasionally in the company of utility representatives at meetings.

"We try to pay our own way, pick up our check and charge it off on the expense account," the chairman said, "but somebody picks up a check now and then. As a general rule, I don't think you will find any fraternization with the people we regulate."

Even on the occasions when commissioners go out of town to address a trade meeting, he said, they pay their own travel expenses.

Last September, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission ordered ICC members to stop letting trade associations and business groups in the transportation field contribute to their travel and lodging expenses. This was after the practice was disclosed publicly by Ralph Nader, a consumer advocate.

Section 386.200 of Missouri's Public Service Commission law forbids anyone connected with the commission to accept a gift or gratuity "of any kind." Penalty for violation is removal from office.

"In the history of the Public Service Commission," Ingles reported, "no commissioner has been openly charged or prosecuted for accepting free passes, gifts or gratuity."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 26, 1970]

SAFETY PROGRAM CALLED FARCE

(By Al DeLugach)

Safety, service and rates are the basic responsibilities of the Missouri Public Service Commission in its jurisdicton over utilities and public carriers. In all three areas its performance is judged harshly by many who have had experience with it.

The man who quit last year as the commission's chief enforcement officer in bus and truck regulation told the Post-Dispatch recently that the inspection staff was a "political rest home" and the safety program a farce.

The influence of the bus-truck lobby on the administration of Gov. Warren Hearnes is blamed by insiders for much of the situation.

In the area of service, the commission staff is ill-equipped to cope with the rising tide of citizen complaints about utilities. Its experts are few.

As to rates, the commission usually decides the level of revenue and lets the utility design and put into effect the complex rate structure under which customers are charged for various types of service.

Chairman William R. Clark said that when the commission began "to get the squeak of the wheels" in the form of complaints, as in the St. Charles foreign exchange rate, it called on the company to produce figures to justify the rate in question or to change it.

So complicated are the telephone tariffs that a new business, the communications consultants, has sprung up here. These experts make a good profit solely by guiding large telephone users through the maze. They get a share of the money they save businesses and government units by finding cheaper types of telephone services to accomplish their needs and by locating errors in billing.

"We are doing some of the work of the Public Service Commission," one of the consultants said. "We are a policeman on the beat. Utilities have never been contested until we came along."

Among the complaints of such experts is the recurrent one that the commission permits the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. to phase out cheaper types of equipment and service in favor of more expensive forms that accomplish the same thing. It is charged that the commission staff sends the complaints to the company and accepts its answers as conclusive.

That the state of the commission's bus-truck safety enforcement is decrepit is unchallenged, even by its officials.

The patronage or spoils system in state politics is a factor. It is related to, and perhaps dwarfed by the enhanced political power of the bus and truck lobby in the administration of Gov. Hearnes.

There was no publicity last June when J. Sidney Schanbacher resigned as the commission's chief enforcement officer to take a position as safety supervisor for a big mobile homes company in Greenville, S.C.

Called there recently by the Post-Dispatch, he said his main reason for leaving was the failure of the year-long campaign to have safety enforcement upgraded with professional instead of political staffing.

The keystone of his program was legislation to obtain "first party" enforcement by commission personnel. At present they must go through the State Highway Patrol for arrests. Federal subsidy of 60 to 75 per cent of the cost, plus additional revenue in enforcement, would have made the program cost-free to the state, Schanbacher said.

He said 40 states now had enforcement through the agencies charged with regulating the bus-truck industry.

Although Missouri is a national trucking hub, the state ranks near the bottom in the quality of enforcement personnel, Schanbacher said.

No one at the commission had spoken out in objection to his proposal to upgrade enforcement, he said, but the legislator who was to sponsor his bill last year suddenly pulled out. Schanbacher said he was told that neither industry nor the Governor wanted the legislation.

The trucking industry would benefit from safety enforcement standards, but its lobby evidently killed the legislation, Schanbacher contends.

He spoke bitterly about the political appointees sent to him for his 10-man staff of field inspectors during the four years he headed the enforcement division.

"I had no choice over whom I got," he said. "It got to be a political rest home. Most of them would sit at home and draw their salary and expense accounts, while a few did all the work."

Schanbacher characterized the Missouri agency as "basically a utility commission" with scant interest in highway safety.

Chairman Clark conceded that political hiring of inspectors still is prevalent, as in previous administrations. He said that the commission had given priority to the wave of utility cases since 1968.

With failure of Schanbacher's efforts, truck safety enforcement remains in the hands of the Highway Patrol, which is directly under Gov. Hearnes.

Dorsey Arnold, a former sergeant in the patrol's truck enforcement section, told the Post-Dispatch recently that his superior, Capt. Thomas E. Whitecotton, and he were transferred abruptly after Hearnes took office in 1965 and that trucker arrests were curtailed sharply thereafter.

Arnold, who said that he remained on the patrol only until he could qualify for early retirement, said of the patrol's policing of truck regulations: "They don't want enforcement and they don't have it." Patrol officials have denied any such policy.

Patrol records show that the number of tickets given for trucking violations fell from 25,177 in 1964 to 17,909 in 1965. The number rose gradually to 25,213 last year. Arnold

noted that the patrol had over 150 inspectors at weighing stations now, or twice as many as in 1964, with the same number of arrests recorded. There are estimated to be 100,000 more trucks on Missouri highways than in the early 1960s.

The commission itself appears primarily interested in what it calls economic enforcement, seeing that truckers buy the $25 annual license stickers for their vehicles.

Its latest annual report boasted that sticker receipts were $990,255, a 14.6 per cent increase in the last fiscal year. The money goes into the State Highway Department Fund, some of which is appropriated for part of the commission's budget.

Service of utilities is a topic of increasing complaint from the public, commissioner Charles J. Fain said. Many complaints involve telephone service.

Although Southwestern Bell is by far the biggest in the field, with 2,156,814 telephones out of the total of 2,589,677, the commission regulates about 70 telephone companies.

Fain observed that it is not generally known that there were still many areas of Missouri without any telephone service. This is a source of recurrent complaint. Although Fain favors forcing firms to extend service into such areas, Clark contends that the commission has no legal right to make a firm take on unprofitable service.

The commission's director of utilities, F. D. Hequembourg, said his department had a great volume of correspondence in service complaints.

Asked whether the commission was able to do something about them with its limited staff and heavy load of rate matters, he said the staff now had field men to send out on telephone and gas inspections. Several years ago it had no such experts, he said.

The staff now has a former Bell System employe, he said, adding: "They couldn't lie to him when he goes out, because he knows too much about the operation."

The commission's annual report said many consumer complaints "or irregularities discovered through surveillance" were resolved through correspondence or informal conference. Critics assert that the commission is ineffective in handling the complaint load.

Commissioner Howard Elliott Jr. said the 1970s would bring more public demand for the commission to monitor the quality of service. He noted that a neglected area of commission concern was rate design, involving the utilities' charges for various types of service.

"It's an area we have to get into," Elliott said. "This gets into cost of service surveys and such, where little information is available. But the commission is getting complaints and is going to have to go into it."

Because of their expertise, independent telephone consultants have occasion to know more to complain about.

They have not had a warm response from the commission, but they have been able to obtain from it copies of the voluminous tariffs filed by the giant Southwestern Bell.

William R. Craft, a consultant here, said the tariff language was often so broad as to allow the company to interpret provisions according to its own convenience. It would be just as easy, and much more in the public interest, for the commission to require specifications that pinned down the practice to be allowed, he said.

Another of Craft's professional peeves is that the commission allows discriminatory provisions to be put into the company's telephone tariffs.

As an example, he said, there is a specific provision allowing a residence rate for telephones in the principal's office in parochial schools in Kansas City. But, Craft said, the same offices in St. Louis are charged the business rate, which is about three times as high as the residential rate.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 27, 1970]

STRONGER VOICE FOR PUBLIC URGED IN UTILITY CASES

(By Al Delugach)

"In the fulfillment of the regulatory mandates of the commission, the public interest is the primary concern."

The quotation, referring to the Missouri Public Service Commission, is from the state's official manual, called the Blue Book.

The question, as always, is the interpretation of what is in the public interest.

Many critics of the present system of utility regulation give priority to creation of special governmental agencies—state and national—that would be devoted solely to protection of consumer interests.

They contend that the regulation of monopolies is so weak and the system so filled with flaws that the best way to redress the balance is through a well-financed consumers' council as a separate arm of government.

A proposal for such an agency is expected to be put before Missouri's State Reorganization Commission this year.

Legislation before Congress would give federal assistance to public representation before state regulatory bodies.

St. Louis County municipalities are showing revived interest in taking an active role in matters before the Public Service Commission.

The barrage of rate increases by every major privately owned utility here since last May has caused some of the new awareness.

Another contributing factor is that some of the municipalities have tangled in recent months with utilities, such as Union Electric Co. in the underground wiring issue and the County Water Co. in the dispute over charges for fire hydrants.

The five commissioners of the Public Service Commission maintain that they are doing a good job of serving the public interest in accordance with statutes and court mandates.

Their view is represented succintly by the following words from the commission's latest annual report:

"The citizens of Missouri are assured of good transportation and utility service at reasonable prices as a result of the work of the Missouri Public Service Commission. The commission also must ensure that the companies it regulates stay in sound financial condition so they can provide service and offer a competitive return to investors."

The reasonableness of the prices is challenged by some well-qualified persons, as is the gauge of how much revenue the industries need to stay in good shape and give a fair return on investments.

At present there is only limited representation of the public in rate cases—through the commission's general counsel. By comparison with the utilities' resources, the general counsel has few and inexperienced legal aids.

The accounting, engineering and economic experts whom he consults in preparing the public's case are not on his staff but are directly under the hiring-firing authority of the commission, particularly its chairman.

Unless they are different from most employees, they can be considered sensitive to the regulatory views of the boss.

This conceivably could affect their work on behalf of the public as a party in the adversary-type bureaus before the commissioners. Aside from this, the staff is not considered to be in the same league with the utilities in experience and knowldge. This advantage of the utilities is financed by the public through rates it pays.

Some students of the commission favor changing it to make its commissioners more of a court, divorced from administrative functions. The State Reorganization Commission will hear suggestions for such changes.

The commissioners give the appearance of being conscientious public servants.

Some favor improvements, but there is little indication that any of them believes that the consumer might be seriously handicapped under the present system.

They cite the increased size of the staff in recent years under the chairmanship of William R. Clark as proof of the vigor and well-being of the agency.

One of the two Republican commissioners, Charles J. Fain, did suggest that putting the staff under the merit system might be helpful in recruiting professional employees, such as engineers and accountants, in competition with private business.

"I don't mean to imply," he quickly added, "that under the patronage system there has been any wholesale turning out of people."

Fain said he would like to see the Legislation give the commission power to put new rate into effect and require utilities to reimburse their customers if the tariffs later were found to be too high.

"Such authority would speed the regulatory process," he said.

Fain said federal and some state regulatory agencies had that power.

"In the long run, it would be helpful to utilities as well as consumers," Fain said.

The utilities must delay putting new tariffs into effect for nearly a year during the process of public hearings, he noted.

"It's really not fair to them either," Fain remarked.

Fain commented approvingly on the close working relationship between the commissioners and staff, but said: "Possibly it would be better if there was more distinction between the commission and the general counsel's office, so if he (the general counsel) thought the commission made an unwise decision he could take an appeal to the courts. I'm the first to admit I'm not infallible. If we make a wrong decision, it should be changed."

Chairman Clark, who clearly is the dominant figure on the commission, strongly opposes creation of a national office of utility consumer counsel. Under a proposal in Congress, it would have branches to represent consumers in state as well as federal rate cases.

Last March Clark was part of a delegation of the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners. The delegation testified before a Senate committee against a bill to create such an agency.

George I. Bloom, the association's chief spokesman at the hearing, with whose statement Clark concurred, said: ". . . The state commissions in general, without any prodding by anyone and through the use of their own counsel and technical staff, are regularly performing the very duty which S. 607 would place upon the separate offices of consumers' counsel to perform."

He said the federal money would be better spent to strengthen the staffs of state commissions that needed financial help.

At the hearing Clark volunteered an observation about lawyers who had made appearances in a number of current Missouri rate cases on behalf of federal agencies.

He said they displayed very little concern for the citizens of Missouri and that they wanted "to set up the Federal Government as a special class of customer in Missouri for lower rates than the Missouri citizens should have . . .

"I feel one of these consumers' counsels could eventually tend to become the lawyer for the bureaucracies more than for the people of Missouri."

There followed what seems to be the essence of Clark's position: "We are going to look after the people of Missouri or the people of

Missouri are going to take care of us and take us out of office."

Clark's stand on the bill "was certainly not in the interest of the common people of Missouri," the committee later was told in a letter by Joseph L. Ingles of the political science faculty of the University of Maryland.

Ingles, who wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Missouri Public Service Commission in 1968, told the committee: "Missouri's customers are not represented before the commission in the vast majority of proceedings in which they have a definite interest."

He observed that the commission dealt almost exclusively in matters initiated by the utilities at hearings in which generally no one appears to question the requests on behalf of consumers.

"Missouri's citizens as well as the rest of the United States could benefit enormously from having testimony presented in their behalf by a competent consumers' counsel whose only interest is the public interest," he said.

Some States have a consumers' council as part of government. The executives of several such agencies testified enthusiastically in favor of the federal bill.

Edward R. Willett, a university professor who heads the Massachusetts council, said: "It is quite clear to me that the consumer often does not obtain adequate rate reductions because the successful political and propaganda activities of all the utilities have created a situation in which the regulatory commissions are unable to reduce rates because of a lack of staff and/or disinterest in rate reduction."

He said that the federal consumers' counsel could assist in the cases of state regulatory agencies that are ineffective. Among possible reasons he cited for their ineffectiveness:

"The policies of the private utility companies and those responsible for utility regulation are so similar as to make any differentiation difficult or impossible.

"This may be due either to the natural tendency of human beings who are closely associated with one another over a long period of time to develop sympathetic viewpoints or it may be due again to successful lobbying on the part of the private utility companies to prevent effective regulation."

While debate continues on the consumer agency, Jeremiah Finnegan, the Missouri commission's general counsel, favors more intervention in rate cases by municipalities on behalf of their citizens.

He recently urged the St. Louis County League of Municipalities to pool resources to share the cost of hiring outside experts and experienced rate-case lawyers to present their cases.

"When you realize that the citizens of St. Louis and St. Louis County had their rates increased by about $30,000,000 a year just last year alone," he said, "a few thousand dollars spent by the cities in rate-case expense would seem to be justified. I would like to say that my office welcomes intervention. We need all the help we can get in presenting the public's position."

The municipalities appeared to favor a renewal of a former practice of intervening vigorously in utility rate cases.

As John J. Morris, city attorney of University City, put it: "I anticipate a rejuvenation of that interest. The commission vitally affects all the people—more than they realize. If there is some interest shown in closer scrutiny of rate applications, it will all be to the public benefit."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 30, 1970]

MISSOURI'S WARM CLIMATE

Does state regulation of public utilities in the modern economy work? Can this method be trusted to protect consumer interests in the supply of monopolistic public services? Or must consumers turn to other methods to obtain fair rates and reliable service?

Such questions have been raised by the series of generous rate increases granted to utilities over the past year by the Missouri Public Service Commission. As reported by Al Delugach in the Post-Dispatch, Southwestern Bell for example has been granted a $30,600,000 rate increase involving one of the highest rates of return in the nation, 7.98 per cent, on an operating base that includes plant under construction. Bell, in other words, is being allowed to count, as a cost of providing service, facilities that do not yet provide any service.

Of such accounting methods the California Public Utilities Commission has said:

"Only in a warm climate in which regulated utilities bask in such a contention possible. In the chilly climate of vigorous competitive enterprise, return comes from revenues, and revenues are impossible until a plant is completed . . ."

Professor Lionel Thatcher of the University of Wisconsin, who has testified in rate regulation cases in 26 states as well as before federal agencies, was baffled by the Missouri commission's action. The commission's own staff, which recommended a revenue increase of between $8,000,000 and $12,000,000, and a rate of return between 7.24 and 7.54 per cent, was discouraged and puzzled. And the chief of the regulatory law division of the Army Judge Advocate General, Curtis L. Wagner Jr., said the commission's findings "lacked any justification whatsoever to substantiate them."

Laclede Gas Co., Union Electric Co. and St. Louis County Water Co. also have been granted recent rate increases by the Public Service Commission under Chairman William R. Clark. Almost everybody would agree that in a period of rising costs like the present utility rates will have to rise like everything else. The question is how much they should rise, in fairness to company and consumer alike. The amount of the telephone company's increase and the way in which it was arrived at raise grave questions about the quality of rate regulation under Chairman Clark.

TRIBUTE TO LT. JOSEPH M. LAUINGER

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, last January 8, a son of one of my good friends in Tulsa was killed in Vietnam. He was Lt. Joseph M. Lauinger. A tribute was paid to Joe by his brother, Tony. I found Tony's words to be very inspiring, and I though other Americans would also find inspiration in this tribute which I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under leave granted:

OF JOE LAUINGER

(By his brother Tony, Funeral Mass, January 17, 1970)

We have a lot of thoughts of Joe—of the way he was: quiet, kind, hardworking, funloving, lovable.

He had a great sense of humor. He used to say and do some awfully funny things at awfully funny times. Some of the stunts he pulled probably didn't seen so funny at the time to his basketball coach or to the leader of the singing group that was such a big part of his college years, the Georgetown Chimes. But it was almost impossible to ever really get mad at Joe; he was so good natured it was contagious.

There was a serious side to Joe, too. He felt very strongly about things like *principle* and *duty* and *love*. He loved God, his family, his friends, his schools, his country. And he was always very loyal to the people and things he loved.

Joe was awfully proud to be an American. He felt very grateful to live in a country where men are free—free to strive after goals they set for themselves, free to practice their own beliefs, free to worship God. He believed that all men on this earth should have that same chance.

For Joe, serving his country was as natural a thing as playing out in the yard or going to school. He felt that the great gift of freedom we possess is not something that person deserves, but something a person earns.

Joe had an awful lot of common sense. And he had a great system of priorities. To him the clearest reality in the world was the great truth of St. Augustine: "Thou has made us for Thyself, O Lord, and our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee.

Joe certainly wouldn't want any sadness on our part at his having gone on to his Eternal Reward. With his rare combination of frankness and humor, he would say—and probably in these exact words—that the life he has left is a lot of "Mickey Mouse compared with the one he has gained."

Joe was an inspiriation to us in life. And he was certainly an inspiration to us in death. But despite all that he has been to us up to now, he will be much more of a joy and comfort to us in the future. Because now he's in a position where he can help us a whole lot more . . .

So do be sure, in the days ahead, to pray to Joe. I can tell you from experience, he'll always be ready to help whenever we ask.

HOSPITAL AID AND INFLATION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 29, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I read an editorial in the Washington Post which very clearly outlines the reasons why the President's veto of H.R. 11102 should be sustained.

Over the years it has become quite evident that if an expenditure is mandatory, before the end of the fiscal year, agencies having such money make every effort to spend it, whether wisely and economically or not. The President's very serious objection to this bill was the mandatory expenditure part. I feel that the Post editorial explains the President's position and why his veto should be sustained in the Senate.

Those of us on the subcommittee which formulated the new amendments very strongly support this measure to aid in hospital construction, modernization, and building of facilites to provide less intensive care for ambulatory patients and those in need of rehabilitation. However, some of our number felt that the mandatory expenditures clause could result in expenditure of money for projects which were not needed.

I commend this Post article to your attention:

HOSPITAL AID AND INFLATION

In overriding the President's veto of the hospital aid bill the House appears to have lined up strongly for improved medical care—a highly popular stance in an election year. When the Senate votes on Tuesday, it should give more thought to the valid objec-

tions which caused the veto. Foremost among these is the fact that Congress is trying to force the President to hold a tight rein on federal spending and at the same time compel spending beyond the limits of the budget.

The House has already passed a bill fixing a ceiling on 1971 federal expenditures, and it has been approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee. In the bill extending the Hill-Burton program for hospital construction and modernization, however, Congress authorized direct grants amounting to $350 million more than has been budgeted for fiscal 1971. It also provided that funds for these programs through 1973 must be spent. Fearing that this will become a precedent for additional compulsory spending requirements, the President vigorously protested that Congress is "withdrawing with one hand the authority necessary to do what it requires with the other."

There are some basic differences between the President and Congress, on the granting of federal funds for hospital construction at this time. The executive view is that the government should guarantee private loans to construct and modernize hospitals where additional beds are necessary, while specializing in grants for facilities to provide less intensive care for ambulatory patients and those in need of rehabilitation. This is in keeping with the modern trend of relying more heavily on less costly and sometimes more effective treatment centers as an alternative to hosiptals. But Congress voted for expanded hospital construction grants in addition to the new program, thus piling one on top of the other.

That generous gesture might be justified if Congress had not attempted to force spending of the funds, regardless of actual need, and if Congress had provided a comfortable surplus in the Treasury. Actually Congress slashed taxes in a most reckless fashion in the Tax Reform bill last December, and the Treasury is confronted by a growing deficit. If Congress insists on thus turning on the spending spigots without regard for where the revenue is coming from, it will give new impetus to inflation at a time when the economy is still suffering from the effects of the war-inspired expenditures of the late 1960s.

If the Senate feels strongly that all the medical facilities authorized by this bill are essential, it should indicate its willingness to accept a tax bill to pay for them. Otherwise it will be voting a new shot in the arm for inflation. The wiser course, we think, would be to sustain the veto and promptly to repass the bill with the objectionable features eliminated.

CRISIS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have long admired the work of Roger A. Freeman in the area of education. His scholarly research has appeared in a number of professional journals, and in several books of high quality. Because of his outstanding background, I was particularly pleased to learn last year that Mr. Freeman was joining the White House staff as a special assistant to the President, where his considerable expertise would be available to the executive branch of the Government.

My expectations for Mr. Freeman were not misplaced. On June 19 he addressed the annual meeting of the Washington State Research Council on the subject, "Crisis in American Education."

In this speech, he eloquently puts into perspective a number of questions which are too often obscured by hazy rhetoric. He discusses the financial "problem" of education and also addresses himself to the current situation in higher education.

I commend his address to my colleagues:

CRISIS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(An address by the Honorable Roger A. Freeman, special assistant to the President of the United States)

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 wreak 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).

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, 1953 AND 1971

[In billions]

	National defense	HEW-Labor	All Other	Total
1953	$49.4	$7.1	$20.4	$77.0
1971 [1]	73.6	74.3	57.6	205.6
Increase in percent	+49	+944	+182	+167

[1] President's proposals as revised May 19, 1970.

INCREASE IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, 1953–71

	Amount (billion)	Percent
National defense	$24.2	19
Health, Education, Welfare-Labor	67.2	52
All other	37.2	29
Total	128.6	100

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 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 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*, 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 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 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 *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."

*According to other sources, 8%.

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 program 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 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 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.'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 beneficient. 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

[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."

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 omnious 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 critcial 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 education 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, 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 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 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 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 centruries, 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.

TRIBUTE TO HERMANN B. DEUTSCH

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following story from the New Orleans States-Item of June 26, recounting the sudden death in New York City last week of Hermann B. Deutsch—Newspaperman, author, sportsman, and Louisiana historian.

May I add to that—one of the greatest writers ever produced by the State of Louisiana.

I have also included the last column written by Mr. Deutsch. It was prepared by him before he flew to New York and was published several days after his death.

Mr. Deutsch, whose survivors include members of a famous family, and more particularly his brother, Col. Eberhard P. Deutsch, one of America's great constitutional lawyers, was my old friend from my college days at Tulane University. The late Mr. Deutsch was one of the judges when during my freshman year at Tulane in 1931 I won the medal given to the best debater of the Glendy Burke Debating Society. I have had a soft spot in my heart for him ever since then.

He lived an active life all of his days. I will greatly miss him.

The articles follow:

[From the New Orleans States-Item, June 26, 1970]

DEUTSCH ADDS UP LIFE: GOOD OUTWEIGHED BAD

(By Dale Curry)

From the will of Hermann B. Deutsch.

"I have known more delight than dolor, more contentment than frustration, more gladness than sorrow. The balance of gain over loss is so heavily in my favor that I am in the position of a golfer who is four up and has but three to go. I can no longer lose, and life has been very good to me. "

The will of Hermann B. Deutsch, 81-year-old States-Item columnist who died in New York yesterday, was probated in Civil District Court this morning, designating his estate to friends, relatives and universities and his most treasured possessions—his books—to family and libraries.

Never married, the Austrian-born author, sportsman and Louisiana history authority, hand-wrote nine legal pages of his last will and testament March 16, 1969, inserting amusing and witty remarks on his life and views of here after.

Writing his will in column style, Deutsch named to beneficiaries approximately $100,000.

An undetermined residue was bequeathed to an old friend in Grady, Ark.

He bequeathed $15,000 each to the University of Chicago, Tulane University and Louisiana State University in New Orleans and $10,000 to Loyola University with the use of the money going to sisters and a nephew during their lifetimes.

He asked that his body be donated to medical research, unles it is found to be of no value. Alternatively, he asked that it be shipped out to sea from New Orleans.

"If legal technicalities should prohibit this, then let my body be cremated and have the ashes scattered over some field where something useful is grown," he wrote.

"The one result I ask to assure by the alternative demands is that owned and already overburdened earth, no one spot of ground which might be devoted to growing something serviceable, shall be pre-empted senselessly by that which once was I.

"Above all, let there be no gathering of any sort, no wake, no funeral or other barbarous survival of an uncivilized past, no prayers, no rituals or other incantations."

Regarding eternity, Deutsch said he made no claim to encompass the infinite within the confines of a finite mind but that he feared neither injustice hereafter nor possible extinction.

He expressed gratitude to New Orleans, which he said gave him the "priceless gift" of making friends, and to his Metairie neighbors of many years.

A page of the will is devoted to a group of friends who met for what Deutsch called "business sessions." He asked that he host a final meeting of the group and set aside $300 to defray the cost a session of La Societe des Escargots Orleanais.

He left his books to his brother, Col. Eberhard P. Deutsch, with the suggestion that some go to New Orleans and Jefferson Parish public libraries and libraries of New Orleans and Baton Rouge universities.

Deutsch said he would leave nothing to organized charity or welfare groups.

"In my estimation the heavy impost levied upon my earnings in life through taxes for the support of those less fortunate then myself or assistance to those less willing to exert themselves for the attainment of what earnest effort could almost surely have brought them, I fully discharge any obligation I may have in this respect."

Throughout his will he referred to monetary bequests as the least valuable part of his belongings. A major portion of the money was dispersed to young friends.

[From the New Orleans States-Item, June 27, 1970]

MAGAZINE COLUMN SETS OFF LAST WALK WITH NOSTALGIA

(By Hermann Deutsch)

A walk with nostalgia—Someone sent me a copy of the glossy Baton Rouge "Register" the other day, and on the instant I went hurtling back in time to the early 1930s, when my first hard-cover book had just come out. It was a biography of Lee Christmas. Its title: "The Incredible Yanqui," published by Longmans, who had somewhat earlier published Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe.

At first all of a novice's gauziest success dreams seemed about to come true. The New York Times, where I was completely unknown, devoted a full page of its fabled Sunday book review section—page 3, at that—to a very favorable review.

I had worked hard on it. I had traveled to Memphis to dredge all the first hand information I could from the first of Christmas' four lawful wives, all of whom were still living at the time of his death in January, 1924, in Touro infirmary of the tropical sprue he had contracted somewhere in the jungles of Honduras or Nicaragua. I had gone to the tropics (my first visit to that storied land) to interview Guy Molony, who had been chief of police in New Orleans (his birthplace) from 1920 to 1925, and who, prior to that time had been a volunteer British soldier in the Boer War in South Africa, where he had been cashiered for borrowing his colonel's horse in order to be photographed with it.

He had been Christmas' chief right bower in at least three Centro-American revolutions; he had been the first donor to give a pint and a half of blood to his old jefe in a second story bedroom of the latter's home on Sycamore st.—and because of the soreness of his arm, which had required surgery to lay bare a vein in the crook of his left elbow, he asked me to drive him back to town in his siren-equipped green Cadillac coupe, which I very proudly did.

But after that one review in the New York Times, and other less gaudy ones in scores of other newspapers, nothing in the way of sales eventuated. So I kept my job on the old Item, covered the first legitimate Louisiana story with Charlie Campbell, John Gasquet and Jimmy Wedell in an airplane—the opposition reporter on that assignment (a penitentiary break at Angola in which eight men died) was a young University of Mississippi alumnus, name of George Healy.

But so far as my cherished firstling of a hard-cover book was concerned there was nothing—absolutely zero-zero—except bills for the clipping service I was green enough to have engaged.

I still have a dusty old carbon among my stored effects, bulging with those clippings, some of them actually pasted into the little Woolworth scrapbook I had acquired for the purpose; and if I can ever excavate that carton from its resting place, I shall add to those clippings the following from Carol Seip's Ad-Libbing column of the April 4, 1970, edition of the Register, published twice monthly at Baton Rouge by Orene (Mrs. Huckabay) Muse. Carol writes of the Matrix Table, an organization of LSU's girl journalism students, who included at that time the late Helen Gilkinson, Mary Champagne, Orene Muse, and blessed "Maggie" Dixon, who died this week after a long and brilliant career as managing editor of the Morning Advocate.

Writes Carol Seip of the Matrix Table's guests, and Orene's recollections of Dorothy Dix and Warren Rogers, and adds: "She (Orene) also remembers Hermann Deutsch, who was the LSU chapter's first Matrix Table speaker when the then Mississippi student at the University here draped herself in a Spanish shawl and gave a reading from Hermann's book about General Lee Christmas. (Hermann was charmed.)"

He was indeed. In my response I said Orene convinced me that I had builded better than I knew. And I am no end grateful to the omnivorous reader, Librarian Maurice D. Walsh Jr., of the Jefferson Parish Public Library, who marked this reference and sent me the Register's April 4, 1970, issue and thus sent me off on this walk with fair Nostalgia.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, MAY 1970

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

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

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, MAY 1970

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of May was 3,013,112 as compared with 3,089,175 in the preceding month of April. This was a net decrease of 76,063, due primarily to temporary Census employment.

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

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of May totaled 2,976,677. This was a net decrease of 76,383 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of April. Employment by months in fiscal 1970, which began July 1, 1969, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1969	3,049,502	+9,140	
August	3,015,864		−33,638
September	2,945,752		−70,112
October	2,927,741		−18,011
November	2,913,598		−14,143
December	2,912,661		−937
January 1970	2,893,593		−19,068
February	2,892,469		−1,143
March	2,975,192	+82,723	
April	3,053,060	+77,868	
May	2,976,677		−76,382

Total employment in civilian agencies of the Executive Branch for the month of May was 1,759,246, a decrease of 71,678 as compared with the April total of 1,830,924. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in May was 1,217,431, a decrease of 4,705 as compared with 1,222,136 in April.

The civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest net decreases were Commerce Department with 72,259, (reflecting a decrease of 71,959 in temporary employees involved in taking the Nineteenth Decennial Census), and Treasury Department with 6,270. The agencies reporting the largest net increases were Agriculture Department with 3,012 and Interior Department with 1,702. These changes were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Navy with 3,470, Army with 483 and Air Force with 460.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in May was 2,748,548, a decrease of 71,572 as compared with April. Total employment outside the United States in May was 228,129, a decrease of 4,811 as compared with April.

The total of 2,976,677 civilian employees of the Executive Branch reported for the month of May 1970 includes 2,563,450 full time employees in permanent positions. This represents a decrease of 4,163 in such employment from the preceding month of April. (See Table 2 of accompanying report.)

The Executive Branch employment total of 2,976,677 includes some foreign nationals employed abroad, but in addition there were 105,811 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during May who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in April was 106,317.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in the month of May totaled 29,579, an increase of 78 as compared with the preceding month of April. Employment in the Judicial Branch in the month of May totaled 6,856, an increase of 242 as compared with April.

DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

The total of 3,013,112 reported by the Committee for May includes 19,594 disadvantaged persons employed under federal opportunity programs, an increase of 952 over the preceding month of April. (See Table 4 of the accompanying report.)

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

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1969	May 1970	Estimated June 30, 1970 [1]
Agriculture	83,425	82,134	83,000
Commerce	25,364	25,294	25,600
Defense:			
Civil functions	31,214	30,213	30,700
Military functions	1,225,877	1,147,782	1,165,900
Health, Education, and Welfare	102,941	101,175	102,500
Housing and Urban Development	14,307	14,332	14,900
Interior	58,156	59,611	59,300
Justice	35,106	37,199	37,600
Labor	9,723	9,894	10,300
Post Office	562,381	565,091	567,000
State	24,658	23,667	23,900
Agency for International Development	15,753	14,582	15,000
Transportation	60,386	62,733	63,600
Treasury	79,982	85,595	86,700
Atomic Energy Commission	7,047	6,980	7,000
Civil Service Commission	4,970	5,117	5,300
General Services Administration	36,176	36,195	36,400
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	31,733	31,323	31,400
Office of Economic Opportunity	2,856	2,178	2,400
Panama Canal	14,731	14,574	14,700
Selective Service System	6,584	6,671	6,600
Small Business Administration	4,099	4,006	4,100
Tennessee Valley Authority	11,987	12,550	12,300
U.S. Information Agency	10,500	10,001	10,200
Veterans' Administration	147,606	147,710	148,500
All other agencies	26,200	26,843	27,800
Contingencies			10,000
Total	2,633,762	2,563,450	2,602,800

[1] Source: As projected in 1971 budget document; figures rounded to nearest 100.

A QUIET ONE WITH CLASS—AL KALINE

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the headline writer for the special feature story on one of baseball's great players, Detroit Tigers' Al Kaline, which appeared in the June 29 edition of the Christian Science Monitor, could not have said it better when he called Kaline "a quiet one with class." In Michigan, we also view Al Kaline as a player in a class by himself. It is equally remarkable that we not only admire his tremendous playing skills, but that we recognize him as a real gentleman and an outstanding citizen. In reading the article by Mr. Ed Rumill, I particularly noted the quote by Detroit Manager Mayo Smith who said:

But Al has all the qualities you look for in a great ballplayer.

As I had the privilege to meet and visit with Al Kaline a year ago last January in my Washington office, it is most natural for me to be able to tell you that Al Kaline has all the qualities you look for in a great person and American, too. It is with great pleasure to insert in the RECORD a fine article on Al Kaline, one of baseball's all-time greats who has future greatness before him either in baseball or other endeavors. The article read as follows:

KALINE: A QUIET ONE WITH CLASS

(By Ed Rumill)

This has been a season for senior-citizen accomplishments in baseball's major leagues.

Atlanta's Henry Aaron became the ninth player in history to reach the 3,000-hit plateau. San Francisco's Willie Mays will join him before the 1970 schedule has run out. Mays has moved into the 600-homer class, topped only by Babe Ruth.

Chicago's Ernie Banks hit his 500th home run and Atlanta's Hoyt Wilhelm made his 1,000th mound appearance and still, well past the age of 40, is an effective relief pitcher.

All of these men, sooner or later, will be enshrined in the Baseball Museum and Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y. They rate such recognition.

"HIS CLASS NEVER DIMS"

It may be, however, that in its eagerness to applaud these long-time veterans, the big-league public has overlooked a less-publicized but worthy member of the senior-citizen group. How many have noticed how swiftly Al Kaline has moved into the game's select society?

In his 18th consecutive season with the Detroit Tigers, silent Al is well decorated with positive statistics, both offensive and defensive. No finer two-way ballplayer is performing in the majors today—an all-star in the batter's box and in the field. He can do it all.

"It's funny," Tiger skipper Mayo Smith was saying recently, "a fellow who seldom speaks out never seems to get the credit he deserves in baseball. Kaline is that sort. He is rarely quoted; he never pops off. You'd hardly know he is around—until the game starts."

"But Al has all the qualities you look for in a great ballplayer," Smith continued. "He can beat you with the long ball, with the

stolen base, and with his glove and arm. What more do you need to say? He just keeps going on and on. His class never dims."

"HE'S A TOUGH HITTER"

If Mays is destined to become the 10th man on the 3,000-hit list, Kaline could be the 11th. He recently passed the 2,500 milestone. And having averaged 150 hits a season since becoming a regular in 1954, he could reach 3,000 at his present rate some time in '73—if he chooses to keep going.

Though a 150-hit average is not spectacular, it should be pointed out that a succession of injuries have dogged the veteran Detroiter through the years, once limiting him to 100 games and on another occasion to 102. Only three times has he played in 150 or more American League engagements. Thus, that 150-hit pace is a lot more productive than a quick glance suggests.

Kaline joined the Tigers at the tender age of 19 and won an AL batting championship in '55 with a .340 average at the remarkable age of 20, an all-time record.

"He's a tough hitter," Ted Williams has said of Kaline. "He has the quick wrists that can hit a ball right of the the catcher's mitt. For a guy with a big swing, he usually gets a piece of the ball. He's one of the best half-dozen hitters to come along since I've been here."

AN OCTOBER AWAKENING

Going into the 1970 campaign the Tiger star sported a lifetime batting average of .302, plus 335 home runs. He also had won 10 Gold Glove Awards for fielding excellence. He has the arm of a right fielder, and before the opposition learned to respect him, would throw out 15 or 20 base runners a year.

The crowd was so occupied cheering Mickey Lolich and Denny McLain, Kaline's .379 batting average in the 1968 World Series against St. Louis almost went unnoticed. Norm Cash hit .385 in the seven games against the Cardinals. But Kaline's eight runs batted in were significant.

"He waited a long time for it [his first series], but when it came he was ready," declared Mayo Smith, following the victory in October of '68. "And a lot of people were rooting for him to do well. He was the happiest guy in our clubhouse afterwards."

The sight of Kaline kicking up his heels that October did seem strange. His shyness had for many years marked him as a player lacking in outward emotions.

"They're the ones you should never underestimate, the quiet ones," Mayo Smith added. "They may be unemotional on the outside, but they have a way of exploding when it means something."

CALIFORNIA REBEKAH LODGE NO. 1

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the California Rebekah Lodge No. 1. The actual beginnings of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows have been lost in the passing of time. Nevertheless, the Rebekah Lodge has carried on the principles that were initiated by the founding fathers of the Odd Fellows; namely, "to visit the sick; relieve the distressed; bury the dead, and educate the orphan." Presently there is a home for the aged in Saratoga and a home for children in Gilroy.

The modern order is known to have been in existence in England during the 18th century. The American order was founded on April 26, 1819, in Baltimore, Md. The order is now in the United States, Canada, and 19 other foreign countries. Originally, the American order only admitted men for membership. Then, in 1851, female relatives were admitted for the first time. The most famous California charter member was Judge Davis Louderback, who became grand master, as did his son.

California Rebekah Lodge No. 1 has contributed its services to such crises as the 1906 fire and earthquake in San Francisco and the depression, for 100 years. It is fitting that we take note on suitable occasions of such quiet service to mankind sustained over so many years. Government welfare programs can never take the place of individual responsibility to those in need of help and comfort.

PEACE IS A COVENANT OF HEARTS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of books and millions of words have been written about peace since the start of history, some of them not only eloquent, but memorable as well.

Dante observed that, "in His will is our peace."

In a speech, Disraeli yearned for "peace with honor."

Lamartine looked for "peace at any price."

That noble advocate of peace, Woodrow Wilson, asked for "a peace without victory."

And in the New Testament, Matthew said, "Blessed are the peacemakers."

Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Haim Kemelman, of East Brunswick, N.J., has been sedulously working for peace all his life, not only because he is a good man, but because he believes in the blessings of peace. The deep love he has for peace, justice, and understanding, is evident in his writings—and what beautiful writings they are.

In a religious column he writes for the Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., called "Lines on Living," Rabbi Kemelman wrote a magnificent article entitled "Peace a Covenant of Hearts."

This distinguished clergyman and talented author ended his inspirational column by reminding us—

It's high time for man to come home in peace, to raise his sights to the heights of mountains, to see clearer and to do better in behalf of peace, in behalf of humanity. Perhaps we can go back to the origin of prophecy and begin anew the works of peace—in our land and abroad—and see in the vision of the prophet: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings, that announceth peace, the harbinger of good tidings that announceth salvation . . ."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that God continues to bless Rabbi Kemelman, for he is truly a peacemaker.

I insert his outstanding and moving column that was published in The Home News on June 5, 1970:

PEACE A COVENANT OF HEARTS

(By Rabbi Haim Kemelman)

The ancient prophet of Jerusalem, Jeremiah, coined the lamentable phrase which has now become the reality of our life: "Peace, peace, peace; where there is no peace."

We say peace and we have war; we say peace and we see desolation; we say peace and there is no peace in our midst. The heart is victim of warring conflicts.

What has happened to the civilization of man that after all the celebrations and salutations of peace—for thousands of years—we are now invoking the princely and prophetic concept of harmonic humanity only to make a mockery of it? What has become of the beautiful words of peace and love preached on the heights of Mounts of the great religions? In the name of what cult, what God, what humanity do humans kill one another, mutilate one another, hate one another?

Dreadfully, the human animal can be the most beastly. He will twist words to mask his animality and cite scriptures to prove his humanity. He will then go on hating more for love and ravaging more for peace—losing his own soul and those of others. There is a war of arms in Southeast Asia and there is a war of hearts inside America, and there is a war of attrition inside the heart. And there is little consolation in shouting at one another when the elements of human peace are shattered.

NO PEACE IN JERUSALEM

"Peace, peace, peace; and there is no peace." Even the symbol of peace is broken, with the crown lying in the dust. The star of peace over Jerusalem is more than eclipsed. Bloody stains cover the paths where divine prophecy of peace first went forth. There are no harbingers of peace in Jerusalem today, only the thunder of explosives and firearms. The city of eternal peace, the land of prophecy of universal concord lies in the dust of lethal powder. School children leave their homes never sure to return, as some of their playmates are found blown to smithereens by terror lurking from the dark. The innocent, the people who have nothing to do with it all—on both sides of the border—suffer and are bloodied in agony and pain, crying "Peace, peace, peace; and there is no peace."

There is no peace because the conditions of peace are frightfully missing. We can have human desolation and call it peace. But peace is not a platitude, it is a proposition. The ancients had a prophetic designation for it, referring to its condition as a covenant of peace—imperatives embodied in a set of relationships of mutual respect, recognition and the binding commitment of reciprocal human interaction. They also called it shalom, meaning peace, but also testifying to wholeness—to total human fulfillment through involvement.

PEACE IS TOTAL

Peace is not the scribbling of a signature on a piece of paper that carries no firm identity and no certain reality. Peace is not negotiated by lip service, phrase peddling and absenteeism. Peace is a total condition of humanity, of complementary human relations: of contact between peoples, of contract between nations, of a covenant of hearts.

There are no half measures to peace—inner peace and outer peace. It's all or nothing. There is only one way to peace—peace! Active peace! Verbal peace! And the price of peace is peace—total and in one piece, not in desolation.

It's high time for man to come home in peace, to raise his sights to the heights of

mountains, to see clearer and to do better in behalf of peace, in behalf of humanity. Perhaps we can go back to the origin of prophecy and begin anew the works of peace—in our land and abroad—and see in the vision of the prophet: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings, that announceth peace, the harbinger of good tidings that announceth salvation. . . ."

LET US CLEAN UP THE AIR—NOT THE MOTORIST'S POCKETBOOK

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, the administration has proposed a tax on lead used in automotive gasoline. The proposed tax would produce approximately $1.6 billion a year in revenue. According to the Treasury Department, the additional cost to the motorist would be approximately 2.3 cents per gallon of gasoline.

I realize that any administration abhors deficits. This is as it should be. Unhappily, however, this too often results in unwarranted or ill-considered revenue proposals for the purpose offsetting a budget deficit.

The administration's proposed lead tax clearly falls within this category. I shall not comment upon the patent absurdity of attempting to eliminate the entire deficit with the tax on a single commodity. Nor shall I dwell upon the contradictory positions being taken by the administration with respect to removing the lead from gasoline.

I have observed, however, that there is a Technical Advisory Board, which has been formed by the Secretary of Commerce, for the purpose of studying lead removal from gasoline; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has distributed a questionnaire to refiners and other interested parties and is currently studying the problem to determine what regulations might most appropriately deal with it; the House has passed legislation giving the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare authority to issue regulations. A bill is presently before the other body, in which a number of related bills had been introduced and hearings had been previously held.

It is simply incredible to me that considering the large sums of money that are being spent by the Departments of Commerce and Health, Education, and Welfare to determine the right answer to this very complex problem, that the administration would superimpose this tax proposal, which is inconsistent to the point of being mutually exclusive of the studies carried on by both Houses of the Congress and two departments of the executive branch.

This is clearly wasteful, nonproductive and bad public administration.

Let me hasten to add that I am not opposed to removing lead from gasoline. Like most Americans, I find myself somewhat confused by the conflicting positions of the many experts in this field. Some tell us that lead is bad for people. Others say that this is not so; it is simply bad for the devices which would remove that portion of automotive emissions, which are bad for people. Yet other equally expert voices state that, in point of fact, those ingredients which would have to be added to replace lead, if it were prohibited, would be far more harmful to the public and the atmosphere than the lead itself.

Simply stated, I am for doing whatever needs to be done to help clean up air pollution. If this involves removing lead, then I am all for it. It is even conceivable that by placing a substantial tax on the lead used in gasoline, this would, over a period of time, give such a competitive advantage to unleaded gasoline, that it would take over the entire market.

Personally, I think this is the wrong way to go.

For one thing, the Nation's independent small business marketers, such as oil jobbers, would be faced with vast and, indeed, prohibitive expenditures to put in a third pump to dispense unleaded regular grade gasoline, if it were allowed to be marketed simultaneously with both regular leaded gasoline and leaded premium gasoline.

It just seems to me that if lead is to be prohibited, then no regular gasoline should be allowed to contain lead. This would eliminate many millions of dollars of needless and nonproductive expenditures for additional pump and tank installations.

Beyond this, however, I feel that this lead tax proposal would be most unfair to the Nation's consumers of gasoline—the American motorist.

The President's proposal would result in the revenue from the lead gasoline lead tax going not to the Highway Trust Fund but to the general Government coffers. Let us analyze that for a moment.

One of the reasons that a gallon of gasoline today is a relatively good buy is that the portion of the cost representing Federal tax provides roads on which to drive the car while burning the gasoline. Nothing is more useless than gasoline or, for that matter even his automobile to the motorist if there are no adequate roads upon which to drive. To me the dedication of the funds derived from the excise tax on automotive gasoline has been one of the real values for the consumers of this Nation. It is a little like getting the bread for the sandwich free when you pay for the salami.

Clearly any increase in the tax on gasoline, whether on lead or any other specific ingredient is really a tax on the motorists. It simply is not fair to take the money from an excise tax on the motorist's gasoline and spend it elsewhere. This is particularly true in light of the many representations made to the motoring public over a long period of years that the funds from gasoline taxes would be available only for highways.

Mr. Speaker, I have been delighted to read in the press that the outlook for this proposal is unfavorable. For myself, I have the greatest faith in Chairman MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee and his very able colleagues. I am sure that when they have finished analyzing this somewhat ridiculous proposal, that they will take appropriate action to insure that the Nation's motorists are not subjected to this unconscionable and unjustifiable burden.

SENATE—*Thursday, July 2, 1970*

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will come to order.

The Senate, under previous agreement, will now adjourn until noon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 6, 1970

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 7 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Wednesday, July 1, 1970, until Monday, July 6, 1970, at 12 noon.